

Page 1

- Phillip Hammond: Ministers 'only backed 3rd Heathrow runway if night flight ban remained'
- Willie Walsh: Heathrow must have arrivals well before 5.30am – then full on for next 2 hours

Page 2

- London Mayor criticises DfT's lack of answers to fundamental questions on Heathrow
- Residents face just 4 hours free from aircraft noise if 3rd Heathrow runway goes ahead
- Transport Committee inquiry into the Heathrow NPS - see the submissions

Page 3

- Neil Keveren set off on 400 mile walk, explaining along the way why there should be NO 3rd Runway
- One man's 400-mile, 3 week, walk to Scotland, to save his village from Heathrow bulldozers

Page 4

- Willie Walsh: Work out cost of crossing M25 before Heathrow runway plan
- Night flight noise likely to increase risk of Type 2 diabetes for those living under flightpaths
- Heathrow NO2 air pollution worsens as Government presses ahead with 3rd runway plan

Page 5

- Four Select Committees launch an unprecedented joint inquiry into air pollution
- Evidence session on Heathrow impacts held by the GLA Environment Committee
- Greg Hands (Chelsea & Fulham MP) urges DfT to ban Heathrow night flights from 11pm to 6am

Page 6

- Runway opponents stage a brief take-over of Maidenhead DfT Heathrow event, filling in information gaps
- Major new coalition launched to fight Heathrow 3rd runway

Page 7

- Packed first public meeting of new anti-Heathrow expansion group, BASHR3 in Hounslow
- Heathrow 2.0: a 'sustainable airport' that pretends no one has to choose between planes and pollution
- Grayling tells the Welsh that Heathrow 3rd runway will be of huge benefit to them

Page 8

- Regions being led to believe, using dubious data, Heathrow runway will benefit them
- Jeremy Corbyn backs further expansion (2nd runway?) for Birmingham Airport – as well connected to transport

Page 9

- IPPR says apprenticeship levy will deepen north-south divide – with areas like Heathrow benefitting
- UK-based airlines told to move headquarters to Europe after Brexit or lose intra-European routes
- "Level": British Airways sister airline offering transatlantic fares lower than rivals

Page 10

- Response by T&E to EU consultation on VAT – there is no logical reason why air travel is exempt
- Fears on how Tory party want post-Brexit bonfire of EU "red tape" on environment etc regulations
- Fears that protecting environment in the courts will become prohibitively expensive, as 'cost cap' scrapped

Page 11

- £150m bid race for Luton airport light rail link from station to terminal
- Edinburgh Airport flawed and inaccessible consultation on airspace changes condemned
- MSP motion lodged at Holyrood about Edinburgh Airport flawed flight path consultation

Page 12

- Stansted announces new £130m arrivals terminal to be completed by end of 2021
- The challenge of tackling the non-CO2 impacts of aviation – explained by Carbon Brief
- Freight train to China leaves UK carrying whisky, pharmaceuticals etc – not needing Heathrow air freight

Page 13

- BA introducing biometric boarding gates at Heathrow, further reducing numbers of airport jobs
- About 30 people at Notre-Dame-des-Landes demand their property back (taken 5 years ago for a new airport)
- Indian air travel pays 25% tax, but Delhi now cut tax for domestic flights only to 1%

Page 14

- Ryanair's Michael O'Leary says climate change is 'complete and utter rubbish' – not related to CO2
- Heathrow's head of property excited about re-development opportunities and maximising revenues from airport's property
- Some useful links

Phillip Hammond:
Ministers ‘only backed third Heathrow runway if night flight ban remained’



Several Cabinet ministers only backed a Heathrow 3rd runway on the condition that the Government ensured there was a proper night flight ban. At a meeting in his Englefield Green constituency, the Chancellor, Philip Hammond hit back at airlines - like International Airlines Group (owner of Heathrow's largest customer airline, BA) - that are pushing strongly for early morning flights to be allowed to continue. These flights cause noise misery for many local people. Hammond told local residents in his Runnymede and Weybridge constituency that he supports Heathrow expansion **if** measures proposed by the Airport Commission (Chairman, Howard Davies) were guaranteed to protect communities close to the airport.

The Commission said there should be a ban on all scheduled night flights [ignoring un-scheduled however] for six and a half hours, between 11.30pm and 6.00am. Heathrow has instead proposed 11pm to 5.30am - it wants early flights, and it knows there are already none scheduled after 11pm. IAG has said it needs flights landing early, and at the terminal, by 5.30am and then a large number of flights before 7am.

Having large numbers of flights overhead from perhaps 5.10am onwards (to land wheels on runway by 5.30am), is likely to actually mean MORE, not FEWER, planes using Heathrow during sleep hours - even with the alleged six and a half hours ban. The only thing to change is the few from 4.30am till 5.30am now.

Few people consider 5.15am the end of their period of sleep, so that is entirely unacceptable to anyone who is woken by plane noise. Evidence shows many health impacts of sleep disturbed by plane noise, including cardiovascular impacts and Type 2 diabetes. 4.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34421>

**Willie Walsh adamant Heathrow must have arrivals well before 5.30am
– then full on for next 2 hours**



IAG has submitted its evidence to the Commons Transport Committee's inquiry into the Airports National Policy Statement (NPS). The NPS and the DfT are proposing - hoping to overcome local opposition to the runway - that there should be a ban on night flights of six and a half hours. IAG does not agree.

The WHO says for good health people need 7 - 8 hours sleep per night, and more for some age groups. Therefore even six and a half hours is not enough, even for healthy adults. IAG is not prepared to have no flights till 6am. (See IAG submission <https://tinyurl.com/IAG-response>)

IAG says ..."the NPS does not recognise the operational flexibility required for flights to connect and deliver the associated benefits. The Government should therefore avoid unreasonable restrictions on night operations that would prevent economically valuable connections." ... from small changes IAG has made "Local communities have therefore benefited ... from a reduction in noise while no additional night movements have been granted at Heathrow in return." ... if Heathrow opened at 7am, that would be 2 hours later than Frankfurt ... to make the best use of the new runway, increase connectivity etc ...

"... the first arrivals will need to be scheduled to have landed and be on-stand ready to disembark passengers by 05:30, with a high arrival movement capacity in the subsequent 1-2 hours." 3.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34406>

London Mayor criticises DfT's lack of answers to fundamental questions on Heathrow

The Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, submitted evidence to the Transport Select Committee inquiry into the DfT's draft NPS on a 3rd Heathrow runway. The Mayor said there would be unacceptable consequences for London; it would hamper efforts to improve London's air quality; 200,000 more people would be exposed to noise while scheduled night flights could increase by at least a third; and there are no credible plans to maintain traffic levels or commitment for infrastructure to support 250% increase in public transport trips.

Sadiq Khan:

"The government's position appears to be to simply hope for the best..."

He said ministers' plans were based on the 3rd runway not being fully utilised – playing down the real impact. The government had 'completely failed', and was his duty to Londoners to oppose a third runway. He said:

"The government has completely failed to demonstrate how Heathrow can be expanded without a severe noise, air quality and transport impact on London. The government's position appears to be to simply hope for the best, with unproven plans that look to take advantage of unrelated improvements being made to air quality and public transport. It's simply not good enough for one of the country's largest infrastructure projects, and it leaves me even more concerned about the prospect of Heathrow expansion on London and the UK." 31.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34385>

Residents face just 4 hours free from aircraft noise if 3rd Heathrow runway goes ahead

Sarah Olney, the new MP for Richmond Park, has criticised the Department for Transport for not being open with residents that a 3rd runway at Heathrow could mean just 6 or 4 hours per day respite from aircraft noise. Currently residents under many of Heathrow's flight paths can expect up to 8 hours without being disturbed by incoming and outgoing flights from Heathrow. However, hidden away in the public

Sarah Olney:

"... the Tories are treating local residents with contempt"

consultation on a 3rd runway (the draft NPS) is an admission from the Government that whilst residents can expect more 'certainty' over when respite periods will be, the number of hours they can expect to be free from aircraft noise will drop to just 6, or even 4, hours.

Sarah Olney raised the issue in the House of Commons on 30th March, asking the Transport Secretary, Chris Grayling, to explain why the consultation did not make this evident. Responding for the Government, he failed to answer the question, stating only that the consultation "set out in broad terms the impact of the changes". Speaking after their exchange in the House of Commons Sarah Olney commented that the government is treating local residents with contempt. If Chris Grayling cannot even give a proper reply in Parliament, either he isn't aware that residents will suffer from more noise (if not, why not, if he is Minister in charge of the process), or he isn't willing to admit it. [No questions to ministers on Heathrow are ever answered properly - always evasively]. 31.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34380>

Transport Committee inquiry into the Heathrow NPS - see the submissions

The full list of submissions on the draft National Policy Statement at <https://tinyurl.com/Transport-submissions> It is still accepting late submissions. There are over 60 responses, some long and detailed. It is interesting to see the approach they take, and some arguments they make. Below are links to just a few:

The submission by Heathrow is at <https://tinyurl.com/Heathrow-submission>

From IAG <https://tinyurl.com/IAG-submission>

From Greenpeace <https://tinyurl.com/Greenpeace-submission>

From Friends of the Earth <https://tinyurl.com/FoE-submission>

From Sarah Clayton <https://tinyurl.com/SarahClayton-submission>

From Teddington Action Group <https://tinyurl.com/TeddingtonTAG-submission>

From Aviation Environment Federation <https://tinyurl.com/AEF-submission> and there are many more.

The Committee will in due course hold oral hearings, (there are no details of those yet) before sending its completed report to the Department for Transport, well before the mid-July start of the Parliamentary summer recess. The DfT will include the Committee's report in its production of the final NPS.

Neil Keveren set off on 400 mile walk, explaining along the way why there should be NO 3rd Runway



A lively group in Harmondsworth village saw Neil off on his one-man long walk north, to Scotland, as he set off on 4th April on the first day's stretch to Chesham. Neil is taking his message the length of the country, to help raise awareness of some of the hugely negative and damaging implications of the proposed runway.

Though Neil's house would not be bulldozed for the runway development, he would be so close to the airport boundary fence, that carrying on living there would be impossible. Half of Harmondsworth (and parts of, or all of, other villages) would be demolished. Harmondsworth itself would remain just as a shell, impossible to continue as a viable community, so close to the 3rd runway. And so Neil is determined to fight this every step of the way, for local group Stop Heathrow Expansion (SHE). And there are a lot of steps in 400 miles. ...

Councillor Ray Puddifoot attended the send-off gathering, and spoke about the significance of Neil's trip, and the importance of persuading MPs across the country, and particularly the SNP, to vote against the runway. The 54 SNP MPs in the House of Commons are likely to vote, en block, for the runway having been dubiously persuaded to believe in huge benefits it would bring Scotland (Helped by Heathrow largely paying for their 2016 party conference). Ray said the runway was nonsensical, as well as illegal – in causing breaches of air pollution standards. He said Neil was representing the interests of tens or hundreds of thousands of people, taking his message across the country, that the 3rd Heathrow runway should not be built. Zac Goldsmith also attended the send-off party, saying in the middle ages – to avoid undue bloodshed and loss of men – armies would send out their best and bravest fighters to do battle on behalf of everyone. So it is with Neil, courageously setting off to speak up for everyone whose lives would be made worse by the impacts of the runway, and especially those in Harmondsworth who face losing their homes, their village and their community, in act of wanton destruction for an unnecessary, and high carbon venture.

4.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34426> To get in touch Neil's phone number is **07850 904 677**

One man's 400-mile, 3 week, walk London to Scotland, to save his village from Heathrow bulldozers

Neil is doing a fabulous job, on his walk north, taking his **NO 3rd Runway** message on a 400 mile walk, up to Edinburgh **#walktoscotland** He is covering about 20 miles each day, and sleeping most nights in the support van - being driven by Neil's lovely uncle Ray. Up to the 10th he has been through Chesham,



Leighton Buzzard, Milton Keynes, Olney, Corby, Oakham, and to Grantham. Then on to Scunthorpe, Snaith, York, Thirsk, Darlington etc - on towards the border. He plans to meet up with campaigners at Drax and also at the Kirby Misperton anti-fracking camp.

Neil is making short video clips (when the technology allows - Neil is a bit of a technophobe and having a steep learning curve on the IT!) and these can be seen on SHE's website <http://stopheathrowexpansion.co.uk/scotlandwalk/april2017/> You can follow his progress in AirportWatch's Twitter and Facebook too.

A key message Neil is taking to regions, as well as the tragedy and injustice of losing his village, to foreign-owned Heathrow airport, is the financial burden that would be put on taxpayers across the UK, having to fund perhaps £15 billion of transport infrastructure, necessary because of the extra demand from passengers using the 3rd Heathrow runway.

Willie Walsh: Work out cost of crossing M25 before Heathrow runway plan

Willie Walsh, CEO of IAG, says pushing through Heathrow's 3rd runway should be suspended until there are proper plans of how the airport is going to bridge the M25. The section of the M25 that the runway would have to go over is about the busiest stretch of motorway in the UK, and it is unclear if there would be some sort of bridge (a cheaper option, about 8 metres above the road surface), or a proper tunnel (more expensive for Heathrow).

IAG and British Airways are concerned the extra cost would mean higher charges by Heathrow, so higher ticket prices. Heathrow says landing charges would remain as close to flat "as possible" but Walsh fears they could double and they raised their concerns in their submission to the inquiry by the Transport Committee, into the draft NPS. IAG is not keen on the runway, due to fear of competition from other airlines.

“high risk” and “a substantial risk of excessive customer frustration about what might be a prolonged period of disruption”

There are a few airports globally that have some sort of bridge, with planes taxiing above the road, clearly visible to traffic. There are none over such a wide, busy section of motorway. In October, when the bridge idea was first suggested (the Airports Commission always presumed a tunnel) papers from Highways England showed it described the scheme as “high risk”, warning of “a substantial risk of excessive customer frustration about what might be a prolonged period of disruption.” 3.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34404>

Night flight noise likely to increase risk of Type 2 diabetes for those living under flightpaths



Research by the Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute in Basel has shown that people who live below an airport flightpath are more than 80% more likely to have type 2 diabetes than people who live in quieter areas. The findings have led scientists to suggest that aircraft noise, rather than air pollution, could be to blame. The noise of the planes overhead, when they are low and loud, is likely to have a devastating effect on the body's metabolism, leading to increased blood sugar levels. The effect is largely from noise at night, confirming that night flights are damaging to health. The cost to the health of over-flown populations needs to be properly taken into account, and given enough significance against small economic benefits of night flights to airports and airlines (which is how the DfT assesses the issue at present). Heathrow already has - by an order of magnitude - the most people affected by night flights, with over 700,000 living within the 55 Lden noise average contours. The link to diabetes is through the body's reaction to stress, raising blood pressure. Noise stimulates the body's sympathetic nervous system and the hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal axis, leading to increased blood pressure, heart rate, and levels of the “stress hormone” cortisol. Type 2 diabetes can lead to heart disease, strokes, limb amputations and blindness. It affects over 3 million people in the UK. 3.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/2017/04/living-under-flightpath-roar-may-cause-diabetes-scientists-say-residents-who-are-exposed-to-daily-aircraft-noise-are-86-per-cent-more-likely-to-have-the-type-2-condition/>

Heathrow NO2 air pollution worsens as Government presses ahead with 3rd runway plan

A report published on the Heathrow Airwatch website, shows that air pollution around Heathrow is getting worse - as the Government presses ahead with plans for a 3rd runway. Nitrogen dioxide (NO2) levels rose at 9 out of 12 monitors in west London within two kilometres (1.24 miles) of the airport between 2015 and 2016, according to provisional data. At two sites in Hillingdon and Hayes it remained in breach of EU limits. At another, Oxford Avenue in Hillingdon, the average NO2 level rose from 32 micrograms per cubic metre of air to almost the legal limit of 40. NO2 levels are below, or just below, the EU limit at 9 out of the 11 local monitoring sites outside Heathrow's boundary within 2km of the airport.



Opponents of the 3rd runway fear this confirms that air pollution around Heathrow is getting worse, and would be at very unhealthy levels with a new runway added. John Stewart, chairman of HACAN, said: "The key fact that Heathrow cannot hide is that air quality around the airport is going in the wrong direction. It is going to be harder than ever for Heathrow to build a third runway and stay within legal air pollution limits." The Heathrow Airwatch report said NO2 levels had increased at many of the monitoring sites between 2015 and 2016, and across the South-East so "indicated" the specific rises were not only the result of changes in local activities. 6.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34453>

Four Select Committees launch an unprecedented joint inquiry into air pollution

MP's from four Parliamentary select committees have combined forces to launch an unprecedented joint inquiry on air quality to scrutinise cross-government plans to tackle urban pollution hotspots.

The Environmental Audit Committee, Environment Food and Rural Affairs, Health, and Transport Committees will hold four evidence sessions to consider mounting scientific evidence on the health and environmental impacts of outdoor air pollution. The Government has lost two UK court cases about its plans to tackle the key pollutant nitrogen dioxide (NO2). The High Court has ordered the Government to publish a draft new clean air plan to tackle NO2 by **24 April, with a final plan by 31 July.**

The European Commission has also threatened enforcement which could see the UK pay millions of pounds in fines if the Government does not within two months take steps to bring 16 UK zones within legal pollution limits. Louise Ellman, Chair of the Transport Committee (dealing with the draft NPS on Heathrow), said emissions from vehicles are a significant problem and the standards that governments have relied on have not delivered the expected reductions: "We will be asking what more can be done to increase the use of cleaner vehicles as well as to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport."

20.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34293>

Evidence session on Heathrow impacts held by the GLA Environment Committee

The GLA Environment Committee held a meeting on 16th March, to which they invited both Heathrow staff (Matt Gorman, and Andrew Chen) and opponents (John Stewart, Jenny Bates and Simon Birkett) to reply to questions. The Committee has serious concerns about the environmental impacts of Heathrow, and they have not yet been persuaded by the bland assurances that Heathrow continues to give. The transcript of the session is not yet available, but it is all on Webcast. <https://www.london.gov.uk/environment-committee-2017-03-16> (Starts 2hrs 9mins 55secs in - ends 2hrs 59 mins).



Important points were made, in response to Assembly Members' questions, on issues such as how much Heathrow would actually pay towards necessary surface access improvements; how long Heathrow will take to install noise the pledged £700 million (up to 20 years, Matt Gorman says); and how the ban on night flights should mean 8 hours without planes, not only the six and a half hours without scheduled flights, that Heathrow has grudgingly agreed to consider. The committee have experience of needing to mistrust bland assurances by Heathrow on how a 3rd runway could meet noise and air pollution challenges. They will be submitting their response to the DfT's consultation on the draft NPS.

16.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34274>

Greg Hands (MP for Chelsea & Fulham) urges DfT to ban Heathrow night flights from 11pm to 6am

Chelsea and Fulham MP (Cons) Greg Hands has urged DfT ministers to impose a ban on all night flights at Heathrow. Greg renewed calls for all planes to be grounded between 11pm and 6am, a period of 7 hours, and says he is frequently woken up at night by noise from aircraft passing over west London. In a letter to Lord Ahmed, the parliamentary under secretary of state for transport, Mr Hands argued that there should be a



“comprehensive” ban on night flights at Heathrow. He said the lives of local people are being unfairly disrupted by the noise, and research from international health bodies, including the WHO and the BMJ, highlights the damaging impacts of sustained sleep deprivation on people’s wellbeing. “These Londoners have jobs to do and families to look after, for which they require a good night’s sleep.”

"I find it unacceptable that the convenience, quality of sleep, and the health of millions of residents ... is sacrificed for the sake of a few thousand inbound passengers per night"

A ban of flights for a 7 hour night period would “lessen the detrimental impact on hundreds of thousands of Londoners living beneath the flight path”. ... “I find it unacceptable that the convenience, quality of sleep, and the health of millions of residents in London and

the wider South East under the flight path is sacrificed for the sake of a few thousand inbound passengers per night". 10.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34223>

Runway opponents stage a brief take-over of Maidenhead DfT Heathrow event, filling in information gaps

The Maidenhead DfT information display on 8th March - pushing the Heathrow 3rd runway - was taken over for its last 20 minutes by an invasion of anti-runway protesters. The DfT events are intended to give information to members of the public who want to know more about the runway plan. Unfortunately the displays are very focused on the alleged benefits of the runway, with very little information on its negative impacts. Generally the DfT staff who man the events are unable to answer questions about negative effects of the runway, in any detail. Anyone asking a question that the DfT is unwilling or unable to answer is told to put the points into their consultation response.

Campaigners from SHE (Stop Heathrow Expansion) with representatives from around 8 other groups, held a brief session to show up some of the gaps in information that the DfT is giving the public at these (20) sessions. Neil Keveren (SHE) pointed out some of the omitted information (like how little change to night flights is actually proposed, the effect of those whose homes will be compulsorily purchased, the health impacts of air pollution and the cost to the taxpayer of improvements to surface infrastructure). There is no info on any of those in the DfT panels. Others then chipped in with other information that the DfT should be including. The session ended with rousing chants of "No New Runways" and "Theresa May, What would your father say, NO 3rd runway" - and Neil singing, accompanied by his guitar, the song *"This is our home, and we will stay - No 3rd runway."*

The song can be seen at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fIaXTK_1T0M

The lyrics are at <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34203>

Major new coalition launched to fight Heathrow 3rd runway

A major new coalition has been launched to fight the proposed 3rd runway at Heathrow. The coalition is formally backed already by 18 local campaign groups, including to name a few, Stop Heathrow Expansion (SHE), HACAN, Teddington Action Group (TAG) and recently formed BASH Runway3 (based in Brentford). More groups are expected to join in the coming weeks and months.



The coalition also has the support of 5 local authorities as well as leading politicians from all main parties. The aim of the coalition is to put additional pressure on the Government to drop plans for the runway, building upon the work of existing opponents including campaign groups, local authorities and MPs. It will provide opponents of the runway a platform, allowing them to work effectively together - including support from MPs to the heroic local Councils challenging Heathrow in the courts.

The coalition will work to highlight issues - including noise, air pollution and economics - with the DfT's current, deeply flawed, consultation on the Heathrow National Policy Statement (NPS). Though the DfT has held 20 consultation exhibition events across west London, Berkshire and Surrey, considerable numbers of residents were left disappointed that there was no information on locations of new flight paths, and that will not be presented until much later in the process. 21.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34298>

Packed first public meeting of new anti-Heathrow expansion group, BASHR3 in Hounslow

Nearly 200 residents packed out a church hall to attend the launch meeting of a new local anti-Heathrow expansion group - BASHR3. The first public meeting of Brentford and Hounslow Stop Heathrow Expansion (BASH Runway 3) meeting on March 21st was a lively event, with speeches from Ruth Cadbury (Brentford & Isleworth MP), John Stewart of HACAN, and Maggie Thorburn, from Friends of the Earth.



The issue of putting profits and pollution before people was high on the agenda and there were serious concerns that tens of thousands more people in Brentford, Isleworth, Osterley, Chiswick and Hounslow will be affected by a third runway. Ruth Cadbury was adamant that the threat of a third runway would be eradicated, and many claims made by Heathrow of how they would deal with problems such as noise, air pollution and carbon emissions were "laughable." ...

Ruth believes that "Together, we'll see off the threat to our area for good." The 3rd runway means the massive intrusion of aircraft noise into the lives of hundreds of thousands of people, who not currently under a flight path. Being overflowed for the first time would come as a deeply unpleasant shock for many, and the DfT has made no attempt to give out information about who would be affected. Air pollution will also become worse across the constituency as a result of the traffic generated by the extra cars and lorries on the local and motorway road network. 24.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34329>

Heathrow 2.0: a 'sustainable airport' that pretends no one has to choose between planes and pollution

A thoughtful article, by two leading academics in public policy and ideology, casts huge doubts on the claims of Heathrow to have solutions to the increased environment problems of a 3rd runway. Heathrow has put out a "greenwash" report, "Heathrow 2.0", (2 degrees C implication) with the intention of trying to persuade politicians etc that the airport will be able to deal with all its environmental problems, and even be carbon neutral. It is absolute nonsense, but dangerous nonsense, because gullible MPs and others will be taken in by it. It contains claims about flights being carbon neutral, and worthy aims such as helping to restore peat bogs that sort of thing ...



The academics' article on this is well worth reading, in full. A few extracts: "Heathrow expansion has become an emblematic issue in the fight against climate change. ... An airport that exists above politics gives the illusion that no one has to choose between planes and pollution ... its "cake and eat it" narrative, in which we could fly more and still cope with rising CO2 ... the plans lack clarity and ambition. Strategic priorities like a 'noise envelope' ... are often stated, but not accompanied with clear targets ... As Heathrow itself accepts, the airport cannot deliver on most of the claims it makes ...

"The airport is simply trying to fill the void left by Theresa May and Chris Grayling, who have abandoned their responsibility to offer policy leadership ... this absence of leadership betrays the emergence of a new "post-sustainable" aviation, designed to accommodate the challenges of Brexit ... people are increasingly urged to believe that human progress and innovation are enough to meet environmental challenges. ... In this emerging discourse, the demands of economic growth trump those of the environment and social well-being." 18.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34273>

Grayling tells the Welsh that Heathrow 3rd runway will be of huge benefit to them

On Friday 7th April the DfT held one of its regional events, promoting the 3rd Heathrow runway - as part of its draft NPS consultation (ends 25th May). Chris Grayling must have felt the need to try to encourage attendance (which has been woefully low at other regional events) so he had a piece in the local paper, Wales Online. He pushes the potential benefits of the runway for Wales as hard as he can, with comments like how it will "boost jobs" and "promote our innovative industries on the world stage" and "the new

runway could provide better links to more destinations around the world, a wider choice of airlines" He said: "According to Heathrow, it currently handles £2.8 bn of Welsh exports each year. The new runway could double the airport's freight capacity, linking Welsh businesses with fast growing global markets." And so on.

Heathrow signed up to a deal with the Welsh government in January, in which the airport gave some very dubious figures of how much Wales would benefit. These figures are based on Heathrow's own assumptions, based on assumptions, based on an out of date, highly exaggerated figure of economic benefit of the runway, of £147 billion (that is, over all the UK, over 60 years). Even the DfT no longer believes that figure. (See below ...) 8.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34459>

Regions being led to believe, using dubious data, Heathrow runway will benefit them

The Airports Commission never actually gave numbers for the alleged economic benefit a 3rd Heathrow would provide, region by region. Nor did they give numbers of jobs per region. But the Commission did come up with a number in July 2015 - up to £147 billion - of the possible economic benefit, before subtracting costs, there might be. Subsequently the DfT downgraded that figure, which was exaggerated in various ways, to £61 billion. That is, over all the UK, over 60 years, and benefits only - no costs taken off.

Heathrow got a consultancy firm called Quod to do a short study. It is undated, with no authorship, almost no references, and no clear methodology. But it came up with a table showing economic benefits of the runway, and the number of jobs, for every region. They did this by taking the £147 billion, taking the proportions of economic activity in the UK per region. Hence the regional figure. They then looked at an average figure of how much a job costs, and using this, divided up the economic number. Hey presto ! A number of jobs the runway would create per region. NB. This was not sanctioned by the DfT or the AC.

But regions, Chambers of Commerce, councillors and MPs, have been given these numbers, as if they were gospel. And they have believed them. Heathrow needs the regions and the MPs to back their runway.

The SNP were told Scotland would get £14 billion economic benefit from the runway, (over 60 years) and 16,100 jobs (by 2050). The North West were told they would get £12.5 billion and 15,300 jobs. Wales was led to believe they would get £6.2 billion and 8,400 jobs. And so on.

Read the Quod report here <https://tinyurl.com/Quod-for-Heathrow> And more details about the problem and how the SNP (among others) are being misled <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=32796>

Jeremy Corbyn backs further expansion (2nd runway?) for Birmingham Airport – as well connected to transport

Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn says Birmingham Airport should have a 2nd runway, as it "is uniquely well connected to transport" which may be better than any other UK airport. Jeremy made these remarks while backing the Labour candidate, Sion Simon, in the West Midlands Mayoral Election in May. Candidates in the battle to become West Midlands mayor have clashed over whether Birmingham Airport in Solihull should have a 2nd runway. Sion Simon says it should, while Conservative candidate Andy Street says there is no need for one.

Jeremy Corbyn said Birmingham airport has "mainline rail within seconds of the airport terminal. And of course a huge motorway network around it. ... Improving airport facilities in the Midlands and the North helps to increase usage of those airports and therefore reduces pressure on airports in the south east." Mr Street argues there is no need for a 2nd runway and the airport can handle twice as many passengers even without a new runway (Birmingham had about 11.6 million passengers in 2016, while Gatwick managed 43 million, with one runway).

More could be done with Birmingham airport to improve the quality of the routes and redevelop the airport to integrate it with HS2. Birmingham is better located geographically to be a major airport for the UK than London, which is too far south. A 3rd Heathrow runway would badly damage Birmingham airport, which is why they oppose it. 6.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34445>

IPPR says apprenticeship levy will deepen north-south divide – with areas like Heathrow benefitting

One of Heathrow's most often repeated claims as benefits for a 3rd runway is taking on 5,000 more apprentices, taking the number up to 10,000, by 2030. In reality, much of the training for apprentices comes from the government, so companies benefit. Many of the apprentices are not young people entering a first job, but existing staff improving their skills. Heathrow would benefit, and get money back, that they have to pay into the levy. Now analysis from the Thinktank the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) suggests the new £3 billion levy on larger employers, starting in April 2017, will raise less money and have smaller impact on areas that need it most - in the regions. Instead it will deepen Britain's north-south divide, with London and the south-east benefiting most, as this is where there is the highest number of big employers. The areas where it is most needed are those that have been hit by deindustrialisation and suffer from low levels of qualifications, low productivity and low pay. Not the Heathrow area. The levy is to be paid by employers in England with a payroll of more than £3m and charged at a rate of 0.5% of their annual wage bill (ie. perhaps nearly £3bn per year.) The IPPR said: the government should analyse the regional impact of its new apprenticeships policy, so it does not leave unemployment hotspots in the north-east or Yorkshire with proportionately less funding. 28.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34345>



UK-based airlines told to move headquarters to Europe after Brexit or lose intra-European routes

Executives at major airlines have been reminded during recent private meetings with EU officials that to continue to operate on routes between European airports, they must have a significant base on EU territory and that a majority of their capital shares must be EU-owned. The EU has warned airlines including easyJet and Ryanair that they will need to relocate their headquarters or sell off shares to European nationals, if they want to continue flying routes within continental Europe after Brexit. This will mean they will need to act to restructure, with economic consequences for the UK, including a likely loss of jobs.

If the EU takes a tough line on Brexit, it might result in the UK reciprocating with its own rules, which would leave EU-owned airlines facing equivalent choices. Some might establish their own British subsidiaries, as the demand for air travel in the UK is high and there is money to be made here. EasyJet flies many routes within Europe (not just from UK) and that is part of its business model. Ryanair is based in Ireland, but has some UK shareholders it will have to replace with Europeans. BA does not fly intra-European flights, and IAG is based in Spain. IAG is likely to need to disinvest shareholders in order to be majority EU-owned, and allow its other EU-registered carriers to continue to operate across Europe. Ryanair believes it will have to set up a UK subsidiary with a British air operating licence (AOC) to continue routes such as Scotland to Northern Ireland. The overall impacts on the UK will not be known for some time. 22.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34311>

"Level": British Airways sister airline offering transatlantic fares lower than rivals

Now many Brits are so affluent, and have been on holiday to all the conventional holiday spots in Europe, they want to go on longer haul trips to more far flung destinations. The price of air travel is so low, that people can have higher and higher carbon holidays and leisure trips, for remarkably little cost. The great hopes of the airlines, and the public who want to visit everywhere they can by air, is for long haul to become super cheap. It has always been a problem, because people are reluctant to accept minimum comforts on a very long flight, of over 6 hours or so. And they then need food etc. Norwegian has cheap flights to the USA, and now IAG has launched a low cost airline, called "Level" to try to combat the challenge from Norwegian. Level is part of the IAG conglomerate, and will be based in Barcelona. Level will initially fly to Los Angeles and Oakland in California, Punta Cana in the Dominican Republic and Buenos Aires. All airlines must charge Air Passenger Duty of £75 for long haul departures, so flights cannot exclude this. Level plans to add more routes with more planes from summer 2018 and is "talking to other potential European airports where Level may operate". 27.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34360>

Response by T&E to EU consultation on VAT – there is no logical reason why air travel is exempt

The EU held a consultation recently, about VAT and changes to the European Directive on it. The consultation closed on 20th March 2017. Some of objectives of the consultation were to ask if there should be greater freedom for Member States to fix VAT rates; the proper balance between harmonisation and Member States autonomy in setting VAT rates; problems of differentiation of VAT rates within the Single Market etc.



Air travel is zero rated for VAT across the EU. The group "Transport & Environment" responded to the consultation, and a couple of their points were that: having no VAT on air travel means the most carbon intensive transport mode, aviation, has ticket prices which are artificially lowered, creating distortions between rail/bus and aviation/ferry. ... all Member States must impose VAT on all passenger transport, especially aviation ... where this cannot be agreed, it should be easy for some Member States to impose VAT on passenger transport ... for things that benefit society such as medicines there is a very strong argument to allow for super-reduced rates, however, climate intensive travel by air or cruise vacations are not among them. There is currently also no VAT on cruises - which are most definitely not essential items. 23.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34315>

Fears on how Tory party want post-Brexit bonfire of EU “red tape” on environment etc regulations

Brexit comes with immense uncertainties, one of the main ones for anyone concerned with the state of the environment, air pollution, water pollution, or carbon emissions, is how much European legislation will be dumped. The Telegraph writes of how keen it, and many in the government, are to get rid of tiresome regulations that hold back business and economic growth, for no better reason than environmental protection. There are comments like: the "Telegraph calls on the Conservative Party to promise a bonfire of EU red tape" ... Iain Duncan Smith thinks the Tories should promise at the next election to “whittle away” unnecessary rules, reducing the “burden” on businesses and citizens. ... "we can reduce the cost on business and on individuals by reducing regulations which will improve our competitiveness, our productivity and therefore ultimately our economy" ... Lord Lawson (prominent climate denier) says UK must swiftly seize the chance to “transform the British economy” by cutting “massive” numbers of EU regulations. ... "Builders have been frustrated by rules on preserving newts, which are classed as “endangered” in Europe even though they are thriving in the UK" [probably due to years of protection]



The **Green Alliance** is working to ensure proper environmental protections survive. The complexity of the transfer creates risks that, if not addressed, could be a serious cause for concern. In a recent blog, they point out the important ones to watch, and what the government should be doing to avoid them. Read their blog here. <https://tinyurl.com/Green-Alliance-red-tape> 28.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34356>

Fears that protecting environment in the courts will become prohibitively expensive, as ‘cost cap’ scrapped

New rules came into force on 28th February which could dramatically reduce the ability of individuals and non-governmental organisations to bring legal challenges to protect the environment. The government is scrapping automatic "cost caps" which limit the costs of losing a case in England and Wales. We have the current cost caps due to the international Aarhus Convention, which was ratified by the government in 2005. Opponents claim the changes will make it "impossible" to "hold the government to account".

The government says people will not be expected to pay above their means, but they could still be virtually bankrupted, if they lose the case, and having to sell their house. The normal "loser pays rule" means that successful claimants can claim their legal costs back from the defendant. The caps on costs (started in 2013) if you lose the case currently stand at £5,000 for an individual and £10,000 for an organisation. The change would mean the loser having to pay both their own legal costs, and those of the winner.

ClientEarth, Friends of the Earth and the RSPB are challenging the rule change in the courts, arguing those bringing such cases would be exposed to huge and uncertain financial risk. The Aarhus Convention requires legal action to protect the environment not to be "prohibitively expensive". It is particularly a concern due to Brexit. 28.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34164>

£150m bid race for Luton airport light rail link from station to terminal

Luton Airport has started the bid race for up to £150m worth of construction work for a planned new light railway system. This will be paid for by Luton council. It has appointed Arup to design and press through the scheme. It would be a 2.1km long guided mass passenger rapid transit system, to run between two purpose-built stations, heading out from Stirling Place, close to Luton Airport Parkway station, to the airport terminal. It will be broken down into two main packages.



Work worth up to £115m will include viaducts, embankments, cut and cover works and station platforms. Some of the works will be within the airside sections of the airport. The track, rolling stock and associated systems package will be subject to a separate contract worth up to £35m, to be awarded concurrently. The light rail scheme forms part of a £1.5 billion inward investment programme by Luton council, with a 20-year plan for major transformation of the town. Planning permission is being sought from Luton Borough Council (which conveniently owns the airport) and Central Bedfordshire Council. They hope work could start later in 2017, and it would open in 2021 with the intention of the journey time from Luton to St Pancras being cut to 30 minutes.

4.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34173>

Edinburgh Airport flawed and inaccessible consultation on airspace changes condemned by opponents

On 2nd February, Edinburgh Airport launched its 2nd consultation, which closes on 30th April, on its airspace change programme. The consultation is very hard for a layperson to understand, with voluminous documents. The aim is to make more "efficient" use of airspace - ie. fit in more planes, especially at the few times of day when Edinburgh airport is particularly busy, like early morning. People are asked to comment on various route options, many of which mean new areas overflown, and some areas newly intensely overflown, under narrow PBN routes. Hundreds of local people, who will be badly affected by some of the proposed changes, have attended packed public meetings. The local group Edinburgh Airport Watch (EAW) are very worried about the lack of justification for the plans. There are no projected numbers on flights, types of planes, the times of day that planes may fly. EAW say the noise shadows created by the proposed flight paths will be enormous, and will affect hundreds of thousands of people, many of whom will not have been exposed to aircraft noise before. Areas excluded from the initial stage consultation were excluded from the published swathes, told they would not be affected and now find flight paths directly over them. Not surprisingly, they are furious. Neil Findlay MSP has lodged a motion in the Scottish Parliament, asking that the consultation be re-done, with proper information. 29.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34319>

MSP motion lodged at Holyrood about Edinburgh Airport flawed flight path consultation



Neil Findlay MSP (Labour Party) is a firm opponent of the changes to flight paths, overflying many areas that were previously unaffected, that Edinburgh airport is planning. He has lodged a motion in the Scottish Parliament (Motion S5M-04708) about the airport's current consultation on airspace change. If the motion gets sufficient support from MSPs across at least 3 political parties, it becomes eligible to be debated in the Chamber. Neil Findlay was able to lead a previous members' debate in September 2015 which led to the scrapping of the airport's TUTUR flight path trial. Neil's motion says: "That the Parliament notes what it sees as the growing concerns about Edinburgh Airport's plan to introduce new flight paths; and

asking "Edinburgh Airport scraps what is considered this flawed consultation and begins the process again with up-to-date information and a more robust and credible consultation process."

People in Scotland are encouraged, by Edinburgh Airport Watch, to contact their MSP by email to ask them to sign his motion. The consultation by Edinburgh airport is inadequate, contains incorrect information, and is based on faulty data. The altered routes would inflict noise on new areas, and for huge numbers of those sensitive to noise, have life changing consequences. 29.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34370>

Stansted announces new £130m arrivals terminal to be completed by end of 2021

Planning permission has been granted for a 34,000 sq metre arrivals terminal at Stansted Airport, (owned by Manchester Airports Group) costing about £130 million. It will include larger immigration and baggage reclaim areas. Work is expected to take up to three years to complete, and will begin in late 2018 - so finished by end of 2021. The new building was granted planning permission by Uttlesford District Council. The airport's Chief Executive Andrew Cowan said Stansted is "playing a vital role in supporting both the regional and national economy." ... and the terminal will enable Stansted to "make the most efficient use of our single runway." Once the site is complete, Stansted will be the only airport in the UK operating dedicated arrivals and departures terminals. So with the improvements at Luton and Stansted, further pressure could be taken off Heathrow and Gatwick. 6.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34449>

The challenge of tackling the non-CO2 impacts of aviation – explained by Carbon Brief

In a long, but very informative article, Carbon Brief discusses the problems of the non-CO2 impacts of aircraft emissions. These are from water vapour, aerosols and nitrogen oxides emitted by aircraft at cruise altitudes. Though these impacts may be short lived, they have definite climate forcing effects, though these are complicated, while CO2 has easily understood impacts and lasts in the atmosphere for decades or centuries. The impact of contrails forming cirrus cloud is to slow the radiation of heat back into space, causing more warming. But this effect is greatest at night, when contrails persist, and also in areas where there is colder, damper air. So the impacts are not uniform across the globe.

The article discusses possibilities of planes avoiding certain areas where contrails persist, either on a daily basis or with blocks of airspace out of use for particular periods. Or of planes flying less high. Both those options are likely to increase fuel use - and thus CO2 emissions - by planes, and so need to be carefully organised, to avoid having yet more overall climate impact. Even if the ICAO deal requires planes to pay a small amount to "offset" their CO2, they are not required to pay for non-CO2 impacts. With the global aviation industry expected to increase its CO2 emissions by 200%-360% by 2050, the non-CO2 impacts are a very real problem, and one that should not be ignored. Small changes to flight routes are unlikely to make more than a token difference. 16.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34266>

Freight train to China leaves UK carrying whisky, pharmaceuticals etc – not needing Heathrow air freight

The first rail freight train from China to the UK arrived three months ago, carrying imports. Now the first return trip is being made, on 10th April, leaving Essex, on the 7,500 mile trip. Thirty containers contain British produced goods including whisky, soft drinks, vitamins, baby products and pharmaceuticals. The DB Cargo locomotive leaves the DP World London Gateway rail terminal in Stanford-le-Hope for the city of Yiwu in Zhejiang province, eastern China. After going through the Channel Tunnel the train will pass through France, Belgium, Duisburg in Germany, Poland, Belarus, Russia and Kazakhstan, arriving at Yiwu on 27th April. The operators say it is cheaper to send goods by train than by air and faster than by sea.



The service is part of China's One Belt, One Road programme of reviving the ancient Silk Road trading routes with the West. The train link means products can be both imported and exported from the UK, as well as by ship - with both being far lower carbon modes of transport than air. Heathrow claims it is vital to the UK economy because of its exports of items like pharmaceuticals and whisky. But it makes better sense to

ship these by rail, rather than use so much fuel getting them up to 38,000 feet Items that are non-perishable do not need to be air freighted. Frozen fish (Scottish salmon) can be carried by rail. 10.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34482>

BA introducing biometric boarding gates at Heathrow, further reducing numbers of airport jobs



Airports always promise huge numbers of jobs if they expand. The reality is that airports and airlines are cutting jobs as fast as they can, and having everything mechanised. It is cheaper not to have many employees. Now British Airways (BA) is introducing automated biometric technology to create self-service boarding gates at Heathrow. Passengers passing through the security channel will have a digital scan of their face recorded. When they arrive at the gate and scan their own boarding pass, their face is matched with the previously recorded data. If the two digital images match, the passenger is allowed to board.

The system was trialled in June 2016, and is now being rolled out, with 3 of these gates (for domestic flights only) at Terminal 5. BA plans to open 3 more of these self-boarding gates every week until mid-June. It will finally be extended to international flights. BA has also opened self-service bag drops at both Heathrow and Gatwick - doing away with more jobs. Back in 1999 when Heathrow got consent for its 5th Terminal, the airport said there would be 16,000 more jobs by 2016. When probed, Heathrow is unable to even give a number for the jobs at T5, let alone prove there has been much of a rise in employment. All they will say is that in July 2013, 76,600 were directly employed on the Heathrow site.

8.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34462>

About 30 people at Notre-Dame-des-Landes demand their property back (taken 5 years ago to build a new airport)

At Notre-Dame-des-Landes, a new airport is planned to replace the existing Nantes airport. (It is not actually needed). The battle has been going on for years. Now exactly five years after the French state expropriated a large area of land for the airport, there has been no start to the project - there is not even a start date in prospect. Therefore under the French system, as work has not begun, those who have lost ownership of their land (they may still live on it for the time being) can apply to get it back.



Around 30 people affected are now submitting the necessary legal papers to get their land, farmland and buildings back, to the court in Saint-Nazaire. These people have not used the money, and they don't want it. They want ownership of their land and property back. The French system did not anticipate, in the law relating to expropriation, that any scheme would have delays for as long as five years. Opponents

have built a huge tower on the ZAD - the zone à défendre - against the authorities attempting to start building. 17.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34276>

Indian air travel pays 25% tax, but Delhi now cut tax for domestic flights only to 1%

Unlike the UK, India puts VAT on the price of jet fuel. Sales Tax (levied by the State Governments) averages across India at 25%. But now domestic air travel from Delhi is likely to get cheaper with the Delhi government deciding to cut value added tax on aircraft turbine fuel (ATF) to 1% from the existing rate of 25%. As part of the central government's connectivity scheme, the Delhi government reduced VAT on ATF by 24% to boost links with smaller airports in its budget for the year 2017-18. Delhi will have cheaper air links especially to the smaller airports to the north west. India is the world's fastest-growing aviation market but most of the air travel is between big cities. Under the regional connectivity scheme, the government will subsidise part of the cost for airlines to operate flights to smaller towns. Jet fuel is one of the biggest costs for airlines, especially for low-cost carriers such as IndiGo Airlines, owned by InterGlobe Aviation, SpiceJet and GoAir. Airline shares rose on the news.

12.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34198>

Ryanair's Michael O'Leary says climate change is 'complete and utter rubbish' – not related to burning carbon

Ryanair chief Michael O'Leary has dismissed climate change concerns as "complete and utter rubbish". Speaking on an Irish radio programme, he said he believes that people's fears about global warming are unfounded. He said: "This kind of nonsense that we all need to cut back on beef production or that we all need to eat vegetables or go vegan and all start cycling bicycles is not the way forward. ... In the 19th century in London, [people] thought they were all going to die from smog. There is always some lunatic out there who points to a load of rubbish science; science changes." He opined: "I don't accept that climate change is real. I don't accept the link between carbon consumption and climate change"

It is hardly a surprise that a businessman whose private fortunes depend on encouraging ever more burning of fossil fuels thinks this. Otherwise how could he cope with the cognitive dissonance? But it is worth noting that the aviation industry does no more than pay lip service to any prospect of reducing its CO2 emissions, merely holding out a few very minor carbon savings - while massively growing (doubling/ tripling) the size of the industry, getting other sectors to offset its CO2. 8.4.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34466>

Heathrow's head of property excited about redevelopment opportunities and maximising revenues from airport's property

Heathrow's head of property and facilities, John Arbuckle, is bullish and "excited" about all the property and developments he is looking forward to, with a 3rd runway. The Heathrow investment property portfolio is worth around £2bn, and that will grow when more land is obtained (by compulsory purchase, and by buying up homes that will be too polluted or too noise to live in). Heathrow now has around "1.9m sq ft of buildings, 100 hectares of leased land, more than 200 houses and 807,000 sq ft of warehousing and offices leased from third parties." Heathrow also owns around 1,250 hectares of land around the airport. He manages to coyly avoid mentioning the destruction of much of Harmondsworth and parts of the Heathrow villages, and compulsory purchase, just talking about the airport "working closely with our local communities" and "being great neighbours to the local community." Property companies are rubbing their hands with glee at increased demand for space. 11.3.2017 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=34231>

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
- **Transport & Environment (T&E)** <http://www.transportenvironment.org> Twitter @transenv
- News & expert analysis by **AEF (Aviation Environment Federation)** www.aef.org.uk @The_AEF
- **HACAN** www.hacan.org.uk Twitter @HACAN1
- **GACC (Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign)** www.gacc.org.uk/latest-news
- **Stop Heathrow Expansion (SHE)** <http://www.stopheathrowexpansion.co.uk>
- **Richmond Heathrow Campaign** <http://www.richmondheathrowcampaign.org>
- **Stop Stansted Expansion (SSE)** <http://stopstanstedexpansion.com/>
- **Links to many of the groups at Heathrow** <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=1307>
- **Brentford & Hounslow (BASHR3)** http://bashr3.betternotbigger.org.uk/3rdrunway_facts
- **HACAN East** at London City Airport. <http://hacaneast.org.uk/news> Twitter @HACANEast
- **Edinburgh Airport Watch** <http://www.edinburghairportwatch.com/>
- **AirportWatch Europe** <http://www.airportwatcheurope.com> Twitter @AirportWatchEU
- **Follow AirportWatch on Twitter @AirportWatch and Facebook on.fb.me/UoSKE**

Bulletin compiled by Sarah Clayton - thanks to many people for their help, input & guidance. 10.4.2017

Email: info@airportwatch.org.uk
www.airportwatch.org.uk