

AVIATION FORUM

12 March 2014

PRESENT: Councillors George Bathurst (Chairman), Malcolm Beer and John Lenton.

Regular Attendees: John Holdstock, Peter Hooper, M Jamieson and Paul Jennings.

Officers: Wayne Coles, Rob Cowan and Chris Nash.

PART I

ITEM 1 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Alan Mellins and Mr Andrew Davies.

ITEM 2 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr George Bathurst declared a pecuniary interest in item four due to his involvement with the Windsor Link Railway.

ITEM 3 - MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Forum held on 28 January 2014 be approved.

ITEM 4 – RESPONSE TO HAL PROPOSALS

The Forum considered RBWM's response to proposals from Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) set out in the public consultation paper "Shaping Heathrow's North West Runway Proposal". A first draft of the response was noted at page 1 of the Agenda.

The Forum noted that little consultation had informed the paper. When public meetings had been held little information had been given on the negative aspects such as the new flight plan. There had only been one consultation to the west of the airport. The circulation of documents to affected residents by the airport had been inconsistent across the area. This had not been the case to the east of the airport in places such as Putney, where there had been greater consultation and availability of information. This gave the appearance of bias. The Forum agreed a formal letter should be sent to HAL outlining RBWM's disappointment at the lack of consultation, in addition to the response to the proposals to the Airports Commission.

The Forum noted that highlighting the effect of the Heathrow's expansion on places of national significance in the Borough would strengthen the position of Windsor and Maidenhead. For example, the tourism industry would be affected as the HAL proposals would effect the enjoyment of the 6 million annual visitors to Windsor Castle.

The Forum noted that expansion of Gatwick Airport was a preferable alternative on economic grounds, as it promoted fair competition.

The Forum suggested the following points be included in the RBWM response:

- The situation for RBWM residents would be made worse by the HAL proposals.
- It was not possible to determine the exact impact of an additional third runway due to a lack of information regarding: location and parameters of the runway, noise footprint/contours, height/glide slope diagrams, surface access details and mitigation measures.
- Flood storage area would be lost in an area which recent events had proven was prone to very bad flooding.
- Reference should be made as to the affect on tourist trade to Windsor due to increased noise/surface access impacts.
- The proposals would see a reduction in respite by a third (with flights increasing from 480k to 740k if cap removed).
- Proposals concerning noise were flawed in that they discussed current noise levels as acceptable, when in fact this was not true (with better existing noise mitigation required).
- Noise was likely to spread to areas not previously affected – with HAL’s detailed noise relief zones not being deemed sufficient.
- The proposals were likely to affect housing. Increased numbers of employees at the airport would require a greater provision of housing in the surrounding area. This would lead to further housing being built on the flood plain (a link should also be made back to the Borough Local Plan).
- The increased economy from the additional runway was not in fact a net gain as it simply moved business away from other areas, rather than generating additional business.
- To accommodate the proposals, the nearby motorways would have to be expanded. Furthermore, the consultation does not acknowledge the current shortfall in road & rail capacity let alone projecting future increases (with an incorrect assumption made that new passengers will fully utilise public transport).
- A reference should also be made to RBWMs support of Gatwick Airport on the economic grounds – supporting the motion made by West Sussex County Council.

RESOLVED: That Chris Nash write the following:

- **A formal letter on behalf of RBWM to Heathrow Airport Limited addressing the lack of information the public has been given from the airport, and the lack of consultation opportunities. Letter to be approved by Chairman and Lead Member before sending.**
- **RBWM response to the Airports Commission regarding the HAL public consultation paper “Shaping Heathrow’s North West Runway Proposal”, in which he should address the comments noted above. Response to be considered at additional AF in April 2014.**

ITEM 5 – ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Forum suggested that representatives of Gatwick Airport be invited to the next Aviation Forum meeting in April 2014. It was requested that representative of Heathrow Hub be invited to the subsequent meeting.

ITEM 6 – DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Forum agreed to meet for an additional meeting in April 2014 to be organised by the clerk. This was in addition to the scheduled meeting on 14 May 2014 (to which Heathrow Hub Ltd should be invited).

MEETING

The meeting, which began at 2.00pm ended at 3.00pm.