

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY PARISH MEETING
OF THE PARISH of WRAYSBURY**
held in the Wraysbury Village Halls at 7.30 pm on
Monday 11th NOVEMBER 2013

1. PRESENT

Councillor A Davies, Chairman of the Parish Council, in the Chair
Borough Councillor D Burbage, Leader of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
Councillor J Lenton, Parish Councillor, Ward Councillor and Chairman of the RBWM Aviation Forum.
Councillor C Rayner, Parish Councillor (Horton) and Ward Councillor.
Mr N Milton, Heathrow Airports Ltd.
Mr C Nash, Environmental Protection, RBWM.
The Acting Clerk, the Deputy Clerk and in excess of 200 registered electors of the Parish of Wraysbury.
Approximately 500 interested parties turned up to attend the meeting. When hall capacity was reached the majority of people remained in the grounds of the hall to demonstrate their support for the objections being presented at the meeting by the Parish Council and others.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION BY THE CHAIRMAN

Councillor A Davies thanked everyone for their attendance and introduced those seated at the top table. He drew attention to the agenda and explained that he was confident that all speakers would be treated with the high level of respect which was customary in the Parish of Wraysbury.

He explained that the meeting had been called in light of the announcement earlier in 2013 that one of the third runway options proposed by Heathrow Airports Ltd would involve runway construction within the Parish, which would have an extremely significant and negative impact on Wraysbury.

3. MOTION TO THE MEETING

The Chairman explained that whilst the meeting was called as a Parish Meeting for the electors of Wraysbury, he was aware that residents from outside of the Parish would be in attendance. A motion was proposed to the meeting by Mrs Margaret Lenton and seconded by Mrs Diana Hughes. With the exception of four objections, the majority of registered electors present supported the motion to suspend the formal framework that restricted speaking rights only to those who were registered electors of the Parish of Wraysbury.

4.

SPEAKERS

Chairman of the Parish Council

Councillor A Davies explained that most people believed that that any proposed expansion to Heathrow was likely to take place to the north of its current site. He and fellow Councillors were horrified at the publication of the South-west option. He stated that it would cut the village in half, that the proposal ignored the historic significance of the Parish (Domesday Book, Magna Carta, the Ankerwycke Yew and Priory), that it would damage a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and that it would destroy a pleasant and delightful place to live and work. The Parish Council had therefore acted swiftly to strongly oppose the proposal. He urged residents to visit the Parish website to read the formal submission by the Parish to the Davies Commission. <http://www.wraysburyparishcouncil.gov.uk/includes/DaviesCommission5.pdf>

Leader of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Councillor D Burbage reflected on the Royal Borough's previous opposition to Heathrow expansion, particularly the Sipson option (*opposition was in conjunction with membership of the 2M Group, an all-party alliance of local authorities concerned about the environmental impact of Heathrow operations on their communities*). He underlined the need to send a strong message to Heathrow Airports Ltd and the Davies Commission that the South-west option could not be allowed to take place. He stated that the whole local area had been blighted, and that all third runway options in the proposals were equally bad. The Royal Borough continued to maintain its membership of 2M. The Borough, and the two Wraysbury Ward Councillors, were therefore clear in their opposition to Heathrow expansion, in any way.

Parish (and Ward) Councillor J Lenton (Chairman of the RBWM Aviation Forum)

Councillor J Lenton expressed his gratitude to Mr N Milton for his attendance at the meeting and the utmost courtesy which he and his team had shown the Borough and Parish councils. He explained that the proposals had blighted the area and that all political parties locally were unanimous in their opposition to expansion. The expansion proposals would lead to increased noise, more night flights and higher levels of pollution. He stated that very few local people would want to see Heathrow closed, but that they opposed significant expansion. He expressed the view that no government was likely to approve the construction of a new airport in the South-east of England. He concluded by expressing a hope that additional airport capacity could be met by expansion at Gatwick and/or Stansted.

Written Statement from Adam Afriyie MP

Councillor A Davies read out a statement from Adam Afriyie MP, in which he apologised for his absence and expressed his strong support for all efforts to prevent unnecessary further expansion at Heathrow. The written statement is attached to the file copy of these minutes.

Mr N Milton, Heathrow Airports Ltd

Mr Milton gave a detailed presentation on the need for expansion at Heathrow Airport. He explained that the airport was operating at full capacity and needed to expand to remain competitive as an international hub, and to maintain the competitiveness of the UK economy.

He then went on to focus on the South-west option.

Comments made during his presentation included:

- The significant contribution that freight and transfer passengers made to keep current routes viable and make new ones possible.
- Gatwick Airport would never expand and therefore could never act as a hub airport, with just two runways. There were only three options available, namely Heathrow, Stansted or the Estuary.
- Heathrow was considered to be the best option as passengers lived and worked there. Customer demand was very much biased towards West London and the areas West of London.
- If Heathrow's significance was diminished through lack of expansion, there was a risk that large businesses would relocate to be near alternative UK airports.
- The importance of Heathrow as a local employer was underlined. Eighty thousand people were directly employed and there were estimated to be forty thousand indirect jobs. One in five working people in the local area were employed directly or indirectly. Expansion would safeguard these jobs and open up new job opportunities.
- The Davies Commission was set up in 2012 to receive, by July 2013, options proposals by operators and any other proposers, which met five key criteria. Heathrow Airports Ltd therefore came up with three options. The Davies Commission was due to shortlist options which would then be explored in much more detail. It was expected that between three and seven options would be shortlisted and that this announcement would be made on 17th December 2013.
- Heathrow Airport Ltd recognised that the transparent nature of the proposals and the decision making timetable created a significant amount of upheaval and distress to large numbers of people.
- The proposal would reduce noise impacts for many residents in the region by the introduction of new operating procedures, new landing timetables, an increased number of landings from the west, better respite periods from increased alternation, and improved noise insulation schemes.
- The proposal would build in fair treatment to those most affected. This would include compensation schemes to anyone displaced, a property market support scheme and new noise insulation schemes.
- Heathrow disagreed with the Mayor of London's position that a four runway airport was needed. Heathrow would function properly with three runways. There would be no need to make provision for non-hub, budget airlines, as these would continue to operate successfully from other airports in the South-east.
- The submission included an option to construct a fourth runway at a later date. This was not because Heathrow believed that this option was needed, but because the Davies Commission asked for it.
- Residents' attention was drawn to the 'Ten Commitments' in the document, "A New Approach – Heathrow's Options for Connecting the UK to Growth". The document could be viewed online at www.heathrowairport.com/about-us/company-news-and-information/airports-commission?cmp=LHRDCHERO

Mr C Nash, Environmental Protection, RBWM

During his brief presentation, the following comments were made:

- The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead had now made four written submissions to the Davies Commission.
- The new proposals would result in 740 thousand movements per year. This would exceed the 480 thousand Terminal 5 movements by an additional 260 thousand movements. It was therefore completely unacceptable.
- There was a need to reinstate night flight restrictions and capping numbers.
- The Borough advocated the complete abolition of the Cranford Agreement.
- Residents were asked to note and possibly participate in the WideNoise initiative. This innovative scheme was devised to empower residents with a method to monitor community noise, with a particular focus on operations at Heathrow Airport. It was a smartphone 'app' that was available on i-tunes and the Android platforms.
- There was a need to continue to represent and legitimise the views of Borough residents and to make their voices heard. Only by engaging residents in debate through initiatives such as WideNoise could we ensure decision makers responded to views, such as the need for increased noise mitigation/respice.
- The Borough had adopted a clear stance, that it wanted a better Heathrow, not a bigger Heathrow.

Ward Councillor Rayner

Councillor Rayner informed the meeting that he had listened carefully to the presentation by Mr Milton. He noted the predicted loss of 850 houses in Wraysbury, and the significant loss of land. The creation of seventy thousand jobs was therefore irrelevant to Wraysbury. He recalled that the Terminal 5 scheme promised a train route from Staines to Heathrow, but that this was never built. He considered that an Estuary airport would not result in the closure of Heathrow. He outlined his commitment to fight against further expansion.

5. QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

At the conclusion of the presentations, the Chairman invited members of the public and Parish Councillors to ask questions.

During the session, the following comments were made:

- Three listed buildings in Wilmott Lane would be lost. It was explained by Nigel Milton (NM) that the proposal was based on there being no Grade 1 and Grade 2* buildings within the proposed perimeter.
- The Parish Priest from Wraysbury St Andrew Church indicated that the church was a Grade 2* listed building. It would be located close to the proposed perimeter and was therefore threatened by it. He acknowledged the excellent submission by the Parish Council. He also highlighted the technical difficulties associated with building over reservoirs.
- Mr Milton noted the technical challenges associated with the South-west option, but explained that none were insurmountable.

- Mr Stewart of HACAN indicated that they had fought previously against Heathrow expansion, and won. He expressed a view that by working together, Wraysbury could achieve a similar outcome.
- The construction of a runway and associated hard landscaping would remove much land currently available for natural storage of flood water. Water would have nowhere to go and would exacerbate the flooding problems experienced by local people. In response, Mr Milton indicated that if a South-west option was to go ahead it would have to meet very strict water management criteria set by the Environment Agency and other bodies.
- NM explained that those householders who would be displaced would be entitled to compensation. This would be based on house prices in June 2013 (prior to the announcement of options for Heathrow), and would be index linked to rise in line with any regional house price increases. There would also be provision of legal and removal fees.
- NM stated that although the exact compensation boundary had not been decided, it was expected that those most significantly impacted would receive compensation. A resident commented that the whole of Wraysbury would be impacted.
- In relation to freight transport it was noted by NM that only two dedicated aircraft flew into Heathrow each day. 99% of freight was said to be transported in the same aircraft as paying passengers. NM further explained that this form of freight transport helped make the flight routes financially viable.
- A resident said that the South-west option might benefit residents of other towns in terms of noise reduction but the noise impact on Wraysbury would be intolerable.
- A former airline pilot suggested that an increased number of planes would fly over Wraysbury, owing to it being less populated than other areas around the airport. He highlighted the difficulty of burying the M25, crossing a number of river and stream channels, the reservoirs and power lines. He stated that the whole area around Heathrow was completely congested and therefore any airport expansion or construction should take place elsewhere in the country. A significant increase in the number of flights would lead to an increased chance of accidents. Mr Milton refuted the safety concerns expressed.
- Mr Milton indicated that the Mayor of London supported the estuary proposal. He stated that this would lead to the closure of Heathrow, which would be devastating to the local economy. He explained that the closure would be required to safeguard the investment risk for the estuary airport proposers. Heathrow Airports Ltd would then seek compensation from the government.
- A resident expressed an opinion that the proposal would damage the setting of the Magna Carta Memorial, installed by the American Bar Association. She therefore suggested alerting them to the proposal.
- Mr Milton indicated that he looked forward to receiving comments on all of the Heathrow proposals from the Environment Agency and Thames Water.
- Mr Milton confirmed that Heathrow Airports Ltd had no links to an organization called Heathrow Hub, which had recently run an advertising campaign in some national newspapers. Heathrow Hub had made its own submission to the Davies Commission, on their proposal for Heathrow. The Davies Commission had, in turn, asked Heathrow Airports Ltd to submit a formal response. Mr Milton made it clear that Heathrow Airports Ltd did not support the Heathrow Hub proposal.

- In response to concerns about pollution, Mr Milton indicated that the airport was currently in breach of its limits. He expected pollution to reduce as greener aircraft were phased in, but observed that most pollution in the local area was due to cars going in and out of the airport. He agreed there was a need to increase public transport use (for staff and customers), and to encourage the use of electric buses and taxis.
- The problem of carrying luggage on public transport was highlighted by a resident.
- NM confirmed that it was not known what the taxpayer contribution would be, whichever proposal was successful.
- The importance of the Magna Carta 800th anniversary celebrations in 2015 was underlined.
- The Davies Commission had received a total of 57 submissions. It was free to consider these plus any other scheme it deemed worthy of further consideration, including those previously discounted.
- NM confirmed that any decision on future airport provision was a UK matter, and would not be a matter for the European Union to consider. Any pollution and public health matters would be considered at the planning application stage.
- It was noted that the growth in air travel was likely to slow down, as the cost of fossil fuels increased.
- The proposal for Heathwick, a high speed rail link between Heathrow and Gatwick to alleviate pressure on Heathrow, was noted. Heathrow Airports Ltd did not consider this to be a viable proposal as they believed international transfer passengers would simply choose to fly via another hub airport in Europe where they would be able to transfer more easily, within a single airport.
- Mr Milton confirmed that runway alternation would continue, should a third runway be built. This was essential to any future plans in order to provide residents with some respite.

6. CHAIRMAN’S CLOSING STATEMENT

Councillor A Davies thanked all of the speakers on the top table and in particular Mr Milton, for his attendance and his patient answers to all the concerns raised by Councillors and residents. He recognised the need to expand airport capacity in the South-east but considered that Heathrow was the wrong place to do this. He acknowledged the importance of Heathrow to the local economy, but did not accept that expansion or construction elsewhere would lead to the closure of Heathrow. He noted residents’ concerns about safety and agreed that a significant increase in flights would increase the risk of accidents.

He concluded by stating that the Parish and its residents were strongly opposed to the proposed expansion, particularly the South-west option, which would destroy the historic Parish of Wraysbury.

..... Chairman

..... Date