

**Page 1**

- Government decides on new runway at Heathrow – with no certainty on air pollution, noise or CO2 (or even economics)
- DfT states £147 billion alleged economic benefit to UK (over 60 years) of Heathrow runway more like “up to £61 billion”
- DfT’s own study reveals just how tiny (even negative?) the real economic benefits of Heathrow runway would be to UK

**Page 2**

- Draft timeline from the DfT of how they hope the Heathrow runway will proceed to completion

**Page 3**

- Chairman of CCC writes to BEIS to query why DfT appears to no longer use the 37.5MtCO2 cap for UK aviation

**Page 4**

- New DfT report indicates number of local jobs from Heathrow 3rd runway about 37,700 by 2030 – not “up to 77,000
- Likely plan to put 3rd runway and taxiways on a bridge over M25 (not a tunnel) to save money

**Page 5**

- No confirmation by government that taxpayer won’t have to fund surface access transport for Heathrow 3rd runway
- Councils and campaigners take first step towards legal challenge against government support for Heathrow runway

**Page 6**

- Sadiq Khan backs councils’ legal action against Heathrow 3rd runway – and TfL will offer help
- High Court win by ClientEarth on air pollution casts more doubt on possibility of adding a Heathrow runway

**Page 7**

- ClientEarth wins air pollution case in High Court, that government action has been too slow
- Even with 55% of Heathrow passengers using public transport there could be 15 million more passenger trips per year by car by 2040 than now
- Difficult to see how Heathrow could prevent rise in staff road trips to/from airport with 3rd runway

**Page 8**

- How the government hopes air pollution will not be a block on a Heathrow 3rd runway
- Truckers warn work for 3rd runway on M25 will cause serious problems, while Highways England expects “excessive customer frustration”
- CAA writes to Heathrow with its expectations, including preventing airline cost rises

**Page 9**

- SNP misled by Heathrow inflated claims of number of jobs for Scotland due to a 3rd runway
- Teddington Action Group commence judicial review proceedings against government re. Heathrow runway decision

**Page 10**

- Zac: Too close relationship between Heathrow & Government borders on corrupt – recent examples
- Willie Walsh doubts current Heathrow management could build runway to budget
- Government and CAA hope that “community engagement” will remove aircraft noise problems with 3rd runway

**Page 11**

- Sarah Olney wins Richmond seat from Zac Goldsmith, on anti-Brexit agenda – while both strongly oppose Heathrow runway
- Analysis by Carbon Brief: Aviation to consume half of UK 1.5C carbon budget by 2050

**Page 12**

- Professor Alice Larkin: Expanding Heathrow flies in the face of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change
- Walsh says Heathrow charges rule out more UK domestic links, and he will not be told where to fly
- Seven more purely, unashamedly, low cost leisure destinations for 2017 from Heathrow

**Page 13**

- 15 people arrested in protest against proposed 3rd runway, blocking two roads close to Heathrow
- T&E says weak ICAO voluntary CO2 deal is NOT mission accomplished for ICAO, Europe or aviation industry

**Page 14**

- Edinburgh airport publishes draft Master Plan for consultation- high growth out to 2050, but no 2nd runway plan
- Environmental Audit Cttee finds Treasury failing to take long-term environmental costs into account
- easyJet is planning to set up a separate airline in Europe, to avoid Brexit risks in UK

**Page 15**

- Dr Tania Mathias calling for a Bill in Parliament to make aircraft noise a statutory nuisance
- Gatwick now only allows noise complaints by online form (or paper post) – no longer by phone or email
- Some useful links

**Government decides on new runway at Heathrow  
– with no certainty on air pollution, noise or CO2 (or even economics)**

The government made its announcement on 25th October that it backs a 3rd runway at Heathrow, using the north west option (not the extended northern runway). It has decided to entirely follow the recommendation of the Airports Commission (AC), by backing one runway only. The statement from Chris Grayling is on the DfT website. The government glosses over details of how it could ensure the runway did not cause worse air pollution, or worse noise, or higher CO2 emissions. Neither the DfT statement, nor Chris Grayling's contributions in the House, gave any clarity or reassurances on most of the problems that a 3rd runway will create. Several DfT documents were published with the announcement.

The most interesting is the **“Further review and sensitivities report: airport capacity in the south-east”** which is at <http://tinyurl.com/sensitivities-Oct-2016> with new jobs and economic assessments.

The government's statements say things like: "Despite the increase in flights Heathrow Airport Ltd has made firm commitments to noise reduction. The government will propose that a six-and-a-half hour ban on scheduled night flights ..." And "the government proposes new legally binding noise targets, encouraging the use of quieter planes, and a more reliable and predictable timetable of respite for those living under the final flight path." And new work "confirms that a new runway at Heathrow is deliverable within air quality limits, if necessary mitigation measures are put in place"..... ie. vague waffly aspirations, with almost no practical details. <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32591>

**DfT states £147 billion alleged economic benefit to UK  
(over 60 years) of Heathrow runway more like “up to £61 billion”**

It appears the economic benefits of a Heathrow runway have been exaggerated wildly. [Critics have been saying that since July 2015 - but the media and the government preferred to believe the exaggerated numbers]. The government announcement on 25th October only says the benefit (benefit without costs taken off) of the Heathrow runway would be £61 billion, for the whole of the UK, over 60 years. The earlier figure had been "up to £147 billion" (both are for a carbon-traded scenario). Now even in its optimistic forecasts, £86 billion - largely highly uncertain projections on future trade - have been removed. The Airports Commission used economic modelling for its projections, which was criticised as being unreliable, by its own economic advisors, Professor Peter Mackie and Mr Brian Pearce (May 2015) who warned of double counting (eg. on trade), and questioned the "robustness and reliability" of the method.

One of the ways the AC forecasts were too high is including benefits to non-UK residents. Another is double counting all sorts of spin-off activities, that are already accounted for in other sectors. The DfT says, given the uncertainties, "various calculation approaches have been proposed over time. Ongoing engagement with external experts means that the preferred methodology continues to evolve, and is likely to continue doing so after the publication of this report." ie. these figures may change again (downwards?) 25.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/2016/10/heathrow-overvalued-by-86-bn/>

**DfT’s own study reveals just how tiny (even negative?) the real economic benefits  
of Heathrow runway would be to UK**

The economics figures by Airports Commission were always dubious, and their methodology was questioned by their own advisors. The Commission did not use the Webtag method that is normally used to cost transport projects. The Commission added in a range of possible future benefits for Heathrow, and for

Gatwick - most purely speculative The AC also counted in economic benefits to non-UK residents of flights to or from the UK. The recent DfT "review and sensitivities" document referred to above, looked more carefully at the figures. It has removed some of the wild claims, and looked at the benefits just to UK passengers. Its figures show little difference in the alleged future economic benefit to the UK between Heathrow and Gatwick, and that these benefits are actually tiny. Even when measured over 60 years.

The DfT document mentions a large number of the aspects they looked at as being of "low analytic assurance", meaning very uncertain. The new DfT figures give the total benefit (NPV - Net Present Value) of a Heathrow north west runway being just £0.2 - £6.1 billion over 60 years, and the figure for Gatwick being £3.1 - £4.5 billion. The equivalent figures by the Airports Commission were £11.4 billion and £10.8 billion. So current estimates are all even lower than before.

Table is Page 39 of the DfT document <http://tinyurl.com/sensitivities-Oct-2016>

**Table 7.1 The department's analysis of monetised impacts (present value, £bn, 2014 prices, assessment of need carbon-traded scenario)<sup>33</sup>**

	Gatwick Second Runway	Heathrow Extended Northern Runway	Heathrow Northwest Runway
Passenger benefits (lower fares, reduced delays and higher frequency of flights)	48.5	46.9	55.4
Government revenue	2.5	1.5	1.8
Wider economic impacts	1.4 – 2.7	1.7 – 3.3	2.0 – 3.9
<b>Total benefits</b>	<b>52.4 – 53.7</b>	<b>50.1 – 51.7</b>	<b>59.2 – 61.1</b>
Environmental costs (noise, air quality, carbon, biodiversity)	-1.5	-2.8	-2.7
Airline profit loss (net of reduced delays)	-40.8	-31.2	-38.0
<b>Net social benefit (AC definition)</b>	<b>10.1 – 11.4</b>	<b>16.1 – 17.7</b>	<b>18.6 – 20.4</b>
Scheme cost	-6.4 – -6.3	-12.0 – -10.7	-14.9 – -12.9
Surface access cost	-0.6	-3.9 – -1.9	-3.4 – -1.4
<b>Net Present Value</b>	<b>3.1 – 4.5</b>	<b>0.2 – 5.1</b>	<b>0.2 – 6.1</b>
<b>Net Public Value</b>	<b>50.3 – 52.2</b>	<b>43.5 – 48.9</b>	<b>53.1 – 58.4</b>

<sup>33</sup> The Net Present Value, Net Social Benefit and Net Public Value presented for all three options include costs and benefits to non-UK residents. A sensitivity test has been undertaken which attempts to estimate UK-only variants of these metrics. Further information can be found in Annex 1.

## Draft timeline from the DfT of how they hope the Heathrow runway will proceed to completion

The DfT has put forward its anticipated timeline, of how it envisages the various stages progressing. The process below is what we think will happen - but some of the suggested process below may prove to be wrong. This is our best guess so far.

The process will start with a **draft Airports National Policy Statement (NPS)** being published early in 2017 - followed by a **consultation for (probably) 16 weeks** on draft NPS and associated documents. There will be a series of local and regional events around the country and in the vicinity of Heathrow. The NPS then, during or after the 16 weeks, goes to a **Commons Select Committee** (almost certainly the Transport Cttee) which will scrutinise it. This stage **could take 12 weeks**. People will be able to send in submissions to the DfT or to the Select committee. The DfT consultation is to be overseen, in a manner that is not yet clear, by **Sir Jeremy Sullivan** to ensure it is carried out correctly and fairly.

The NPS will be supported by an **Appraisal of Sustainability** that examines the social, economic and environmental impacts of the chosen runway scheme, including air quality, carbon and noise. The public will have the opportunity to comment on this during consultation on the draft NPS.

During the scrutiny stage, there would be the chance for MPs and others to present evidence to the committee, which would call witnesses to question. Whether any other committee, such as the Environmental Audit Committee, would also be able to have input, is not yet clear. The Select Committee will then make its **report and**



**recommendations to Parliament.** The DfT will also review all the consultation responses and write a report of its recommendation. The NPS and its supporting documents will be **amended and updated by the DfT**, taking account of the consultation responses and the Parliamentary scrutiny process.

By now it will probably be autumn 2017. Perhaps in late autumn, the **Government places the final NPS before Parliament.** There will be a debate in the Commons, and it will also be debated in the Lords. There is then a vote to approve the final within 21 sitting days. If the final NPS is not approved by the Commons, the Secretary of State could make changes and lay a new NPS before Parliament, on which again a vote to approve would take place 21 sitting days later. Once voted through, **the NPS is then deemed to be "designated"** (ie. comes into force) by the Transport Secretary.



<http://myhome.iolfree.ie/~lightbulb/Research.html>

Any **Judicial Reviews** would follow within a six-week period after the approval of the final NPS, but these could also occur at any point if the correct process was not followed. Legal challenges could hold up proceedings. There could be legal challenges at various stages, which might hold things up.

That might, at the earliest, be around the start of 2018. Once the NPS is agreed, then Heathrow can begin the formal process of seeking planning permission, which includes further consultation with local communities.

As the runway is considered to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) through the Planning Act 2008, **Heathrow would then submit a development consent order (DCO)** to the planning inspectorate. (It is not a normal planning application, via the local authority - but it is considered in relation to the NPS). Heathrow would probably also have to do some **pre-application consultation events**, before the DCO stage - perhaps summer or autumn 2017. There would then be **a planning inquiry and examination (taking at most six months)**.

Heathrow will also be required to complete a number of environmental assessments to support its application for development consent. These include an **Environmental Impact Assessment**, an **Environmental Statement**, a **Statement on Compliance with the Habitats Directive** and a **Flood Risk Assessment**.

The planning **inspector then submits his report to the Secretary of State (within three months)**; and the **Secretary of State considers the report and announces a decision (within 3 months)**. This would, at the earliest, be around the end of 2018.

The DfT expects the **runway planning process to take perhaps 3 years**, 2018 - 2021 or 2022. There will be a General Election by May 2020, in the middle of this. The DfT hope the runway would be operational by some time after 2025 or the late 2020s.

### **Chairman of CCC writes to BEIS to query why DfT appears to no longer use the 37.5MtCO<sub>2</sub> cap for UK aviation**

The Committee on Climate Change (CCC) has been giving the UK government the advice, since 2009 (when government was trying to get a 3rd Heathrow runway) that UK aviation should emit no more CO<sub>2</sub> than its level in 2005 (which was 37.5MtCO<sub>2</sub>) per year by 2050. This has tacitly been accepted by government since then. But the DfT "sensitivities" document put out on 25th October, said that this cap on UK aviation carbon was "unrealistic" and its assessments were only now looking at the carbon traded option. That means UK aviation CO<sub>2</sub> well above the target.

The Chairman of the CCC, Lord Deben, has now written to Greg Clark, Sec of State at BEIS (now in charge of UK carbon emissions, since DECC was scrapped) to point out that the DfT seems to no longer see the constraint of 37.5MtCO<sub>2</sub> as being important, and its forecasts and business assumptions are all now based on higher CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by UK aviation.

Lord Deben said the central business case Ministers made in October when they agreed to back a 3rd Heathrow runway would mean greenhouse gas emissions from aviation were about 15% higher than their target level by 2050. Lord Deben says: "If emissions from aviation are now anticipated to be higher than 2005 levels, then all other sectors would have to prepare for correspondingly higher emissions reductions in 2050." Even if UK aviation stuck at 37.5Mt CO2 by 2050, this would mean "an 85% reduction in emissions in all other sectors".

If aviation is allowed to exceed - by 15% - its already very generous allowance, this would necessitate CO2 cuts from all other sectors to be more than 85% of their 1990 level by 2050. The CCC does not have confidence that cuts of over 85% could be made. Lord Deben said that would require "significantly more action" to slash carbon pollution from other sectors, which is likely to be impossible. That implies the UK would miss its legally binding CO2 target.

Doug Parr, chief scientist of Greenpeace, said: "What ministers know full well but don't want to admit is that a third runway means other sectors of the economy will have to bear the costs of further carbon cuts, whether it's regional airports or the manufacturing and steel industries. ... it's time ministers came clean about it with those concerned and the British public."

22.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=33095>

*At the Environmental Audit Cttee hearing on 30th November, Chris Grayling and Caroline Low (DfT) tried to imply that they were still looking at both the carbon traded, and carbon capped scenarios, "or somewhere in between" ... with a certain amount of evasiveness and lack of clarity. Chris Grayling confirmed that he had not had any discussions with other sectors about deeper cuts in CO2 they might have to make, if aviation emissions rise.*

### **New DfT report indicates number of local jobs from Heathrow 3rd runway about 37,700 by 2030 – not "up to 77,000"**

The Airports Commission's Final Report said the Heathrow NW runway would lead to an additional 59 – 77,000 jobs [direct, indirect and induced jobs - ie. supply chain etc] in 2030 for local people. Indeed, Heathrow "astroturf" lobby group got membership partly on the strength of the jobs claims. But now, having looked at the details, the DfT has come up with much lower figures. While the statement on the DfT website on 25th October still says "up to 77,000" local jobs, its more considered assessment "review and sensitivities" document accepted these figures were likely to be exaggerated.

Instead the DfT now say, using a more accurate method, the number of local jobs might be 37,740 by 2030, not 77,000. By 2050, the DfT now estimate the number of jobs might be 39,100 - while the Commission expected 78,360. The DfT say the 2050 figure is the cumulative total, and cannot be added to the number of jobs created by 2030.

The DfT "assessment and sensitivities" report states that it had "identified a number of uncertainties with the approach taken" to assessing jobs by the Commission, which used job multipliers from the airports. These "could lead to significantly different results". The new DfT figures use Berkeley Hanover Consulting Ltd (BHC) and Optimal Economics Ltd survey data rather than airport assumptions to generate estimates of the indirect job multipliers, which are likely to be more robust. Despite requests to amend the statement on the website of "up to 77,000 jobs" and no mention of 37,700, the DfT decline to do so, saying it is "a range."

25.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32658>

### **Likely plan to put 3rd runway and taxiways on a bridge over M25 (not a tunnel) to save money**

The Airports Commission (that cost almost £20 million) looked - in theory - at everything in great detail, and its (allegedly) incontrovertible recommendations have now been followed by government. It talked about the M25 needing to be tunnelled under the runway. It did not mention any sort of bridge. But Heathrow was asked by government to



cut the cost of its scheme (to avoid raising costs to passengers, to keep demand for flights high) so it came up recently with the idea of a bridge over the motorway.

There is a bridge for one of a runway (+ taxiways) at Schiphol. There are a few other similar bridges. So it is possible.

However, there are enormous questions, not the least of which being that nobody has seen any details (cost, practicality, level of disruption, safety, terrorism danger etc) let alone been consulted. The section of motorway that might be bridged is the busiest on the M25 or in the UK, and one of the busiest (it might be the busiest) in Europe. DfT figures show around 263,000 vehicles per day on the Junction 14-15 stretch in 2014. The runway would need to be raised about 8 metres in order to get over the motorway. Heathrow has only said it would spend a total of £1.1 billion for all surface access infrastructure.

The cost of tunnelling was estimated by the Airports Commission at £3.2 billion. The bridge would be cheaper, and Chris Grayling has confirmed (30th November) that Heathrow would have to pay for this.

27.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32632>

### **No confirmation by government that taxpayer won't have to fund surface access transport for Heathrow 3rd runway**

Transport for London calculated the costs of upgrading and improving surface access, to deal with the extra passengers using a 3 runway Heathrow could be up to about £18 billion, over several years. Heathrow has only offered to pay a total of £1.1 billion. On 25th October, Stephen Hammond, a former transport minister, (2012-14) asked Chris Grayling about the costs, as did other MPs. The responses were evasive. Stephen Hammond believes the transport work is likely to cost the taxpayer (= us) at least £5-10 billion, and the government is misinforming the public by announcing that: "Expansion costs will be paid for by the private sector, not by the taxpayer."

Asked about the costs, Grayling replied that Heathrow ... "will be held to a plan that: first, does not increase the current level of road transport to the airport; and, secondly, increases public transport access to the airport to 55% of those using it. Those will be obligations that it will have to fund. The Government's financial advisers have said that that is viable and investible. There are question marks about what schemes are actually part of the surface access. Some of them we have to do anyway. For example, we are about to start improvements to the M4, which will benefit Heathrow and improve access, but they are not solely about Heathrow." Chris Grayling and the DfT hope there will be no more vehicles on the roads (!) with the 3rd runway than now, and surface access improvements will be made anyway. So there is no reason for Heathrow to pay anything. (Having to find even more money might prove impossible for Heathrow anyway). ie. There's no clarity at all, and sounds as if government realise Heathrow cannot even build the runway etc without raising landing charges, let alone all this work.

Chris Grayling said nothing on 25th October about how much of the Transport for London (TfL) estimate of £18 bn for surface access work the taxpayer would have to fund. He told the Environmental Audit Committee that he found the TfL cost estimates "ludicrous" and he was not convinced by them.

A problem is that there is no current data on what percent of traffic on roads near Heathrow is airport related. Unless baseline data are obtained, it would be impossible to know if Heathrow had increased it or not. 26.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32737>

### **Councils and campaigners take first step towards legal challenge against government support for Heathrow runway**

Solicitors Harrison Grant acting on behalf of Hillingdon, Richmond, Wandsworth and Windsor and Maidenhead Councils, together with Greenpeace and a Hillingdon resident have (17th November) sent a letter, under the Judicial Review Pre-Action Protocol, to the Secretary of State for Transport. The letter gives the Government a period of 14 days in which to withdraw its decision, issued on the 25 October to support a 3rd runway at Heathrow. If it fails to do so, judicial review proceedings will be commenced in the

High Court, without further notice to the Government, on the basis that the Government's approach to air quality and noise is unlawful and also that it has failed to carry out a fair and lawful consultation exercise prior to issuing its decision.

The 33 page pre-action letter sets out comprehensive grounds for legal challenge, drawing on a broad range of statute and legal precedent, as well as highlighting the many promises and statements made by senior politicians confirming that the third runway would not be built. The move comes shortly after the Government's air quality plans were overturned in the High Court, putting ministers under greater pressure to reduce illegal levels of air pollution in places like Heathrow. The latest court ruling rejected the current government plans to tackle emissions as inadequate and based on over optimistic assumptions.

18.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32999>

### **Sadiq Khan backs councils' legal action against Heathrow 3rd runway – and TfL will offer help**

London Mayor, Sadiq Khan, has announced at Mayor's Question Time that he is officially supporting legal action against a 3rd Heathrow runway. He has instructed Transport for London (TfL) to help 4 local councils (Hillingdon, Richmond, Wandsworth and Windsor and Maidenhead) and Greenpeace, which are together bringing the case against expansion. The involvement of TfL was met with delight from many Assembly Members. TfL is expected to be named as an "interested party" in the action.

It is believed that the intervention of TfL will strengthen the case of the local authorities' challenge. In the previous Mayor's Question Time, Mr Khan said he wasn't able answer the question on legal action until the government decision had been made. Though Sadiq Khan had in the past backed a Heathrow runway, he changed his mind in 2015 when the extent of the noise and air pollution impacts became clear. He has now said, addressing the full London Assembly: "I promised I wouldn't just stand by and see hundreds of thousands suffer from the additional noise and air pollution a third runway would cause. That's why I've directed TfL to provide their expert advice and assistance to support" the councils, "and why I will be ready for us to play an active role in the action if required." TfL has the most expertise on matters relating to impacts of Heathrow expansion on London's transport network. 17.11.2016

<http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/2016/11/32983/>

TfL evidence to Environmental Audit Committee 29.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=33250>

### **High Court win by ClientEarth on air pollution casts more doubt on the possibility of adding a Heathrow runway**



On November 2nd the environmental law group, ClientEarth, won its High Court case against the Government over its failure to tackle illegal air pollution across the UK. The judge agreed that the UK government had failed to take measures that would bring the UK into compliance with the law "as soon as possible" and ministers knew over optimistic pollution modelling was being used. AEF (the Aviation Environment Federation) says this failure by the government to get NO2 levels down discredits the air quality plan that formed the basis for the Government's argument that a new runway at

Heathrow would neither cause nor exacerbate legal breaches in NO2 levels.

Required to publish an updated plan for UK air quality, Defra produced one in December 2015. This brought forward the anticipated date of compliance to 2025 for London – just in time for the opening of a new runway according to the Airports Commission's anticipated timeline. But the plans appeared to rely on new, more optimistic forecasts of emissions from diesel vehicles without presenting substantive policy proposals to actually deliver improvements. A new runway would lead to higher levels of air pollution, and the new court ruling confirms that compliance should not be based on over optimistic modelling - and government needs instead to take action to cut pollution levels.

<http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32769>

## **ClientEarth wins air pollution case in High Court, that government action has been too slow**

In a damning indictment of ministers' inaction on killer air pollution, Mr Justice Garnham agreed with ClientEarth that the Environment Secretary had failed to take measures that would bring the UK into compliance with the law "as soon as possible" and said that ministers knew that over optimistic pollution modelling was being used. In his ruling, the judge questioned Defra's 5 year modelling, saying it was "inconsistent" with taking measures to improve pollution "as soon as possible." Defra's planned 2020 compliance for some cities, and 2025 for London, had been chosen because that was the date when ministers thought they'd face European Commission fines, not which they considered "as soon as possible." The government must now have a draft plan by April 2017 and a final plan by July 2017.

<http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=33090>

The case is the second the government has lost on its failure to clean up air pollution in two years. In the judgment he handed down, Mr Justice Garnham ruled that the government's 2015 Air Quality Plan failed to comply with the Supreme Court ruling or relevant EU Directives. He said the government had erred in law by fixing compliance dates based on over optimistic modelling of pollution levels. Future projections of compliance need to be based on real emissions, not discredited lab tests.

2.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32772>

## **Even with 55% of Heathrow passengers using public transport there could be 15 million more passenger trips per year by car by 2040 than now**

The government claims Heathrow can meet air quality standards in future, even with a new runway and 50% more passengers, because it will (among other changes) ensure that there are no more road vehicles than now - and by around 2031 about 55% of passengers would use public transport. Is that likely?



Looking at passengers only, not freight, and the work done by Jacobs for the Airports Commission, it seems that (2012 data) there were about 70 million passengers, about 20 million of whom were transfers (ie. they did not leave the airport). That meant slightly below 50 million passengers travelled to and from the airport, using surface transport. In 2012 about 59% of these travelled by car (ie. about 29.5 million), 41% came by public transport (28% by rail and 13% by bus or coach).

But by 2030 with a new runway, there might be around 110 million passengers, and around 33% would be international transfers. That leaves around 74 million passengers, and if 55% of them use public transport, that means about 34 million using cars. By 2040, the number using cars might be about 45 million (ie. about 15 million more per year than now).

And about 9 million using bus/coach - which is of course also on the roads. There would have to be dramatic increases in electric vehicles and improved engine technology to ensure no higher emissions in the Heathrow area. And that is not counting freight vehicles. Or staff. Or other increased vehicle traffic associated with the 3rd runway. 6.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32833>

## **Difficult to see how Heathrow could prevent rise in staff road trips to/from airport with 3rd runway**

More staff  
still 47% by car  
➔ more car trips

Heathrow has told the DfT that there would be no higher a number of car trips to and from the airport with a 3rd runway than now. But is that actually credible? Neither the DfT nor Heathrow produce easy-to-find figures, but they be located with a bit of digging. There are probably about 76,000 staff at the airport at present. The October 2014 Jacobs report done for the Airports Commission said: "Headline employee commuting mode share was assumed to be 43% public transport and 47% private vehicles (ie. about 35,700 came by car - and Jacobs states: "with the vast majority of those undertaken as single occupancy car trips.") ... Elsewhere the



same document says "with the 47% public transport mode share split between 35% using bus and 12% using rail." There are various estimates of how many on-airport staff there might be with a new runway. The Commission's Carbon Traded Assessment of Need scenario anticipated the number of staff to be around 90,000, and their highest growth scenario anticipated about 115,000 staff. Heathrow said by 2030 trips by both staff and passengers to the airport will be 53% by public transport, and still 47% by car. Nowhere is there anything to indicate that below 47% of airport employees would get to and from work by car.

With 90,000 staff at Heathrow, if 47% travelled by car that would be 42,300 people, (or if 43% came by car it would be 38,700). If there were 100,000 on-airport staff, and 47% came by car, that would be 47,000 people (and if 43% came by car, 43,000). Those numbers are higher than today. This is not including people travelling to newly increased numbers of jobs in the area.

28.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32903>

### **How the government hopes air pollution will not be a block on a Heathrow 3rd runway**

The Government has produced claims that adding a 3rd Heathrow runway would be compatible with air quality limits for NO<sub>2</sub>. The DfT statement on 25th October stated that the government had done more work, since the Airports Commission, and this "confirms that a new runway at Heathrow is deliverable within air quality limits, if necessary mitigation measures are put in place, in line with the 'National air quality plan', published in December 2015." That air quality plan has since been judged inadequate by the High Court ruling in the case brought by ClientEarth. The DfT also said: "Heathrow's scheme includes plans for improved public transport links and for an ultra-low emissions zone for all airport vehicles by 2025. The government will make meeting air quality legal requirements a condition of planning approval."

Lawyers Bircham Dyson Bell comment: "would you build, or invest in, a new runway if you weren't sure it could be used?" Heathrow and the government hope that, by 2040, 55% of Heathrow passengers will be using public transport, but there is no guarantee whatsoever that legal air quality limits would in reality be met. Currently [2012 data] about 41% of Heathrow passengers use public transport (about 28% by rail and 13% bus/coach - on the road). Heathrow hopes 43% will use rail by 2030.

5.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32819>

*And there is more about what the DfT says on air pollution at <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32780>*

### **Truckers warn work for 3rd runway on M25 will cause serious problems, while Highways England expects "excessive customer frustration"**

Stark warnings have been issued by the Road Hauliers Association (RHA) and Highways England that construction traffic for a Heathrow 3rd runway could bring everything to a complete standstill, for years. Highways England says: "There will be a substantial risk of excessive customer frustration about what might be prolonged period of disruption, first while any Heathrow works are done and then while our works are completed within the wider area."

There will also be the problems from extensive changes to the local roads. RHA's CEO Richard Burnett said: "We need to have clarity on the plans for the additional necessary road infrastructure during construction work. We also need to know the timescale of the proposed work. Although there will be considerable long-term benefits – increased cargo etc, the immediate impact on the adjacent motorway network – the M25, M4 and M3 will also be considerable".... "The M25 in particular is already operating to maximum capacity – the addition of construction vehicles will only add to the burden." A new Highways England document, Airports Commission Surface Access Works, was published by the DfT on 25th October. It makes no mention of the bridge idea. 29.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32696>

### **CAA writes to Heathrow with its expectations, including preventing airline cost rises**

Andrew Haines, the CEO of the CAA, has written to John Holland-Kaye to tell him that airport charges should be kept down, despite the huge costs of the runway and terminal etc. The CAA is the body that controls Heathrow's charges to airlines. Mr Haines said the CAA "expects to see constructive engagement

between the airport and its airline customers to drive value for money and efficiency." The CAA will soon publish their proposals on how Heathrow can recover planning and construction costs. The letter to Heathrow says: "But a new runway project cannot simply be treated as 'business as usual' and it will require airport-airline engagement to be taken to a deeper and much more productive level by both sides." And "You will have seen the Government's aspiration that airport charges should remain close to current levels, indeed the Secretary of State was clear on this being a goal inches announcement."

The CAA is keen to work with Heathrow, the airlines and other interested parties on the appropriate framework for the recovery of future construction costs, and their immediate priority is a clear timetable for this. There will also be a CAA consultation on key options for the economic regulation framework, to be published by the end of June 2017. There will also be a series of consultation documents through 2017 in which the CAA "will seek to build and expand on its regulatory principles."

27.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32705>

### **SNP misled by Heathrow inflated claims of number of jobs for Scotland due to a 3rd runway**

The SNP decided to give its backing to a Heathrow runway, rather than one at Gatwick - having been led to believe that the only choice on offer was between these two. They were led, by Heathrow PR, to believe there would be greater benefits for Scotland. The SNP hoped to get exports from Scotland (salmon and razor clams) shipped through Heathrow. The Airports Commission came up with a figure of economic benefit from a Heathrow runway of *up to* £147 billion to all the UK over 60 years. Heathrow got a consultancy called Quod to work out the number of jobs. They came up with (no methodology shown) the figure of 16,100 jobs for Scotland (over 60 years) from the runway.



The DfT has now downgraded the £147 billion figure, as it included various speculative elements, and double counted benefits. The new figure (still far higher than the reality) from the DfT is *up to* £61 billion for the UK over 60 years. That, pro rata, would mean up to about 9,300 jobs for Scotland - not 16,100. It is unfortunate that the SNP were misinformed, as were other MPs, Chambers of Commerce etc across the regions. Heathrow also pledged benefits for Scotland such as using its steel for construction, and using Prestwick as a base. The Scottish Green party see the SNP backing of a Heathrow runway as a betrayal of those badly affected by it, and of Scotland's climate commitments.

4.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32796>

### **Teddington Action Group commence judicial review proceedings against government re. Heathrow runway decision**



Residents group, Teddington Action Group (TAG) has started judicial proceedings against the government, on its recommendation for a Heathrow runway. The Judicial Review process requires that a Letter of Claim is served on the interested parties, in accordance with "Pre-action Protocol".

This was sent on 27 October.

Sir Howard Davies, Chair of the Airports Commission, steered it towards its conclusion to back Heathrow. Now one of the key claims in the 27 page TAG document relates to the "apparent bias" of Sir Howard, from his remunerated roles at GIC Private Ltd (GIC), one of Heathrow's principal owners. TAG says from 2009, Sir Howard was a paid adviser to the Investment Strategy Committee of GIC (formerly known as the Singapore Government Investment Co.), advising them on "new growth opportunities". From 2011, he was appointed to the International Advisory Board of GIC, a board on which he was still sitting on the day of his appointment as "independent" Chair of the AC.

Sir Howard only resigned these remunerated roles with GIC, when his appointment to the role as unremunerated Chair of the AC had been confirmed by the government in 2012. At the time of his appointment to the AC, GIC owned 17.65% of Heathrow, was represented on Heathrow's main Board (as it

still is), and was pursuing their shared goal of Heathrow expansion. Sir Howard did not disclose his roles with GIC in the AC's Register of Interests. 28.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32688>

### **Zac: Too close relationship between Heathrow & Government borders on corrupt – recent examples**

Zac Goldsmith has accused the Government and Heathrow Airport of having a relationship that "borders on the corrupt". He said the closeness of the interaction between the airport and Whitehall was "rotten". Examples recently of this are that the Chairman of Heathrow since March 2016 (succeeding Sir Nigel Rudd) is **Lord Paul Deighton**. Between 2013 and 2015 he held the position of Commercial Secretary to the Treasury, some of the roles of which are described as "infrastructure policy, including working with Infrastructure and Projects Authority and National Infrastructure Commission" and "working with the rest of government to promote the UK as a destination for foreign direct investment."



Another recent revolve of the door is **Vickie Sherriff**, who has since September 2015 been the Head of Communications at Heathrow, having earlier worked for the Prime Minister, in 2013, with a dual role as official deputy spokesperson for the Prime Minister and head of news at Number 10. She went to the DfT and then Diageo in 2014. Then there is **Simon Baugh**, who in March 2015 became the group director of communications at the DfT, having previously been the director of PR at Heathrow.

And Nigel Milton, who had worked at the DfT as Assistant Director for International Aviation (October 2000). Before that he was Private Secretary to the UK Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Transport, John Prescott (1998 to 2000). And there are many earlier cases too.

Zac commented: "And that's why you've always had this default position in favour of Heathrow." The DfT naturally rejected any suggestion of corruption.

4.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32808>

### **Willie Walsh doubts current Heathrow management could build runway to budget**

The chief executive of IAG, Heathrow's biggest customer, has said he has no confidence in the airport's management to deliver a new runway cost-effectively. Willie Walsh did not believe Heathrow would build the new runway within the cost constraints on charges to airlines, set out by their regulator, the CAA, under its current management with John Holland-Kaye. Perhaps they could with different management.

Walsh has said for years that he is not prepared to pay up-front higher charges, to help Heathrow pay for their runway during its construction. Heathrow has made the odd comment that it will "hold its charges steady on average over the period up to 2048" but that they may go up in some years and down in others. IAG has about half of Heathrow's take-off and landing slots. The Financial Times believes IAG is likely, according to aviation insiders, to win only around a quarter of slots on the new runway - so it will face more competition. The government's aspiration is that charges should remain close to their current levels. Heathrow would have to work with airlines and have "productive engagement" with them.

30.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32707>

### **Government and CAA hope that "community engagement" will remove aircraft noise problems with 3rd runway**

The proposed 3rd runway at Heathrow is intended to increase the number of annual flights to 740,000 per year - an increase of 260,000 from the current cap of 480,000. This will mean huge numbers of people newly affected by aircraft noise, and changes to the noise for those currently affected. New flight paths would be required, and these would need to be consulted on. The government and the CAA have misguided faith in the magic solution of "community engagement" to solve the noise problems. In the recent documents from the DfT and the CAA, there are numerous



comments about how Heathrow will be required to "engage." The fallacy, and the incorrect impression it is intended to create (especially to the naive) is that somehow having information about the noise, and being told about it, makes it less of a problem, and less annoying (stressful, depressing, or damaging to house prices). Some examples of the disingenuous and guileful wording are:

(CAA) "... airport expansion can only be permitted if there is a credible package of measures to deal with local communities." ... On legitimate concerns of local communities that "... will require changes to operating practices and full community participation in the airspace changes that will be required."

And (DfT) "Proposals will be brought forward .... including the way in which affected communities can best be engaged."

There is to be some form of "independent" noise body that will oversee aircraft noise issues, roughly as the Airports Commission suggested. Details are not yet known, but it is not likely to have any statutory powers, or any real authority. The form of this body will be part of the consultation in early 2017 on airspace and noise issues. 31.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32734>

### **Sarah Olney wins Richmond seat from Zac Goldsmith, on anti-Brexit agenda – while both strongly oppose Heathrow runway**



When the Conservative government announced it was backing a 3rd runway at Heathrow, Zac Goldsmith (MP for Richmond) resigned. He had said even before the May 2010 election that he would do this, and as a matter of principle, he did so. The by-election was therefore triggered on the issue of Heathrow, largely because Richmond is badly affected by plane noise from landings every few minutes, for over half of each day.

The Liberal Democrats, with only 8 current MPs, fought the seat on the issue of Brexit, and their candidate, Sarah Olney has won with a margin over Zac of around 1,800 votes. (Richmond was held by the LibDems until 2010). Sarah Olney, who only joined the LibDems in 2015, is also very much opposed to Heathrow expansion, so will carry on the fight against the runway.

Her primary focus, however, has been Brexit. Richmond is one of the constituencies that voted most strongly for the Remain campaign, and so this election became one about Brexit - with everyone appreciating that all candidates (except one minor one) were against the runway.

Those who backed Zac will be saddened that his principled stand, which is regrettably rare in politics, has been hijacked in order for the LibDems to get another MP. Zac is widely acknowledged to have been an excellent MP. Opposition to the runway will continue in Richmond, as the area would lose half of its "respite" period without planes overhead, if the expansion was allowed.

Tania Mathias, who leads local MPs against Heathrow, has already congratulated Sarah on her win, and said she looks forward to working with her. All those campaigning against Heathrow expansion look forward to working with Sarah, in carrying on the opposition as forcefully as Zac has done, for many years.

Sarah's election is NOT an indication that the level of opposition to Heathrow is any lower. The election was won, and lost, on Brexit. For better or worse, Brexit dominated the by-election, rather than the reason for which it was called - the runway. There would be no justification at all for the government, or Heathrow, to try to make political capital of the LibDem win. Brexit has been the THE issue uppermost in the media, and for many people, for the past 5 months, eclipsing most other topics.

2.12.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=33266>

### **Analysis by Carbon Brief: Aviation to consume half of UK 1.5C carbon budget by 2050**

The UK aviation's greenhouse gas emissions could consume around half the carbon budget available to the UK in 2050, even if the sector's emissions growth is constrained. An assessment by Carbon Brief shows that even with no new runway, the anticipated demand for air travel - from DfT forecasts - could mean UK aviation (flights taking off from UK airports) could be 47 MtCO<sub>2e</sub> by 2050. With a new runway, the emissions could be as much as 51 MtCO<sub>2e</sub> in 2050.

The Paris climate agreement means the UK must raise its existing climate ambition. The UK's current legislated target, to limit global temperature rise to below 2 degrees C, is to cut CO2 emissions 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. ie. from 800 MtCO2 per year to 160 MtCO2 per year. To keep below 1.5 degrees C the reduction in CO2 would be around 91% (86 - 96%) below the 1990 level, ie. 72 MtCO2 per year for the UK.

Therefore, if UK aviation emitted 37.5 MtCO2 per year by 2050 would be about 52% of the UK's carbon limit of 72 MtCO2 for a 1.5C global target, or about 23.4% of the UK's carbon limit of about 160 MtCO2 for a 2C global target.

And if instead of sticking to the 37.5 MtCO2 limit (which the DfT regards as "unrealistic" <http://tinyurl.com/sensitivities-Oct-2016> ) UK aviation emitted 51 MtCO2 by 2050 that would be about 71% of the UK's carbon limit of 72 MtCO2 for a 1.5C global target, or about 32% of the UK's carbon limit of about 160 MtCO2 by 2050 for a 2C global target. <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=33080>

### **Professor Alice Larkin: Expanding Heathrow flies in the face of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change**

Professor Larkin, an expert on climate policy, says measures aimed at increasing capacity and supporting further growth in air travel, such as the 3rd Heathrow runway, are at odds with the Paris Agreement. Such developments risk future stranded assets, and are inconsistent with tackling climate change. In the past we have slightly limited the growth in UK aviation CO2 by having constraints on Heathrow and Gatwick runway capacity. The government now wants to remove that constraint.

Professor Larkin said: "Researchers will need to raise their voices to new levels given this week's decisions. ... the government have to be willing to sit up and pay attention to the evidence of climate change scientists and prove their commitment to the Paris Agreement." It is not enough to depend on future improvements in aircraft fuel efficiency, which have only been incremental. There have been no new, groundbreaking technical solutions to decarbonise the aviation sector.

An increase in air travel cannot somehow be compatible with the Paris Agreement's goals. All this suggests that climate change science is being overlooked by the UK government to an even greater extent than it was before. 2.10.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32636>

### **Walsh says Heathrow charges rule out more UK domestic links, and he will not be told where to fly**

Chris Grayling and the DfT were eager to point out how a 3rd Heathrow runway would increase links to the regions, and increase the number of routes from Heathrow from 8 now to 14 in future. And these links might have to be ensured by payments. Heathrow, in trying to persuade government this was possible, said it would create a new £10m Route Development Fund. The Airports Commission said there should be a Public Service Obligations on an airport-to-airport basis, to encourage these unprofitable routes.

Now Willie Walsh has confirmed that there is "zero chance" of British Airways operating any new domestic flights from an expanded Heathrow. He will not be told, by government or an airport, where to fly. He says the high landing charges, inevitable to pay for the expansion, made it impossible to deliver an increase in domestic air links. He would refuse to run these links even if Holland-Kaye "begs me to do it" because it would not be profitable.

Walsh said Heathrow was "fat, dumb and happy" and that it attracted large numbers of airlines but that many failed to make a profit. He also said with a 3rd runway, Heathrow would price out most airlines. Holland-Kaye is hoping he can get easyJet, Flybe and BMI Regional to take on potential regional routes.

Walsh said the current charge of £40 for a return trip would double to £80 per passenger with a new runway. 23.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=33111>

## **Seven more purely, unashamedly, low cost leisure destinations for 2017 from Heathrow**

So much for the claims that Heathrow is ensuring Britain is "open for business" and creating "trading links to the growing markets of the world" or "connecting Britain to global growth". The reality is that many of the landing slots at Heathrow are used for leisure flights, and many are for cheap European leisure flights. British Airways has announced 7 new routes from Heathrow for 2017. These are to Murcia, in "stunning" southern Spain "known for its world renowned golf courses". There is also Brindisi, in Italy "ideal for holidaymakers looking for some sun to soak up in." And Nantes, in western France, which is a "gateway to Brittany and Loire Valley as well as being home to the world famous Muscadet wines." Also Montpellier, in southern France, with "a blend of the beaches of the Mediterranean Sea and the mountains of the Pyrenees.



Also Pula, in Croatia "an increasingly popular destination for families who want a cheap summer holiday, replacing the likes of Spain and France." Then there is Tallinn, in Estonia, which is cheap and "one of the most preserved medieval cities in Europe". And Zakynthos "This Greek island in the Ionian Sea is nicknamed the flower of the East. It is home to the Navagio beach, the most famous landmark on the island which is a stunning setting for a day lounging in the sun. Price: from £65". There are also flights for cheap holidays to Menorca.

This demonstrates, yet again, that Heathrow is not full of flights to vital, far flung, business-related destinations. It has flights to high volume popular destinations that make money. ie. cheap holidays.

13.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32923>

## **15 people arrested in protest against proposed 3rd runway, blocking two roads close to Heathrow**



In an action organised by RisingUp! close to Heathrow, by climate protesters got onto the M4 spur road to the airport at a traffic lights when the traffic had stopped. Within seconds five had locked themselves together with arm locks, blocking the road. Another Heathrow road, the East Ramp, was also blocked, for a short time, with some road trips slightly delayed, but no flights were affected. Fifteen arrests were made for obstructing the highway or public order offences. Many others protested, though without blocking a road.

A spokesman for Rising Up! said: "The government's decisions to expand Heathrow, despite mass opposition from local residents and the fact that doing so is incompatible with the UK's own laws on climate change, leaves us with no morally acceptable option but to resist." One of the protesters taking part in the demonstration, Genny Scherer, 70, said: "It's one or the other: new runways or a safe climate. I want my nephews and nieces to grow up in a safe climate, just like I was able to."

19.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=33026>

## **T&E says weak ICAO voluntary CO2 deal is NOT mission accomplished for ICAO, Europe or aviation industry**

The deal agreed by ICAO to at least make a start on limiting the growth of global aviation CO2 is very far below the level of ambition needed. Transport & Environment have commented on just how inadequate it is. They say the agreement only offers to offset, not actually reduce, the CO2 from international flights, starting in 2021.

Participation till 2027 is voluntary and its coverage of emissions falls well short of the 'carbon neutral growth in 2020' target promised by ICAO and the industry. The European Commission will now examine the agreement and decide what action to recommend in the light of the current suspension of the ETS coverage of flights into and out of Europe.

A major problem is that the offsetting programme agreed so far lacks clear rules on both the quality of offsets that will be recognised and how they are accounted for, so double counting is not ruled out. To be of

any use, offsets must be additional, ie. that would not have happened anyway. It is estimated that only about 20% of total aircraft CO2 emissions between 2021 and 2035 will be offset, meaning that the sector's emissions are very far from being negated. T&E says that large historical emitters like Europe and the US must introduce additional measures to close aviation's emissions gap, such as strengthening the EU ETS and stripping aviation's harmful privileges regarding taxation and subsidies.

The UK government is eager to use the ICAO deal as an excuse to not further restrict UK aviation CO2 emissions. 15.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32960>

### **Edinburgh airport publishes draft Master Plan for consultation - high growth out to 2050, but no 2nd runway plan**

Edinburgh Airport has produced a draft master plan for consultation (deadline for comment is 23rd December) about its future development up to 2050. The airport says "The Masterplan highlights how we aim to grow and develop the airport responsibly over a 25 year period whilst improving the experience" ....benefits to the economy etc etc." It plans to increase its passenger number from about 11.1 million in 2015, to 19.2 million in 2030, and 35 million in 2050.

It will continue to safeguard land for a possible 2nd runway, if there is enough demand after 2040 if there are 30 million passengers by then. The numbers of passengers and ATMs in the current master plan are much higher than in the 2011 plan (eg. 2011 plan anticipated about 200,000 ATMs by 2040, but the 2016 plan expects 208,000. For passengers, the 2011 plan anticipated 20.5 million passengers in 2040, but the 2016 plan expects 25.8 million.) There is little on noise to encourage those already negatively affected by the airport's flight paths. It says it has a noise action plan that "sets out the actions we propose to take to manage and, where possible, minimise aircraft-related noise at Edinburgh Airport." But "as long as people want to fly, there will be noise from aircraft landing and taking off." Local groups Transform Scotland, the campaign for sustainable transport, and Edinburgh Airport Watch criticised the plans for yet further expansion, and the negative environment impacts. 13.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32928>

### **Environmental Audit Cttee finds Treasury failing to take long-term environmental costs into account**



HM Treasury

The Environmental Audit Committee (EAC) has done an investigation into the role of the Treasury in relation to sustainable development and environmental protection. The EAC is calling for the Treasury to "green-check" all its decisions, after its major investigation found that the Treasury puts short term priorities over long term sustainability – potentially increasing costs to the economy in the future. [The Treasury has been a key promoter of a new south east runway, with Treasury staff helping the Airports Commission.]

EAC Chair, Mary Creagh, said: "The Treasury is highly influential and uniquely placed to ensure the whole of Government works to promote sustainability. But we have seen considerable evidence that it fails to do this. The Treasury tends not to take full account of the long term environmental costs and benefits of decisions which would reduce costs for taxpayers and consumers in the long run. On the carbon capture and storage competition and zero carbon homes we saw the Treasury riding roughshod over departments, cancelling long-established environmental programmes at short notice with no consultation, costing businesses and the taxpayer tens of millions of pounds." 18.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=33006>

### **easyJet is planning to set up a separate airline in Europe, to avoid Brexit risks in UK**

EasyJet recently reported slightly lower profits. Their results state: "As a result of the UK's referendum vote to leave the European Union, easyJet plans to establish an Air Operator Certificate (AOC) in another EU member state. This will secure the flying rights of the 30% of our network that remains wholly within and between EU states, excluding the UK.....The primary driver of the cost is the re-registering of aircraft in an EU AOC jurisdiction."

The BBC reported that Carolyn McCall "also confirmed that Easyjet is in the process of setting up a separate airline based on the European mainland, in readiness for when the UK leaves the EU. Current EU flying rights might have to be renegotiated and the new company would ensure Easyjet could operate within the EU." She said they don't have the luxury of waiting to see what happens with Brexit, but there was no question of job cuts or moving from the current headquarters at Luton. It was about registering aircraft and "securing flying rights." Though easyJet already has a Swiss subsidiary, Easyjet itself will become the entity inside the EU. "The British airline will become the subsidiary, with the existing UK airline operating certificate ring-fenced, so that it remains majority-owned by British shareholders." 16.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32980>

### **Dr Tania Mathias calling for a Bill in Parliament to make aircraft noise a statutory nuisance**

In the 1920s aviation was a nascent, struggling industry, and governments gave it a lot of support to get going. One of the benefits it got was in the Air Navigation Act 1920, which provided the basis of the UK's aviation noise regulation regime, by exempting aviation from nuisance sanctions, in order to stimulate the new industry. This was reaffirmed in the Civil Aviation Act 1982, which says citizens have no recourse against aircraft noise nuisance: "No action shall lie in respect of trespass or in respect of nuisance, by reason only of the flight of an aircraft over any property at a height above the ground ....". Unlike almost any other noise nuisance source, there is nothing anyone can do about aircraft noise that disturbs them. Now Dr Tania Mathias, MP for Twickenham, has called for a Bill to make aircraft noise a statutory nuisance. She has put down: "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend Part 3 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to make noise caused by aircraft a statutory nuisance, and for connected purposes." Tania says an average food blender makes a noise of about 80 decibels, and plane noise in homes in Twickenham can be up to 83 decibels. It is an unacceptable anachronism that while the noise nuisance from model aircraft is recognised in law, the noise of real planes is not. She believes we need the law to provide a means of making it better when noise goes beyond what is reasonable or safe. 30.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=33216>

### **Gatwick now only allows noise complaints by online form (or paper post) – no longer by phone or email**

The number of noise complaints to Gatwick rose 6-fold in a year, with the increased number of flights and altered routes. Gatwick then changed the complaint system so there could only be one noise complaint per household per day. Gatwick has now found a way to cut the complaints. While in the past people could email or phone their complaint, - now the only means of complaint is filling in a relatively long internet form, with obligatory choices, before there is the chance to write your complaint in your own words. People can still send in a complaint by Freepost. Gatwick say this system is effective in ensuring all complaints are logged properly and details fully recorded.

However, this new system means anyone not able to access the internet is effectively prevented from complaining, unless they go to all the trouble of writing and posting a letter. Though there is now no limit on the number of complaints per day, each time the ten lines of required information for the form must be filled in. At least the complaint system at Heathrow allows someone to email, or phone and speak to a person. Local groups feel Gatwick's treatment of its neighbours seems to have taken a further, downward, turn. Now it has not been selected for a new runway, it has given up on any sort of charm offensive with the local residents. 7.11.2016 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32852>

### **Some Useful Links**

- For **large amounts of up-to-date news** on airports and aviation, see **AirportWatch's** news pages <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/latest-news/> with many topic sub-sections
- For daily transport news in the UK - **Transportinfo** at [transportinfo.org.uk](http://transportinfo.org.uk)
- **Transport & Environment (T&E)** <http://www.transportenvironment.org> Twitter [@transenv](https://twitter.com/transenv)
- News & expert analysis by **AEF (Aviation Environment Federation)** [www.aef.org.uk](http://www.aef.org.uk) [@The\\_AEF](https://twitter.com/The_AEF)



- HACAN [www.hacan.org.uk](http://www.hacan.org.uk) Twitter @HACAN1
- GACC (Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign) [www.gacc.org.uk/latest-news](http://www.gacc.org.uk/latest-news)
- Stop Heathrow Expansion (SHE) <http://www.stopheathrowexpansion.co.uk>
- Stop Stansted Expansion (SSE) <http://stopstanstedexpansion.com/>
- CHATR Chiswick Against the Third Runway. <http://www.chatr.org.uk/>
- HACAN East at London City Airport. <http://hacaneast.org.uk/news> Twitter @HACANEast
- AirportWatch Europe <http://www.airportwatcheurope.com> Twitter @AirportWatchEU
- Follow AirportWatch on Twitter @AirportWatch and Facebook [on.fb.me/UoSkEx](https://www.facebook.com/UoSkEx)

*Bulletin compiled by Sarah Clayton - thanks to many people for their help, input & guidance. 3.12.2016*  
[www.airportwatch.org.uk](http://www.airportwatch.org.uk) [info@airportwatch.org.uk](mailto:info@airportwatch.org.uk)