

Please reply to: Terry Gould
Direct Line: 01628 683501
Fax: 01628 683594
Email: terry.gould@rbwm.gov.uk
My ref: TJG/JS

**Community Services/
Public Protection &
Sustainability Unit**

Terry Gould
Head of Public Protection & Sustainability
York House, Sheet Street
Windsor
SL4 1DD
www.rbwm.gov.uk



27th February 2008 – emailed to heathrowconsultation@dft.gsi.gov.uk

Dear Sir

I am instructed by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead to respond on behalf of the Council to the recent DfT consultation entitled: *“Adding Capacity At Heathrow Airport”*.

For your information a full report was presented to the Council’s Cabinet meeting on 21st February 2008 where upon after a full debate it was:

“RESOLVED: That

- a) **The contents of the recent Government consultation document entitled ‘Adding Capacity At Heathrow Airport’, issued by the DfT be noted.**
- b) **The actions taken by the Royal Borough’s officers, Members and stakeholders in engaging and encouraging local residents to respond to the Government’s consultation be noted.**
- c) **The recommended responses as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report, be endorsed.**
- d) **Authority be delegated to the Lead Member for Highways, Transport and Environment, in consultation with the Head of Public Protection and Sustainability, to incorporate additional comments from Members and the public meetings that been held, into the Council’s response to the consultation.**
- e) **The Chief Executive be authorised to send a copy of the Council’s response to all MPs with constituencies around Heathrow Airport requesting that they collectively urge the Secretary of State to urgently reconsider the areas of concern that are raised by the Consultation Document, the contents of which are outlined in the report.**
- f) **The Head of Public Protection and Sustainability be authorised to forward, on behalf of the Council, the Royal Borough’s comments to the DfT.**
- g) **The Council’s response be published and the actions be regularly updated on the Council’s web site and via the local press and media, and the comments as set out in paragraph 6.2.1 of the report relating to the Royal Borough’s potential involvement in future judicial review proceedings be noted.”**

A copy of the Borough’s response, as indicated in Resolution (c) referred to above is attached. This constitutes the Borough’s formal response to the Eleven (11 no.) Questions as set out in the consultation document.

The Borough would also wish to draw to the Secretary of State’s (SoS) attention to a number of other issues that are of great concern to the Council arising out of the consultation process itself and a number of other matters that the SoS is urged to consider as a matter of great urgency prior to making any final decision on the matter. These are number consecutively to enable a response to each of the points.

1. The Consultation Process

The Borough is deeply concerned about the manner in which the consultation exercise has been conducted and is of the opinion that it has lacked clarity, transparency, accessibility and an objective assessment of the facts surrounding many of the proposals.

This Council is fully aware of the Government's adopted '*Code of Practice on Written Consultations*' and believes that this consultation fails to comply with many aspects of the Code. Many local residents have not received or are totally unaware of the Consultation. Those that are, or have been made aware are either unable to understand the technical complexities of the document given it is deficient in key facts that do not appear in the Summary Document or, simply are unable to answer the questions in the absence of the supporting documentation. It has been stated that this has resulted in an inability for many people to respond.

In addition, there is confusion about how respondents are supposed to answer the questions without being led by questions that have been carefully crafted to provide the answers that support the proposals.

Distribution of the document has been haphazard and there are inconsistencies, particularly the questions, between the Full Consultation and the Summary documents in how respondents are required to answer and what will be counted as an eligible response.

The consultation is considered to be more of a 'Statement of Intent', rather than a Consultation that implies views are being openly sought. There is a strong sense amongst local communities that the proposals are no more than a foregone conclusion and that Government has made up its mind. A point expressly promulgated by civil servants at the DfT Exhibitions on a number of occasions.

The Council requests a formal response to these matters.

2. Contradictions of existing Government policies

The Borough believes many of the proposals set out in the consultation are in direct contradiction to a number of existing government policies. In particular, those relating to:

- Sustainability ('*Securing the Future*'- March 2005), and the importance of 'striking an equitable balance' between the various interests. It totally disregards the well established '*Polluter Pays Principle*' and '*Precautionary Principle*'.
The Government's current Sustainability strategy also expressly sets out its policy based on key Guiding Principles of: '*Using Sound Science Responsibly*'; '*Living Within Environmental Limits*'; and '*Ensuring a Strong Healthy and Just Society*'. Given the Heathrow Airport proposals are perhaps the single biggest test of the Government's commitment to its sustainability strategy, approval of proposals that are unproven in economic, societal and environmental terms which are largely based on assertions and pre-suppositions seriously questions the robustness and well-meaning of its commitment to the sustainability agenda.
- World Health Organisation (WHO) '*Guidelines For Community Noise*' for the protection of public health against the adverse effects of aircraft noise and a government commitment to meet the standards in the longer-term.
- Planning Policies;
- Climate Change (GHG and carbon reduction) at the global and local levels;
- Integrated Transport Planning

In addition there is a clear contradiction and evident falsehood relating to the Government's stated and current policies relating to community noise particularly in respect of its own definitions of '*excessive noise*'; and a positive and clear U-turn on commitments to '*bearing down on noise*'.

The proposals, if sanctioned, appear set to repeat the chequered history of '*Broken Promises*' and '*U-turns*' in respect of:

- Further development at Heathrow Airport as cited by statements in relation to the Terminal 4 and Terminal 5 decisions and undertakings;
- The basis of the T5 decision (2001);
- Conditions attached to the T5 decision for the protection of local communities. On the face of it, these will need to be revised to accommodate the stimulated growth and continuance of the much discredited '*predict and provide mentality*'.

3. ANASE

In 2001 the then Minister for Aviation gave an undertaking that a study would be commissioned to research whether the former criteria used for the '*onset of annoyance*' had become un-calibrated over time (i.e. since ANIS in 1980's). It was stated at the time that the findings of this new research would underpin Government noise policy upon which a future aviation strategy would be cognisant. The Council is deeply concerned that, after 6.5 years and costing £1.5 million, the study has been deemed to be inconclusive and in effect disregarded for the purposes of the Heathrow Airport proposals. Further, that requests for information regarding the Study from both local authorities, local community groups and individuals have been refused and withheld prior to being released only following pressure from 2M Group merely 3 weeks prior to the publication of the Consultation Document.

It is noted the Government concedes the onset of annoyance is now significantly lower at 54dB(A) conclusively and possibly as low as 50dB(A) and that the number of aircraft movements is a significant factor in the onset of annoyance. Therefore the Council remains deeply suspicious of the Government's motives for totally disregarding the findings of the Study and not taking them into account when assessing the economic and environmental impacts of the proposals as set out within the consultation document.

The Council believes the consultation needs to be withdrawn and re-issued only after a proper consideration, in public, of these findings.

4. Directive 2002/30/EC

The Council believes Government is failing to meet the requirements and objectives of DIRECTIVE 2002/30/EC in relation to the process for improving the noise climate around civil airports. The Consultation cites a base year of 2002 for assessing future noise levels and whether the proposals can be contained within a noise cap of 127Km². What the consultation does not state is that this noise cap is based on a time when Concorde was still flying and thereby gave a huge margin on its retirement from service for introducing a greater number of less noisy aircraft movements; a totally unacceptable noise climate in WHO standards; the base year was succeeded by a number of years when the noise level actually improved. (ergo it will now deteriorate with the increase in movements); and in any event is based on a noise contour of 57db(A) that appears to be no longer valid following the ANASE Study (see Point 3 above).

The Council would appreciate a formal response to this point.

5. Introduction of Mixed Mode / Abolition of Cranford Agreement / Retention of Westerly Preference

The Council notes that the Government is minded to introduce 'Mixed Mode' as early as 2010. The Council is deeply concerned that this would lead to a significant deterioration in the quality of life for many thousands of people living around the airport from increased noise, coupled with the annoyance from increased over-flights and the changing patterns and loss of alternation (i.e. respite). Also, the Government is minded to abandon the Cranford Agreement.

The Council believes that it is essential to consider these two elements as separate issues as they are not necessarily linked and should be considered on their individual merits. The Council believes there is an opportunity to develop a compromise situation that would better serve all Parties based on the following:

- Retention of segregated mode on the existing two runways; and
- Grant permission for a slightly increased cap; and
- Retention of westerly alternation; and
- Introduction of easterly alternation (not currently feasible due to the existence of the Cranford Agreement); and
- A ‘legally binding’ Agreement (i.e. not a planning permission) that covers all of these elements.

Under these circumstances the Council believes this represents a more equitable sharing of the noise burden; achieves the Government’s objectives of optimising capacity at Heathrow Airport within constrained environmental capacity limits that provides some measure of reassurance and certainty for residents living under the existing flight paths; and it would recover some trust and credibility for the Government and its policies.

The Council would appreciate a response to these constructive proposals

6. Destruction of Sipson village (700homes)

Whilst outside of its boundaries the Council is deeply concerned about the destruction of Sipson village, loss of heritage in favour of a Third runway and the resultant stress on housing provision in the wider area. The Council’s specific concerns relating to the Third Runway and Terminal 6 are discussed in the attached response.

7. Other Matters

The Council is concerned about a number of other issues that need to be considered. Accepting that the consultation document is not expected to fulfill the requirements of a Strategic Environmental Assessment at this stage the Council requests assurances and answers in relation to the following questions:

- Are the modelling predictions (for noise, AQ, transport, economic benefits) accurate? How will breaches or non-compliance be enforced if the predictions prove to be wrong?
- What is the future security of T5 undertakings and basis of that decision?
- Are any of the results of the ANASE Study valid?
- How much would the economic justification falter if LAeq_{16h} 50dB(A) proves to be valid?
- What is the TOTAL environmental and social cost?
- Public Safety – NATS studies?
- What compensation arrangements are being made for both planning blight, home loss and disturbance?
- What is the protection and guarantees for local communities?
- What is the form of protection, undertakings and guarantees for local communities?
- How do the proposals integrate with longer-term international developments in climate change and carbon emissions?
- What role will the future use and impact of high speed rail links, e.g. St. Pancras have in releasing capacity at Heathrow Airport by displacing short haul aircraft movements?
- What consideration has been given to the likely impact of new and ‘virtual’ technology for reducing demand and/or optimising the efficiency of runway capacity?
- Has the Government/aviation industry considered the impact of ‘Peak oil’ upon future demand?
- Has sufficient attention been given to alternative sustainable development, redevelopment and expansion of sites in the South-East?
- How is a ‘London-wide system’ comprising 5 airports and six existing runways losing out to individual European airports?
- Why is there such an obsession on ‘Heathrow Airport’ rather than a more relevant focus upon a ‘London-wide system’?

During the period of the DfT's consultation the Council took upon itself the task of presenting the contents and context of the Consultation proposals to local residents. A number of resolutions were also tabled and are reproduced below as Appendix 2. These should be taken as part of the Council's wider response to the proposals.

An Exit Poll was also conducted at the DfT Exhibition held in Windsor on 17th December 2007 to try and gauge the reaction of attendees to the Exhibition. The results of the Poll are attached for your information in Appendix 3. You will note there is overwhelming concern about the quality of the information provided at the Exhibition and the perceived impacts and acceptability of the proposals.

Taken together and in consideration of the numerous shortcomings and misgivings with the objective evidence presented within the Consultation, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead would strongly urge the Secretary of State to:

- Abandon the proposals for a Third Runway, Sixth Terminal and Mixed Mode at Heathrow Airport;
- Conduct further follow up research in relation to the ANASE Study;
- Commission a refreshed, independent economic appraisal of the proposals;
- Conduct an early critique of the consultation process;
- Consider the Borough's responses to the specific questions set out in the Consultation;
- Respond to the various issues raised in this communication.

Please note the Council has no objection to this response being made publicly available. Copies will also be sent to all Members of Parliament with constituencies around Heathrow Airport and this response and attachments are to be posted on the Borough's web site with immediate effect.

Yours sincerely

T.J.Gould
Head of Public Protection & Sustainability

RBWM RESPONSE: ‘ADDING CAPACITY AT HEATHROW AIRPORT’ (DfT Nov 2007)

CONSULTATION QUESTION	RBWM RESPONSE	COMMENTS
<p>Q1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposal that a third runway at Heathrow, if built, should be supported by associated passenger terminal facilities? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations you believe need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>The Council is strongly opposed to <u>any</u> further unsustainable expansion at Heathrow Airport. The suite of proposals that are set out in the consultation document are considered wholly unsustainable.</p> <p>Moreover, the Council is mindful of the evidence presented at the Heathrow Terminal 5 Inquiry and the fact that the Inquiry Inspector was unequivocal in his recommendation to Government (as indeed was the previous T4 Inspector in 1983) that: ‘the total number of aircraft movements at Heathrow must be strictly controlled and a realistic cap imposed together with effective controls on movements at night...Unless the controls I have proposed are imposed the impact of Terminal 5 would soon exceed that on which I have based my judgement. It would rapidly become wholly unacceptable whatever benefits it might bring...Nevertheless I agree with <u>BAA</u> that the evidence placed before me demonstrates that a third main runway at Heathrow would have such severe and widespread impacts on the environment as to be totally unacceptable’.</p> <p>The current proposals go far beyond these determining</p>	

	<p>factors and the current town planning limits which specify five terminals only and a ceiling of 480,000 annual air traffic movements (ATMs).</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <p>a. Relate mainly (but not exclusively) to the adverse environmental impact that an expanded Heathrow airport will have on a large number of the Borough's residents through exposure to increased levels of aircraft noise, infringement of air quality standards, lack of adequate infra-structure and the over-development that would be stimulated in an already stressed region.</p> <p>b. The Council is concerned that the consultation relies on unproven, uncalibrated and flawed assertions; a lack of objective evidence; and is unsupported by any concrete commitments or proposals relating to how the expansion proposals will constitute a sustainable development.</p>	
<p>Q2. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's view on the continuing validity of the environmental conditions? What are your reasons?</p> <p>Are there any significant considerations you believe need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>The Council does not agree that there is any continuing validity to the environmental conditions.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basis and conditions upon which both Terminals 4 & 5 were permitted have been reneged. • The very basis upon which community noise is measured and assessed is uncalibrated, outdated 	<p><i>“All possible steps should be taken to satisfy those living around Heathrow that this is the last major expansion at the airport.” (T4)</i></p> <p><i>“It should be assumed that no further major development would take</i></p>

	<p>and non-compliant with EU requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government has totally dismissed the findings of the recent ANASE Study, a 6-year study undertaken by an internationally respected group that found that community noise criteria should be based on LAeq.50dB(A) and not LAeq.57dB(A). The Council believes this was a deliberate ploy given the economic implications and damage to the economic justification for the proposals. The results of the ANASE Study were supposed to underpin the Government's noise policy. There is now a policy vacuum and the current proposals are being assessed against dubious criteria. • Contradictions of the Government's own policies and statements relating to climate change, sustainability, 'bearing down on noise', 'striking the balance' between sustainability options; what constitutes 'excessive noise'; regional planning policies; EU Directives relating to noise and air quality; and many more. • Continuance of the catalogue of 'broken promises' to local communities by government, airport operators and airline industry. Communities have little trust or 	<p><i>place at Heathrow after Terminal 5" (T5 – 2001)</i></p> <p><i>"I agree with <u>BAA</u> that the evidence placed before me demonstrates that a third main runway at Heathrow would have such severe and widespread impacts on the environment as to be totally unacceptable"(T5 - 2001)</i></p> <p><i>"Terminal 5 would enable the best use to be made of Heathrow's potential capacity and would achieve this without the need for a new runway or alterations to the current operating procedures (T5 - 2001)</i></p> <p><i>"It is the company's view that the local communities around Heathrow should be given assurances...BAA would urge the Government to rule out any additional runway at Heathrow, and BAA would support a recommendation by the Inquiry Inspector in his report that the Government should rule it out. Indeed BAA invites the Inspector to make such a recommendation" (Letter from Sir John Egan, CEO BAA plc - 1995)</i></p> <p><i>"Our position could not be clearer, nor could it be more formally placed upon record. T5 will not lead to a 'third' runway (Sir John Egan CEO BAA plc – April 1999)</i></p> <p><i>"Ultimately the approval of</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p>confidence in these parties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is scant mention of how the government intends to meet the surface access and infrastructure requirements. The existing networks are already congested. Further development on the scale being proposed will gridlock the highway network. It is simply not acceptable to base assumptions on and assertions that technology, charging mechanisms and increased public transport provision will solve the inevitable congestion and resulting adverse environmental impacts. There is no objective evidence presented that justifies the claims made by the Consultation in support of the proposals. • The Council is also concerned that many of the assumptions relating to new aircraft fleet, 80%+ of which are not in service or even designed, will or can meet the necessary improvements being claimed and upon which the modeling is based. 	<p>Terminal 5 would lead to demands for an additional runway. ...one more step in the seemingly uncontrolled growth of Heathrow at the expense of the living conditions of those living around it". (T5 LA Consortium – LAHT5)</p> <p>Contrary to 'Precautionary Principle'</p>
<p>Q3. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's view on adding a third runway and being able to meet air quality limits without further measures? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations you believe</p>	<p>The Council disagrees (i.e. is not convinced) with the Government's view that it will be able to meet air quality limits without further measures. Reasons: a. The consultation document is silent on <u>how</u> it is proposed to ensure</p>	

<p>need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>that air quality targets are maintained year on year.</p> <p>b. The Council recognizes the difficulties with predicting certainty with the long-term vision that the government is seeking. But the aspirational statements made within the document relating to measures it hopes to take for reducing the air quality levels as a result of the developments are weak and not supported sufficiently to provide some measure of certainty and achievability.</p> <p>c. The absence of certainty is in total contraction to the previous statements in seeking to make further development at Heathrow conditional upon compliance and to the precautionary principle enshrined in the definition and principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>d. It is not acceptable to merely claim 'confidence' in meeting annual air quality limits when the public cannot see the effects of possible changes in vehicle fleet growth and replacement.</p>	
<p>Q4. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's view that adding a third runway is achievable within the noise contour limit of 127 sq km, at the indicated levels of air traffic? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations you believe</p>	<p>The Council no longer considers the basis upon which noise contours are defined remains relevant because there is considerable doubt whether the defining limit for the onset of annoyance i.e. LAeq_{16h} 57dB(A) is valid or meaningless following the results of the ANASE Study</p>	

<p>need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>being disregarded. Further the contour cap level is based on 2002 during a period when Concorde was still flying. Such a contour was certainly not acceptable then and therefore should not be subsumed into being considered a reliable descriptor or comparator for future benchmarking of acceptability.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council disagrees with the Government's assertion that the noise contour limit of 127 sq km is capable of being achieved with a third runway despite the indicated levels of air traffic of 605k atm as early as 2020.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Flawed baseline methodology. b. Too much reliance is being placed on aircraft and technological advancement and designs that have yet to be created. 	
<p>Q5. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's view that mixed mode operations could be introduced within the noise limits set out in the White Paper?</p> <p>What are your reasons?</p> <p>Are there any significant considerations you believe need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>The Council disagrees with the Government's view that mixed mode operations could be introduced within the noise limits set out in the White Paper.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Previous undertakings and permissions for development at Heathrow categorically stated that mixed mode operations were not required or even necessary. b. The introduction of mixed mode is a 	

	<p>precursor to allowing future unrelenting growth at Heathrow Airport. There are no guarantees of aviation movement limits being offered or imposed (i.e. legal agreements).</p> <p>c. Government has not demonstrated that it would be able to meet air quality limits with partial or full mixed-mode operations by 2010 and 2015 respectively.</p> <p>d. There is no assured evidence presented within the consultation document that tests assumptions relating to future road vehicle fleet replacement and mix not being forthcoming within the predicted time frame.</p> <p>e. Furthermore, no details are provided to indicate how the Government is intending to ensure that the rolling annual average level for Nitrogen Dioxide does not exceed the EU Directive Limits.</p>	
<p>Q6. To what extent would you support the introduction of mixed mode operations:</p> <p>a. Throughout the day?</p> <p>b. Limited to specific hours (if so, would you support mixed mode between 0600 and 1200hours? Some other period? (please specify)</p>	<p>a. See (c) below.</p> <p>b. As current i.e. 0600-0700h</p> <p>c. Within the current planning cap, supported by a long-term <u>legal agreement</u> and the introduction of easterly alternation. No night time operations.</p> <p>Reasons:</p>	

<p>c. Within the current planning cap (i.e. with no extra capacity overall)?</p> <p>If you support additional movements, in what periods of the day do you think they should be provided?</p> <p>What are your reasons for these answers?</p> <p>Are there any significant considerations you believe need to be taken into account?</p> <p>If so, what are they?</p> <p>Please provide evidence where you can (e.g. environmental impacts, business benefits).</p>	<p>a. Mixed mode is rejected outright on the grounds that its introduction would lead to the inevitable increase in movements and capacity and calls for even further expansion ('predict and provide' mentality). As a consequence, the accompanying adverse environmental impacts of noise and disturbance, increased emissions, loss of alternation and other development pressures resulting from such a growth in activities would never be resolved.</p> <p>b. Maintenance of the status quo;</p> <p>c. Striking a more equitable balance and regional responsibility between the various communities around Heathrow Airport; and bridging the gap between the conflicting interests of the economic and social & environmental considerations.</p>	
<p>Q7. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's view that full mixed mode operations could be introduced by 2015 and be compatible with compliance with the air quality limits in the vicinity of the airport?</p> <p>What are your reasons?</p> <p>Are there any significant considerations you believe need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>The Government has not demonstrated that it would be able to meet air quality limits with full mixed mode operations by 2015. The consultation document fails to demonstrate what would happen if assumptions about future road vehicle fleet replacement and mix are not forthcoming within the predicted time frame. Additionally no details are provided to indicate how the Government would intend to ensure that the rolling annual</p>	

	<p>average level for Nitrogen Dioxide does not exceed the EU Directive limits.</p>	
<p>Q8. Do you agree or disagree with the Government’s views on retaining westerly preference? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations you believe need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>The Council agrees with the retention of Westerly Preference. Reasons: a. Avoiding operational safety implications; and b. Retention of established exposure patterns (habituation). Any change would on the face of it seem wholly unnecessary.</p>	
<p>Q9. Do you agree or disagree with the Government’s proposal to end the Cranford Agreement? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations you believe need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>‘On balance’ and subject to a number of constraints, the Council could agree with the Government’s proposal to end the Cranford Agreement. The Cranford Agreement constitutes the ‘horns of a dilemma’ for Royal Borough communities as, thousands of residents are significantly affected by continuous ‘easterly landings’ (from the west), on a single runway, without the benefit of respite afforded by runway alternation. Currently, up to 650 movements per day are frequently experienced, often for sustained periods during settled climate conditions. This is probably <u>the</u> most significant impact upon any community around the Heathrow Airport complex representing an un-equitable sharing of the existing noise burden around the airport. Conversely there are other Borough communities lying under the southern runway approaches, with little current exposure to landing</p>	

	<p>noise and who will experience a significant increase in noise from aircraft movements.</p> <p>The Council is also very cautious and mindful of the fact that removal of the Cranford Agreement will, in the absence of certain constraints at the airport, result in the likely introduction of mixed mode designed to optimize movement capacity and, as a consequence lead to the inevitable adverse environmental impacts of noise and disturbance, increased emissions and other development pressures.</p> <p><i>The Borough would more readily accept the Government's proposal to abandon the Cranford Agreement in the event that the following constraints could be agreed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Retention of a movement cap;</i> • <i>Retention of segregated mode on the existing two runways;</i> • <i>Introduction of easterly alternation;</i> • <i>Sector limitation</i> • <i>A Legally binding Agreement to this effect (i.e. not a planning condition)</i> 	
<p>Q10. Do you agree or disagree with the Government's views on continuing night time rotation? What are your reasons?</p>	<p>The Council disagrees with the Government's view that night time rotation should be continued.</p> <p>Reasons: The Council is, as is well</p>	

<p>Are there any significant considerations you believe need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>known from previous consultations on successive night flying restrictions proposals, totally opposed to night flights. Whilst the consultation is largely silent on the night flight issue the Council is extremely concerned about the statement ‘Adding a third runway at Heathrow could also potentially provide capacity to increase movements in the night period’. (Summary Document, page 4). This suggests the Government’s intention might be to continue with its discredited ‘predict and provide’ policy for aviation, the social and environmental outcomes of which are likely to be significantly worse than is currently being portrayed within the document.</p>	
<p>Q11. Do you agree or disagree with the Government’s views on continuing runway alternation in the 0600 to 0700 period? What are your reasons? Are there any significant considerations you believe need to be taken into account? If so, what are they?</p>	<p>The Council agrees with the Government’s view of continuing runway alternation in the 0600 to 0700h period, subject to a cap on the maximum number of permitted total movements</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintenance of the status quo; and b. Equitable sharing of the noise burden between communities c. Increased certainty for local residents living under the flight path. 	

APPENDIX 2 – RESOLUTION FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS

This Appendix should be read in conjunction with the Borough's response to: '*Adding Capacity At Heathrow Airport*' – *Dft Consultation*. It provides information drawn from the public consultation that has taken place.

- Joint Horton & Wraysbury Parish Council meeting (28/01/2008) – There were ***overwhelming statements of objection to the proposals as set out in the consultation document***
- Joint West Windsor Residents Association and Windsor and Eton Society meeting (4/02/2008). Four motions were put to the meeting:
 - 1) ***This meeting wants a third runway at Heathrow. This Motion was unanimously rejected, without exception.***
 - 2) ***This meeting considers that the consultation document and the questionnaire do not allow them to give an informed view on the expansion proposals. This motion was unanimously carried.***
 - 3) ***This meeting considers that existing environmental impact arising from Heathrow operations is unacceptable and believes that the criteria proposed for measuring the impact of future operations are inadequate. This motion was unanimously carried.***
 - 4) ***This meeting would support the efforts of the Borough and the 2M Group to seek a judicial review of the consultation process. This motion was unanimously carried.***
- Maidenhead Public Meeting (11/02/2008). The MP for Maidenhead and Borough Councillors also attended this event. There were overwhelming statements of objection to the proposals as set out in the consultation document.
- Windsor Public Meeting: Held at the Windsor Boys School on 13/02/2008. Adam Afriyie MP for Windsor attended this event. There was unanimous support for the Borough to reject the proposals and for the local MP to continue to oppose the proposals through the parliamentary processes.
- Old Windsor Public Meeting: Held on 19/02/2008. There was unanimous support for the Borough to reject the proposals and the following resolution was put forward and carried:

'This meeting fully supports the efforts of the RBWM in conjunction with the 2M Group of local authorities in rejecting the proposals; and further supports

the Borough in the event a Judicial Review is considered to be the most appropriate way forward' There were only two abstentions to the resolution.

- Datchet Parish Council: Held on 20/02/2008. There was unanimous support for the Borough to reject the proposals and following resolution was put forward: *'This meeting fully endorses the concerns of the RBWM and rejects the DfT's proposals for the development of Heathrow Airport as set out in the consultation document; and further urges the Borough, together with the other 2M Group of local authorities to commission an independent study to consider an alternative airport strategy based on the development of alternative sites in the south east that will be better able to meet the future demands in air travel.'*
The resolution was carried unanimously.

APPENDIX 3 – EXIT POLL WINDSOR LEISURE CENTRE 17TH DECEMBER 2007

The results of the Exit Poll conducted at the DfT Exhibition held at Windsor Leisure Pool on 17/12/2008 are as follows:

QUESTION	STRONGLY/ AGREE	STRONGLY/ DISAGREE	NEITHER + DON'T KNOW + NO ANSWER
The exhibition told me what I needed to know about the proposed R3.	42%	37%	21%
London needs a 3 rd runway if it is to continue prospering as a world city.	22%	71%	7%
A R3 will damage the environment and contribute to global warming.	82%	10%	8%
Government will take account of local resident's views when making the final decision on whether Heathrow airport should expand.	9%	82%	9%
My quality of life will personally suffer if there was a R3 built at Heathrow Airport.	75%	12%	13%
My quality of life would suffer if aircraft were allowed to land all day long without a break at 3pm.	77%	10%	13%
TOTAL 164 RETURNS			

Update as of 21st February 2008