

1a. Do you support our proposals for a noise objective?

No.

1b. Please provide any comments you have on our proposals for a noise objective

The objective is vague and offers no guarantee of reducing noise. The wording 'limit and, where possible, reduce the effects of noise on health and quality of life' fails to commit Heathrow to any specific targets.

The consultation confirms that the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames is an area where a new flight path could be positioned. It would be inevitable that many people who currently aren't impacted by noise would be as result of these proposals. Those who areas already suffering noise are likely to suffer from worsening conditions.

The draft proposal does state that noise management measures will be put in place, it also states that they need to be 'proportionate and cost effective', this will mean they may become compromised and have limited effect. We also do not believe that the health and quality of life through the increase in noise should be comprised in order to allow more flights.

Seemingly there is not guarantee for residents that they will get any benefit from quieter aircraft despite the technological improvements to aircraft design and airspace management that would allow for this.

The noise objective should commit to significant reductions in overall noise impact over time.

1c. Please provide any other comments or suggestions you have on our proposed approach to developing a package of noise measures for an expanded Heathrow

The lack of a direct comparison of existing noise levels and potential noise levels is a glaring omission from the consultation. It makes it difficult to assess the differences.

2a. Would you prefer to have longer periods of respite less frequently (all day on some days but no relief on other days) or a shorter period of respite (e.g. for 4-5 hours) every day? Please tick one of the following options: Longer period/shorter period/don't know

Insufficient detail given in the consultation to respond

2b. Please tell us the reasons for your preference

We believe all residents should have the opportunity to have a period of respite over an 8-hour period in the day. This will enable people to have the daily rest and fresh air that is conducive to long-term health.

National Planning Policy Guidance states that increasing noise exposure will at some point cause the 'significant observed adverse effect level boundary' to be crossed. Above this level the noise causes a material change in behaviour such as keeping windows closed for most of the time or avoiding certain activities during periods when the noise is present. It is clearly undesirable for such exposure to be caused.

3a. Should we continue to prefer westerly operations during the day and easterly operations at night to reduce the total number of people affected by noise? Yes/No/Don't know

Insufficient detail given in the consultation to respond

3b. Please tell us the reasons for your answer

We do not believe that any night flights should take place therefore find it difficult to answer this question. However, any increase in the number of flights from an easterly direction would generally mean increased noise, something we do not approve of.

3c. Should we sometimes intervene to change the direction of arriving and departing aircraft to provide relief from prolonged periods of operating in one direction – even if that means slightly increasing the number of people affected by noise? Yes/No/Don't know

Insufficient detail given in the consultation to respond

3d. Please tell us the reasons for your answer

Without knowing how this would impact Kingston Borough, it is not possible to answer this question. However, there is deep concern that changes to the direction of flight paths could be dictated by those areas that do not already have significant noise issues, where there is some headroom before limits are breached. Such flight paths would necessarily be over areas with existing low ambient noise levels such as Kingston Borough which is a significant concern to those living in the area.

3e. Please provide any other comments or suggestions you have on directional preference

We would be unable to support any scheme that would see an increase in noise over Kingston Borough.

4a. To help inform our consideration of the options, we want to know whether you would prefer for us to: Option 1 - Use one runway for scheduled arrivals from 5.30am (runway time 5.15am), Option 2 - Use two runways for scheduled arrivals from 5.45am (runway time 5.30am) or I don't know

I don't know

4b. Please tell us the reasons for your preference:

No runways at all before 6am. People's health and wellbeing is reliant on an adequate amount of uninterrupted sleep. We believe this should be 8 hours and there should be a period during the day that no flights leave or arrive at Heathrow in order to provide this uninterrupted sleep.

The consultation document provides little evidence of the "significant contribution" night flights make to the UK economy. Any evidence should also consider the impact on those living under the flight path and the impact on their health and wellbeing.

4c. Please provide any other comments or suggestions you might have on early morning arrivals:

We understand from reading the consultation briefing documents that the Independent Parallel Approaches will mean that up to 20 arriving flights between 6am and 7am could fly over Kingston Borough at low altitude. We believe this to be unacceptable considering this area currently receives no such flights and the impact it could have on people in relation to noise during a period where many people are still asleep.

5a. Please provide any comments or suggestions on how we should encourage the use of the quietest type of aircraft at night (outside the proposed scheduled night flight ban):

We strongly encourage incentivising the quietest type of aircraft through lower landing fees. We would also encourage examining an outright ban on any aircraft landing at night or in the early morning with an older and/or noisier engine.

5b. Please provide any other comments you have on night flights and restrictions:

We are deeply concerned that Kingston Borough could be significantly impacted by any night time flights as to date, the area does not suffer from significant exposure to noise at unsociable hours.

6. What sites or local factors should we be aware of in your area (or other area of interest to you), when designing flight paths for an expanded three-runway Heathrow?

Kingston Borough is a densely populated area with over 50 schools, a significant number of nursing homes, including a soon-to-be-built dementia care facility in Surbiton, Kingston University, home to nearly 20,000 students, and Kingston Hospital including vital maternity and A&E wards used by people from across South-West London and North Surrey.

In addition, the population of Kingston Borough is set to increase significantly with new housing targets. This means that any additional aircraft movements over our area would not only result in many existing people suffering increased levels of noise intrusion but also many thousands of additional people who would occupy the new homes that will be built in the borough. We therefore request that each of these matters be accounted for in the designing of new flight paths for an expanded Heathrow.

We also value our precious open spaces. The open spaces we do have nearby include Richmond Park and Bushy Park, both a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (Richmond Park is also a National Nature Reserve), Hogsmill, a strategic wildlife corridor, Home Park and the Thames path. These are critical areas for the mental wellbeing of residents and the loss of peace and tranquillity could be devastating. They are important areas for young and old to walk, play, run and cycle free from noise and air pollution, with many people doing this early in the morning between 6am and 7am. In the consultation documents, it is clear that this would be when the most intense number of flights would take place.

7. What sites or local factors should we be aware of in your area (or other area of interest to you), when designing new arrival flight paths to make better use of our existing two runways?

Please refer to the response given in question 6.

8. Please provide any other comments you have relating to the airspace elements of the consultation

We believe that expansion of Heathrow, with the addition of a third runway and a change of flight paths, will see a significant increase in noise in Kingston Borough. Noise respite will reduce, and a greater proportion of flights will fly over the area cross the day.

We do not believe this acceptable and conducive with the health and wellbeing of Kingston Borough's residents.

9. Having considered everything within the consultation, do you have any other comments?

We do not support the need for new runway capacity in the South East, primarily on environmental grounds and because we believe the priority should be to support economic regeneration in other regions.

Expansion at Heathrow would generate millions of extra road passenger journeys a year, a matter for which TfL has raised significant concerns and objection. Expansion requires rerouting some local roads, putting the M25 in a tunnel and increasing rail capacity which will cause years of disruption and major expense to the taxpayer. Up to 1,000 homes will be destroyed as Heathrow expands and there is little planned new infrastructure to support an expanded airport.

With poor transport infrastructure to Heathrow from the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, we believe any expansion will see additional road passenger journeys which will have a detrimental effect on the local area including noise and air pollution as people would have to be reliant on car-based journeys to reach the airport.

Airport expansion has the ability to provide additional jobs, further supply chain opportunities, skills and training as well as new homes generation over a wide area. However, there is no guarantee that these additional opportunities will come to our borough

Q10. Please give us your feedback on this consultation (such as the documents, website or events)

The sheer complexity and abstract nature of the consultation has made it totally unsuitable for engagement by most ordinary residents. Even those with some basic awareness of the proposals need hours to understand complex issues.

The main fault in the consultation lies in the absence of precise flight paths and the lack of comparative maps with existing aircraft operations therefore making it unclear what the real impact of the proposals are on Kingston Borough.

In addition, the inclusion of binary answers was inappropriate.

We do appreciate that a consultation event took place in Kingston and that a significant number of staff members from Heathrow were available for conversation and questions however the lack of promotion of both consultation event and the consultation, as a whole, has been disappointing.

Taking these comments on board, we believe the process to be wholly unsatisfactory when assessing the complexity and seriousness of what it is being suggested in the consultation.