

Page 1

- Willie Walsh says Heathrow's runway is too expensive, at that price it would fail and be a "white elephant" - the airlines will not pay
- John Holland-Kaye won't commit to no Heathrow night flights (11.30pm to 6am)

Page 2

- John Holland-Kaye and Sir Howard Davies gave evidence to the Environmental Audit Committee
- 3 arrests after Plane Stupid block Heathrow tunnel for 3 hours using a van + activists locked onto it

Page 3

- Ten MPs and council leaders write to PM to warn over air quality problems of Heathrow 3rd runway
- Heathrow plans to double its volume of air freight, necessitating more trips by diesel powered HGVs and goods vehicles

Page 4

- Heathrow never mentions imports, only exports – but imports larger by tonnage and by value than exports
- Heathrow air cargo tonnage falling recently - just 1.76% higher in 2014 than in 2010

Page 5

- Richmond campaign shows Heathrow runway would lead to 50% of the new capacity used for international transfers
- Environmental Audit Committee says government should not permit Heathrow runway without strict environmental conditions

Page 6

- "No 3rd Runway" flashmob at Heathrow T2
- Critical analysis of the Airports Commission economic figures, by an Economics Professor, sent to Cabinet Members

Page 7

- TfL confirms extent to which Airports Commission underestimated Heathrow runway impact on surface access
- Simon Jenkins comment: Don't buy the idea that Heathrow expansion is 'good for the nation'
- Teddington Action Group show – from Heathrow report – that they are now suffering more aircraft noise

Page 8

- Group of Heathrow Community Noise Forum members express concerns about the airport's treatment of the Forum
- Number affected by Gatwick night flights up 15% last year – 12,850 in the larger 48 dB Leq contour
- Though Gatwick number of passengers is up 5.7% this year on 2014, flights only up by 2.6%

Page 9

- Stewart Wingate says Gatwick won't give up on its 2nd runway – whatever the government says
- CAA's disappointing PIR finally published, with just one Gatwick route to be slightly changed

Page 10

- New group in Tunbridge Wells, TWAANG, against increased Gatwick noise
- Meeting of Cabinet's runway sub-committee postponed from Tues 1st December

Page 11

- Gatwick hopes YouGov poll of Londoners (not local people) favouring its runway will help its case
- George Osborne launches National Infrastructure Commission, under Andrew Adonis, so UK can "think big again"
- Robert Goodwill on flight path noise problems: "we must think about this carefully"

Page 12

- Edinburgh TUTUR flight path trial ended 2 months early – but residents say changes persist
- Despair in East London as CAA approves new concentrated flight paths – may be a legal challenge
- Jeremy Corbyn reported as saying we should "look at the under-used capacity" of other airports

Page 13

- Lands Tribunal rules that residents near Farnborough can claim if their homes have been devalued by more flights
- BA pilot's eye damaged by 'military' laser shone into cockpit at Heathrow – plus less serious attacks
- Work on the new Nantes airport at Notre-Dame-des-Landes might start by early next year

Page 14

- Solena, the company meant to be producing jet fuel from London waste for BA, goes bankrupt



AirportWatch bulletin 82  
November 2015

## **Willie Walsh says Heathrow's runway is too expensive, at that price it would fail and be a "white elephant" - the airlines will not pay**

Willie Walsh was the key speaker at the Airport Operators Association conference, and he told them that Heathrow should not get a 3rd runway, if the Airport Commission's calculation of the cost of building it is correct. He said: "The Commission got its figures wrong – they are over-inflated. If that is the cost [of a new runway] it won't be a successful project. British Airways is by far the biggest airline at Heathrow, with 55% of the slots. Willie Walsh said the Commission's expectation that the airline industry can afford to pay for Heathrow's through increased fares was "outrageous". He does not believe the estimated costs are justified, and "If the cost of using an expanded airport significantly exceeds the costs of competitor airports, people won't use it... Either the figures are inflated or you are building inefficient infrastructure. I do not endorse the findings. I definitely don't support the costs of building a runway. If those costs are real, we should not build it."

Earlier British Airways gave written evidence to the Commons Transport Select Committee's inquiry into surface access for an expanded airport. Its statement said: "The Heathrow option recommended by the Airports Commission is unaffordable and unfinanceable. This calls into question the economic benefits of the scheme. The Commission's proposals, costed at £17.6bn, would turn Heathrow into a white elephant." On the cost of £8 billion to build a 6th terminal he commented: "How many chandeliers can you have in an airport terminal?"

BA repeated its view that the cost of transport infrastructure for a new runway should not be funded by airlines and their customers. BA says, rather deviously, that as the Commission suggests the alleged benefits to the UK of "up to £147 billion" (over 60 years), the new road and rail links should, like standalone transport schemes such as M4 widening, be paid for by taxpayers. *[That "up to £147 billion" benefit figure is highly dubious, and the Airports Commission's own expert economic advisors, Mackie and Pearce, warned that it includes double counting and should be treated with caution.]* BA avoids any specific opposition in principle to expanding Heathrow. There has been speculation if Willie Walsh is just "browbeating aimed at cowing the CAA into lower charges" rather than stopping a Heathrow runway.  
23.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28655>

## **John Holland-Kaye won't commit to no Heathrow night flights (11.30pm to 6am)**

When the Airports Commission final report was published on 1st July, one of the conditions of a 3rd Heathrow was that there should be no night flights. The report stated: "Following construction of a third runway at the airport there should be a ban on all scheduled night flights in the period 11:30pm to 6:00am" and "the additional capacity from a third runway would enable airlines to re-time very early morning arrivals." Already by its statement on 6th July, Heathrow was trying to cast doubt on the conditions, with John Holland-Kaye saying: "I'm sure there is a package in there that we can agree with our local communities, with the airlines and with Government."

Giving evidence at the Environmental Audit Committee hearing on 4th November, asked if Heathrow would accept no night flights, he said "we are not in a position to do that yet." Heathrow had not yet accepted a ban on night flights, and the airport was "confident we will be able to find a way forward" in discussions with airlines and government, and it could "significantly reduce" night flights. Mr Holland-Kaye instead talked of the alleged economic benefit to the UK of flights between 4.30 and 6am. He was asked by Committee members whether the government should agree to a Heathrow runway, (perhaps by December) before Heathrow firmly committed to the no night flights condition. Mr Holland-Kaye could not give an answer. 5.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28345>

## John Holland-Kaye and Sir Howard Davies gave evidence to the Environmental Audit Committee (EAC)

The Environmental Audit Committee (EAC) has now completed an inquiry into the implications for Government commitments on carbon emissions, air quality and noise should the Airport Commission's recommendation of a 3rd runway at Heathrow Airport be adopted. It held its second evidence session, on 4<sup>th</sup> November, hearing from John Holland-Kaye and Matt Gorman, of Heathrow - and Sir Howard Davies and Phil Graham, from the (now closed) Airports Commission. They were asked a number of questions on noise, air pollution and CO2 emissions – all topics on which the Airports Commission's final report on 1st July and their supporting documents, gave unsatisfactory and incomplete answers. **The full transcript can be seen at <http://tinyurl.com/EAC-2nd-session>** Those giving evidence were not able to reassure the EAC on many of the issues raised.

There are still no details of flight paths from a new runway, or information on which areas would be newly overflowed. There is no certainty that levels of NO2 around the airport, already sometimes over EU legal limits, would not rise with a 50% increase in the size of the airport, and massive increase in road traffic, including that relating to more air freight. There is no satisfactory answer on how the UK could meet its aviation carbon target, while building a new runway. <http://tinyurl.com/Env-Audit-Cttee>

The report by the EAC is expected on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> December, ahead of the Government announcement on the next steps on its attempts to get a new runway built.

## 3 arrests after Plane Stupid block Heathrow tunnel for 3 hours using a van + activists locked onto it

The main road entrance tunnel to Heathrow's Terminals 1 and 2 was blocked by climate change activists from Plane Stupid, for about 3 hours, from 7.40am on 26<sup>th</sup> November. Three activists parked a vehicle



across both lanes of the entrance tunnel and locked themselves to it, unfurling a banner quoting David Cameron's election promise in 2010: “No ifs, No Buts: No Third Runway”. They were arrested, and the tunnel was finally cleared. Heathrow said only about 200 people missed flights and were then put onto later ones, so few were gravely inconvenienced. Traffic was diverted. Local resident Neil Keveren, a builder from Harmondsworth, whose house

would be bulldozed for the 3rd runway, was fined after blocking the same tunnel with his van for half an hour on 2nd July, the day after the Airports Commission announcement. Neil said: “No one wants to do this. People feel they have to. They feel they have no choice. After we campaigned for years, David Cameron was elected promising 'no ifs, no buts: no third runway'.... We have tried every other option. We have been forced to be disobedient just to be heard.... To save our homes and our planet.”



There is already airport capacity for families taking a couple of trips per year, or wealthy foreign visitors to the UK, but a new runway would be for the most wealthy to take multiple leisure trips each year.

Plane Stupid apologised for causing inconvenience, but believe the strong arguments against a Heathrow runway must be heard. The government does not give the impression it is listening.

26.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28710>

## Ten MPs and council leaders write to PM to warn over air quality problems of Heathrow 3rd runway

Opponents of a Heathrow 3rd runway have written to David Cameron, asking him to block it on the grounds of “illegal” air pollution. Ten MPs have signed the letter, including Tim Farron, (leader of the Liberal Democrats and staunch opponent of Heathrow), London mayoral candidate Zac Goldsmith, and the representatives of Twickenham (Tania Mathias), Windsor (Adam Afriye), Hammersmith (Andy Slaughter), Harrow East (Bob Blackman), Carshalton and Wallington (Tom Brake), and Brentford and Isleworth (Ruth Cadbury). Poor air quality is a huge cause of public concern, particularly in London, with increasing awareness of the impact of NO<sub>2</sub> and particulate matter on health. Air pollution is a make-or-break issue for Heathrow, already often in breach of air quality limits. In the letter, the MPs said: “Air quality is a huge cause of public concern, particularly in London, and this has only been exacerbated by the recent revelations regarding VW emissions tests.” They say that failing to meet European Union air pollution rules could mean that “large financial penalties” are imposed on Britain “which would ultimately have huge implications for the UK taxpayer”. 8.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28433>

Heathrow has various optimistic - somewhat unrealistic - claims about how air pollution limits could be met, even with more air freight and 50% more flights. On the day Heathrow appeared before the EAC, (4<sup>th</sup> November) it “pledged” a (dubious) “**triple lock**” on air pollution. Heathrow knows it has a problem with the high levels of NO<sub>2</sub> pollution (and particulates) in its surrounding area, regularly breaching EU limits. Mr Holland-Kaye wants people to believe that there would (somewhat incredibly) be no more car

journeys to Heathrow with 3 runways than with 2. People would almost all travel to Heathrow on public transport, and likewise almost all staff working at the airport. That would, necessarily, put huge pressures on public transport –needing improvements which Heathrow is not prepared to pay for ...

Heathrow would have options “ready” if needed to cut traffic flows and emissions, such as a congestion charge. And bizarrely and implausibly, Heathrow says more flights would only be allowed on the 3rd runway, if it was clear “the airport’s contribution would not delay compliance with EU air quality limits.” As revealed at the EAC hearing, it is implausible that Heathrow funders and shareholders would accept paying £18

billion for a runway, to then find it could not be used, due to air quality reasons. Zac Goldsmith asked about this at the EAC and John Holland-Kay could only say he was very confident that Heathrow would get people out of their cars, and there will be no extra car journeys. It was not very convincing.

Challenged by the EAC there was the usual unconfirmed spin about jobs and growth, and no convincing evidence that NO<sub>2</sub> air pollution could be reduced with a new runway. The Airports Commission appears to have misunderstood the EU air quality directives, implying a runway would be permissible if air pollution was worse elsewhere in London, on the Marylebone Rd. <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28262>

## Heathrow plans to double its volume of air freight, necessitating more trips by diesel powered HGVs and goods vehicles

Heathrow plans to double its air freight volumes in its aspiration to become one of the leading airports for cargo in Europe. CEO John Holland-Kaye announced at the British Chambers of Commerce that Heathrow will invest £180 million in the project and has its blueprint ready. Investment will be made to enhance air-to-air transit by building a facility on the airport for faster handling of transit cargo that arrives by air and is due to fly out again by air, reducing the times from a current average of more than hours. The improvement to air freight is meant to be “essential for the growth and success of the UK economy.”



(Where have we heard that before?) There will need to be a new truck parking facility for over 100 vehicles, with waiting areas for drivers. There will be a special pharmaceutical storage area to move temperature-sensitive medicines etc etc. Holland-Kaye says this will "support British businesses to keep the economy moving, connecting exporters to the world and helping the government reach its £1 trillion export target by 2020." This can only increase the number of

HGVs in the Heathrow area. HGVs are all powered by diesel, not petrol - with its attendant higher NO2 emissions. Transport for London said Heathrow expansion "will lead to an increase in freight movements to and from the airport, and this was not properly included in the surface access assessment undertaken by the Airports Commission." 6.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28362>

### **Heathrow never mentions imports, only exports – but imports larger by tonnage and by value than exports**

Heathrow is very fond of saying how vital its air freight is to the UK economy. It is also always very keen to stress how important it is for the UK's exports. Strangely, it never mentions imports (which are not so good for the UK economy). A detailed document by the DfT in 2009 set out the figures for UK air freight exports and imports. The 2007 figures (by HMRC) showed that the tonnage of UK exports by air freight was 414 thousand tonnes. And the tonnage of imports was 1,663 tonnes. That means, in terms of just weight, the imports were 4 times larger. The 2007 figures show that the value of UK imports by air freight was about £31.1 billion. And the value of exports was £51.1 billion. That means the value of the exports was only 61% of the value of the imports.

**The CAA data for 2014 show the total air freight at Heathrow was 1,501,906 tonnes. The 345,575 tonnes of exports was just 23% of the total weight of air cargo. The other 77% of air freight was imports.** Odd that Heathrow never mentions them.

**Heathrow says the value of its air freight in 2014 was £101 billion. But it says the value of its exports was £48 billion. That is 47.5% of the total - a bit under half.** The rest is imports. (But the value per tonne of the exports is higher than the value per tonne for the imports.)

Strange then that in any document put out by Heathrow, or any of its supporters, imports and their value are never mentioned. It was as if they barely existed. This is comparable to the way in which the benefits of inbound tourism are stressed repeatedly - but rarely the greater numbers of outbound Brits taking their holiday cash to spend abroad. Odd, isn't it? 25.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28676>

### **Heathrow air cargo tonnage falling recently - just 1.76% higher in 2014 than in 2010**

In recent years the volume of Heathrow air cargo has been pretty much static. There was 1.76% more air cargo (tonnes) in 2014 than in 2010. In September 2010 Heathrow handled 123,680 tonnes, and in September 2015 it handled 119,092 tonnes. In October 2010 it handled 138,301 tonnes and 132,575 tonnes in October 2015.

Tonnage has been down compared to 2014 every month since May. Earlier in November, John Holland-Kaye said: "Cargo is essential for UK PLC and Heathrow is its global freight connector, with 26% of all UK goods by value going through the airport." Heathrow's aspiration is that faster more efficient cargo movements will encourage airlines to increase freight capacity, boosting the UK's global export competitiveness. And imports ?? Air cargo has been declining at Frankfurt too. 22.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28557>



## **Richmond campaign shows Heathrow runway would lead to 50% of the new capacity used for international transfers**

The Richmond Heathrow Campaign has produced a very useful set of carefully argued briefings and aspects of a 3rd Heathrow runway (noise, CO2, air quality etc). These can be found at <http://rhcfacts.org>



There is now an updated briefing on economics. It makes several vital points showing how the Airports Commission's conclusion and recommendation for a Heathrow runway are not supported by its own evidence. The RHC points out that the Commission's own "strategic fit" document shows that with a new Heathrow runway, there would be an extra 22 million international-to-international (I-to-I) transfer passengers using Heathrow per year (about 30 million in 2050 rather than about 8 million then, if there was no runway).

The additional 22 million passengers would take up over 50% of the new runway capacity, and would provide little or no economic benefit to the UK. They do not pay APD. Transfer passengers do not leave the air-side at Heathrow. They contribute to the airline and airport profits and their value is said to add connectivity by providing minimum aircraft loads for otherwise unviable routes and by adding to route frequency. Support for thin (i.e. low demand/frequency) destinations is a main justification for the Commission recommending a Heathrow runway. But 95% of Heathrow's I-to-I transfers support higher frequencies to already popular destinations rather than otherwise economically unviable thin destinations. 5.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28358>

## **Environmental Audit Committee says government should not permit Heathrow runway without strict environmental conditions**

The EAC report's conclusions state: "The Government should not approve Heathrow expansion until Heathrow Ltd. can demonstrate that it accepts and will comply with the Airports Commission conditions, including a night flight ban, that it is committed to covering the costs of surface transport improvements; that it is possible to reconcile Heathrow expansion with legal air pollution limits, and that an expanded Heathrow would be less noisy than a two runway Heathrow. In each case - climate change, air quality and noise - it needs to set out concrete proposals for mitigation alongside clear responsibilities and milestones against which performance can be measured. It should report regularly to Parliament, through this Committee and others, on progress. The Government should not avoid or defer these issues. To do so would increase the risks of the project: delay through legal challenge, unquantifiable costs resulting from unclear responsibilities, economic risks through constraint of other sectors to meet increased aviation emissions and long-term costs to public health from the impact of air pollution and noise." 1.12.2015

For details on the EAC's Conclusions and Recommendations on Heathrow, summarised separately:

**Surface access** - "the Government has been clear that it expects the scheme promoter to meet the costs of any surface access proposals that are required as a direct result of airport expansion and from which they will directly benefit." see <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28809>

**CO2 emissions** - the Government "should as a minimum, commit to accepting the CCC's advice on aviation in relation to the 5th carbon budget, introducing an effective policy framework to bring aviation emissions to 2005 levels by 2050 no later than autumn 2016." <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28811>

**Air pollution** - "Before the Government makes its decision, it should make its own assessment of the likely costs of preventing an adverse impact on health from expansion at Heathrow and publish it." <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28818>

**Noise** - "The Government should not approve Heathrow expansion until Heathrow Ltd. can demonstrate that ....an expanded Heathrow would be less noisy than a two runway Heathrow." <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28820>

## **“No 3rd Runway” flashmob at Heathrow Terminal 2**

On 21<sup>st</sup> November, around 60 protesters staged a flashmob in Heathrow's Terminal 2, with red "No 3rd runway" T-shirts and chanting "No ifs, no buts, no third runway!" They expressed their opposition to plans for a 3rd runway – for a huge number of reasons. There are already hugely more people affected by disturbing levels of plane noise at Heathrow than at any other airport in Europe.

People who suffer from plane noise do not want more of it, and those who get some periods of "respite" during the day do not want to see this decrease. If there was a new runway there would be around 250,000 more flights per year using Heathrow - making a 50% increase compared with the existing number now.



The level of noise, the new areas affected, and the hundreds of thousands more people to be newly affected would make the addition of a new runway unacceptable.

And that is not to mention the increase in air pollution, the road congestion, the rail congestion, or the huge cost to the taxpayer over many years. There is also the not inconsiderable matter of the demolition of 780 homes, making their occupants homeless.

For all these reasons, a large number of groups and organisations from a wide area oppose the runway. People at the flashmob came from Hammersmith, Ealing, Chiswick, the Heathrow villages, and areas west of Heathrow affected by flight paths.

They are adamant that protest at a runway will not go away. <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28626>

### **Critical analysis of the Airports Commission economic figures, by an Economics Professor, sent to Cabinet Members**

An economics professor has assessed the claims by the Airports Commission, of huge benefits to the UK from a Heathrow runway - and found them to be very dubious indeed. He has written to members of the Cabinet, to express his concerns. Professor Len Skerratt (Brunel) believes the Commission has presumed unreliable indirect benefits to the UK national economy. He says there would not be an economic case for the 3rd runway without the supposed indirect benefits to the national economy. These wider economic benefits are said by the Commission to amount to some £131-£147 billion, between 0.65% and 0.75% of GDP by 2050.

However, these predictions are not believable. There are only small predicted direct benefits, which could be as low as £11.8 billion (carbon traded model) or just £1.4 billion (carbon capped at the level suggested by the CCC). As the Commission's own expert economic advisors (Mackie and Pearce) point out these appraisals rely on assumptions which are excessively optimistic.



The Commission has gone to great lengths to quantify all the uncertain benefits, particularly the wider and often intangible economic and social benefits. Yet scant attention has been given to the certain tangible and intangible costs of serious damage to health, and quality of life in the very long term, and also the productivity loss, delays and annoyance caused by ten years of construction. 15.11.2015

<http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28612>

## **TfL confirms extent to which Airports Commission underestimated Heathrow runway impact on surface access**

On 10th November, the GLA Transport Committee had a session looking at the implications for surface access - road, rail and Tube - if there was a 3rd Heathrow runway. There was a presentation by Richard De Cani (Transport for London's Managing Director - Planning). The meeting was described as a "well mannered mugging" of the Airports Commission's (AC) analysis of the situation. The AC did not assess the impact of a fully utilised 3rd runway, with 148 mppa; instead they only looked at the situation in 2030 with 125mppa. That might mean 70,000 more trips per day than estimated by the AC. They also did not take into account how recent employment forecasts will increase demand even further, or increased vehicles needed for expanded air freight capacity. TfL estimates it would cost **between £15 and £20 billion** to improve the transport infrastructure needed to get all passengers to and from Heathrow, with a 3rd runway. Unless this is spent, the road congestion and the rail congestion even by 2030 would be "some of the worst that we currently see in London." It would "impact quite significantly on the whole performance of the transport network across west and south west London." If there was a congestion charge, the impact on public transport would be even higher (perhaps 90,000 more trips per day than estimated by the AC), as people choose not to use their cars. 13.11.2015

<http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28480>

### **Simon Jenkins comment: Don't buy the idea that Heathrow expansion is 'good for the nation'**

Simon Jenkins was on great form when he wrote a comment piece in the Evening Standard, on the subject of Heathrow and its expansion hopes. Well worth reading, in full. It is so full of wise words, telling analysis and crushing put-downs that summarising it is impossible. But here are a few quotes:



"Heathrow was only allowed to grow because gutless ministers dared not stand up to the airlines lobby." ... "Heathrow is primarily for leisure travel, and that travel is overwhelmingly outbound. A new Heathrow runway is an aid to the foreign tourist industry..." ... "Of course it would generate economic activity and jobs. So does all infrastructure. So would a heliport in Hyde Park. But it has nothing to do with "British exports". Precisely the opposite."

..."We should have no truck with the archaic "predict and provide" line of the Davies report. Just because more people want an airport does not mean a runway must be built. .... **Demand is not God.**" ... "**Air travel is overwhelmingly leisure travel, a modern luxury that needs no subsidy nor deserves planning privilege.**" ... " a bigger Heathrow should be unthinkable. It should concentrate on business travel. Above all, the decision should be decided on a proper plan,

not the Davies report's attempt to reconcile competing lobbyists."

.... "**We just need to keep calm and remember, they are in it for the money. All else is hogwash.**"

11.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28522>

### **Teddington Action Group show – from Heathrow report – that they are now suffering more aircraft noise**

Residents in Twickenham and Teddington have been aware of greatly increased aircraft noise from Heathrow, over the past year. However, Heathrow have for months insisted that the noise has not increased. Now an independent report commissioned and paid for by Heathrow, by PA Consulting, has shown that the residents are right. Examining data between November 2011 and May 2015, the report confirms that planes - especially the heavier, noisier types - are flying lower than previously over the area, in greater numbers and concentrated within flight paths. Also that the periods of greatest disruption are increasingly late at night and early in the morning.

Rather than being associated with the 2014 Flight Path Trials, which saw record numbers of noise complaints from residents, the report states that these developments merely reflect the general trend of fleet

development and air traffic movements. TAG say they have more of the noisiest long haul planes flying over lower than before, sometimes at little more than 2,000 feet in Teddington and 1,400 feet in Twickenham. Worryingly, if this disruption stems from new flight trends, it is only likely to get worse, and for many other areas overflowed by Heathrow planes. <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28145> 21.10.2015

### **Group of Heathrow Community Noise Forum members express concerns about the airport's treatment of the Forum**

The Heathrow Community Noise Forum was set up by Heathrow earlier this year, in an attempt to improve "engagement" with people affected by the airport's noise. It aims to build trust, provide information, improve understanding of Heathrow's operations, and seek communities' input. The first phase of its work has been to employ consultants to verify how accurate Webtrak is, and to see whether flight paths now are much different to before the "trials" in 2014. However, there has been some dissatisfaction from many of those attending that the Forum has not been working adequately. Eight of the groups that attend presented a statement to the meeting on 5th November, declaring their concerns. One particular matter raised was that Heathrow appears to have taken advantage of the Forum, without the consent of participants, in pressing its case for a 3rd runway. The airport has cited the existence of the Forum as evidence that it can be relied upon to engage with neighbouring communities. There have been instances where HAL has opted to publish its interpretation of analysis in the public domain, without consulting the Forum beforehand, leading some to question whether the HCNF is being used to benefit HAL's commercial ambitions. The statement by the groups requires 4 changes to how the HCNF is conducted, without which "the community groups will need to consider the value of the CNF as a mechanism to achieve their objectives". 17.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28539>

### **Number affected by Gatwick night flights up 15% last year – 12,850 in the larger 48 dB Leq contour**

The CAA has released figures showing 12,850 people were adversely affected by Gatwick night flights, a 15% increase from the previous year. The increase comes despite the fact the airport has changed the way it counts complaints, with multiple issues raised by the same person on the same day now counted as a single incidence. Campaigners say the dramatic increase in complaints is proof a 2nd runway should not be allowed.

A review of the changed arrivals flight paths, by Bo Redeborn, is due to be published towards the end of January 2016. People are very stressed by noise from night flights, adversely affecting their sleep and their health. Gatwick made an even worse than usual comment.

A Gatwick Airport spokesman said: "Gatwick recognises that aircraft noise has an impact on people living near the airport and will continue to do everything possible to minimise its effects.....The increase in people affected has

been influenced by an increase in aircraft movements, a change in the fleet mix from planes with propellers to small jets, and an increase in population due to Gatwick's immigration centre being included in the numbers." (sic) On Sunday 1st November, CAGNE released a short film highlighting the plight of residents, businesses and communities beneath Gatwick concentrated flight paths.

6.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28377>



### **Though Gatwick number of passengers is up 5.7% this year on 2014, number of flights only up by 2.6%**

Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign (GACC) says that use of larger planes, and with fewer empty seats, explained how Gatwick has a record-breaking 40 million passengers per year. Gatwick has been expanding its passenger numbers as fast as possible, in its bid to get another runway. It has been getting the most

publicity it can about reaching its 40 million passenger figure. The Airports Commission estimated, based on past trends, that it would not reach 40 million passengers per year for many more years.

But Gatwick has not increased the number of air transport movements (flights) by much. For example while the number of passengers link in the 12 months to October 2015 is 5.7% higher than the previous 12 months, the number of flights was only 2.6% more. GACC said it is the number of landings and take-offs (air transport movements - ATMs) which create a need for a new runway, not just the number of passengers. The load factor (how full the plane is) is higher, with the figure is October 2015 being 85.3% compared to 82.2% in October 2012 or 81.7% in October 2013. GACC chairman Brendon Sewill said: "At this rate of growth Gatwick and Stansted and Luton won't be full for at least fifty years!"

In fact, Gatwick had more flights in 2007 than in 2014. Though the number of passengers was UP 8.3% in 2014 compared to the earlier pre-recession peak in 2007, the number of flights was actually DOWN by – 1.5% in that time. The number of flights may only this year reach the earlier peak in 2007. There were about 256,000 ATMs in 2008, 259,000 in 2007 and 255,000 in 2014. The average number of seats per plane was about 180 in 2014 and about 174 in 2013. The average number of passengers per plane was about 151 in 2014 and about 145 in 2013. 19.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28565>

### **Stewart Wingate says Gatwick won't give up on its 2nd runway – whatever the government says**

Stewart Wingate says Gatwick will continue to push for a 2nd runway even if Heathrow gets Government backing for a runway, when (if?) the announcement is made later this month. The Prime Minister has said there will be a formal response to the Airports Commission's findings though it may be by George Osborne or Patrick McLoughlin, to save Cameron having to admit his "no ifs, no buts, no 3rd runway" promise. Gatwick has spent the past four months attempting to pick holes in Sir Howard Davies' work, trying - not very successfully - to convince the Government to back Gatwick instead of Heathrow.

Stewart Wingate has said he thinks a Heathrow runway is undeliverable, and he will not lose his appetite to get his runway. "This is going to be a multi-year event." He refuses to rule out legal action to block Heathrow expansion if it gets government backing. Gatwick has already examined the legality of the air quality issue, but Wingate adds: "I think there'd be other people in the queue well ahead of us" who would challenge the Government in the courts. Wingate also

insists that he will "absolutely not" resign if the Government supports Heathrow, because he believes Heathrow will ultimately be refused on environmental grounds. He continues to deny the environmental problems of a Gatwick runway, which are nearly as bad as those of a runway at Heathrow.

16.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28534>



*Legal Challenge in the Courts?*

### **The CAA's disappointing PIR finally published, showing only one Gatwick route to be slightly changed**

Since autumn 2013 there have been changes to flight paths for Gatwick airport, given provisional approval by the CAA. Routes have been altered, and flight paths have been more concentrated. This has been done without consultation of affected communities. The CAA has done a PIR (Post Implementation Review) that ended in January. It has finally, after delays, published its findings. These are regarded as very disappointing, as almost no concessions have been made and though hundreds of complaints were sent in, there are few changes to routes. People are angry that the CAA, yet again, ignores input from the public.

The more concentrated noise has caused great distress for the people unlucky enough to live directly under the flight paths. The only change to a route is one which takes off to the west, and flies over Holmwood,

Brockham and Reigate - Gatwick will be consulting on a revised route in the next few months. Local group, Plane Wrong, welcomed that admission, but are dismayed by the CAA's conclusion that the easterly departure route does not need to be changed. <http://www.planewrong.co.uk/news/4587404075>

GACC (Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign) commented: "In a 198 page report they devote only 2 pages to the possibility of dispersal – spreading the aircraft over a wider area – and to the possibility of respite – giving people a break from constant noise. And then reject both. We will now need to take the case to the Government and indeed will raise this when we meet the Minister for Aviation, Robert Goodwill MP ...on 18 November." Which they did ....

Sally Pavey (CAGNE) commented that "For a Government, in this day and age, to implement and subject residents to such an airspace concentrated system without any research into the noise readings or emissions from concentrated routes is beyond belief." She added: "The noise shadow is far greater from a concentrated route than a dispersed route. It's like having a country lane next to your home, which might see a few cars throughout the day and night, and changing it to the M1 overnight. The noise is relentless. Until the aviation industry recognise that concentrated routes create noise shadows these reports are pointless as they serve only the aviation industry and not the taxpayers."

12.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28470>

### **New group in Tunbridge Wells, TWAANG, against increased Gatwick noise**

The area to the west of Tunbridge Wells, and the town itself, have found themselves increasingly affected by aircraft noise from Gatwick over the past year or more. Now the local councillor for The Pantiles and St Mark's ward has backed the formation of a new local group to oppose the noise nuisance, which many are finding intolerable. The new group is TWAANG - Tunbridge Wells Anti Aircraft Noise Group, set up due to an upsurge in complaints about plane noise and to get the voice of Tunbridge Wells heard. This group joins the many others that have sprung up recently, including Gatwick Obviously NOT - which originated around Penshurst, the Langton Green Village Society, the Speldhurst Action Group and the High Weald Councils Aviation Action Group. The new group will work in conjunction with the other groups, avoiding any nimby tendency for each area to ask for the flight misery to be put over someone else. The increased number of flights has been especially noticed this summer, due to altered flight paths and also Gatwick having a busier summer than usual. The group's email is TWnotogatwick@gmail.com and local people are urged to get in touch and sign up, if they are concerned about plane noise.

29.10.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28213>

### **Meeting of Cabinet's runway sub-committee postponed from Tues 1<sup>st</sup> December**

A meeting of the Cabinet sub-committee (the Economic Affairs (Airports) Sub-Committee) working to push through a new runway, was planned for the 1<sup>st</sup> December. Due to the vote on bombing Syria, it has been postponed. Perhaps to next week. David Cameron will then consider the decision of the sub-committee before it is debated by the full Cabinet. Again, maybe next week.

An announcement of some sort will probably be made in Parliament the week after. The Times believes the sub-committee backs a Heathrow runway. There are 10 members of the sub-committee, and it does not include any of the vociferous opponents of Heathrow, such as Boris Johnson, Justine Greening or Theresa Villiers – or even Philip Hammond or Theresa May. But a Gatwick is very much a possibility.

It is likely that if the government backed a Heathrow runway, Zac Goldsmith would resign as MP for Richmond Park, requiring a by-election. There will be fury – especially in the Heathrow Villages and those living near Heathrow – that Cameron had gone back on his word. He specifically promised at the 2010 election that: "No Ifs. No Buts. No 3rd Runway."

Going back on a promise is bad enough, but people believed him, and made life-decisions about their homes etc on the strength of it. They have been betrayed, and this betrayal could be Cameron's legacy. The Conservative Party also said in May 2010 that there would be no new runways at Gatwick or Stansted. That was just as much a promise as no Heathrow runway. <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28764>

## **Gatwick hopes a YouGov poll of Londoners (not local people) favouring its runway over Heathrow, will help its case**

Gatwick airport is hoping to persuade people that there is support for its runway. It has commissioned and paid for (yet another) YouGov poll, in the attempt to show people want a Gatwick runway. As there is a high level of opposition in areas near and around Gatwick, the poll had to be of Londoners. It is hardly surprising, if Londoners are asked about aircraft noise, that they would say the negative impact on quality of life (meaning noise and pollution?) would be lower at Gatwick than at Heathrow. The details of the poll have not been publicised, but it was of 1,072 Londoners - details of where they were located not published, nor is the interview script. The questions are carefully selected to only include issues on which Gatwick could be seen as scoring higher than Heathrow (numbers affected by noise, cost of building runway, importance of exceeding air pollution limits etc).

Several London councils have been supportive of Gatwick for a long time, fearing the noise impact on their residents if there was a Heathrow runway - and knowing the opposition within their boroughs. They hope some of their residents might get jobs at Gatwick. The backing of Southwark, Wandsworth, Kingston and Croydon for Gatwick has been public for a long time. Gatwick says there would be more regeneration benefits from its runway - but the area has minimal unemployment. Yet another example of a dubious survey, being "spun" for even more dubious reasons.

12.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28500>

*Interestingly, members of the British Polling Council have to publish a certain amount of detail of polls within 2 days of the release of a poll. That means the organisation that commissioned it – and paid for it – can use it for the first 48 hours, without the details of the poll being available for anyone to check. Then after two days later, life has moved on, and most people are no longer interested. Convenient, eh?*  
<http://www.britishpollingcouncil.org/objects-and-rules/>

## **George Osborne launches National Infrastructure Commission, under Andrew Adonis, so UK can “think big again”**

George Osborne has launched a national infrastructure commission, saying infrastructure investment would be at the heart of his spending review. The new independent body would think “dispassionately and independently” about Britain’s infrastructure needs. Andrew Adonis will chair the commission, which will oversee £100 billion of infrastructure spending by 2020. Osborne says the failure of successive governments to invest in infrastructure has meant that the British people have longer commutes, higher energy bills and can’t afford to be home-owners. Osborne himself has overseen a 5.4% fall in infrastructure investment since he took office in 2010. He wants this government to be thinking "long term" and he wants new railway lines, new broadband installed (and perhaps a new runway). Other members of the commission include Michael Heseltine, Prof Tim Besley, Sir John Armitt, and Bridget Rosewell, The commission will have the initial priorities of examining connections between the big northern cities, London’s transport system and energy infrastructure. It will produce a report at the beginning of each parliament with recommendations for spending on infrastructure projects, though politicians will have the final say. 31.10.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28294>

## **Robert Goodwill on flight path noise problems: “we must think about this carefully”**

Changes to Gatwick flight paths, using satellite precision-area navigation (PR-Nav) technology, have meant an increase of noise for those under flight paths that are now narrower, or those under new routes. This has led to a huge number of noise complaints, as well as anger and upset for those affected. Reigate MP, Crispin Blunt leads the Gatwick Co-ordination Group of MPs in Parliament, opposed to the changed flight paths and to plans for a 2nd runway. Crispin has been trying to ascertain, from Aviation Minister, Robert Goodwill, that the new technology would be used in a way that allowed aircraft to be spread out as widely as possible, rather than being concentrated. In a recent letter to Robert Goodwill, Crispin asked for stronger policy guidance from the Government to ensure "noise ghettos" are not created, by reducing

aircraft concentration, maximising dispersal and by permitting multiple arrival and departure routes to give respite to communities affected. In his response, Mr Goodwill said "it is extremely important that we listen to the concerns of communities on these matters", before giving an assurance that the Government will consider the issues raised and the need for appropriate guidance to achieve "solutions which are locally suitable when airspace changes must be made". He said "we must think about this carefully."

16.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28546>

### **Edinburgh TUTUR flight path trial ended 2 months early – but residents say changes persist**

In June Edinburgh airport started a trial of a new, concentrated take off flight path (TUTUR), designed to enable the airport to deal with more planes per hour, and therefore make more money and raise the airport's value. Due to the utter noise misery the trial produced and the huge volume of complaints, it was ended two months early - on 28th October, not 24th December.

However, as has been the pattern at other airports, people overflown say the route has not returned to how it was before the trial. Campaigner Helena Paul from local group SEAT (Stop Edinburgh Airport Trial) said: "Despite assurances that the TUTUR trial has ended, the noise disturbance has not stopped. In fact, many residents are reporting a serious increase in the levels of noise from flights compared to before the trial started. ... It's perfectly clear to many thousands of us that there's been a significant change in the pattern of use of the skies above our heads, to the severe detriment of many communities living beneath." Helena has asked for data gathered during the trial period to be released, so that questions can be answered. They want to show definitively and precisely what happened pre-trial, and what is happening now.

10.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28446>

### **Despair in East London as CAA approves new concentrated flight paths – there may be a legal challenge**

Many residents in East London are in despair following the CAA announcement that it will allow London City Airport to concentrate its flight paths. Campaign group HACAN East is considering legal action against the CAA. Departure routes will be concentrated over places like Bow, parts of Leyton, Leytonstone, Wanstead, Dagenham and parts of Havering. Areas of South London will also experience more concentrated routes. The decision follows uproar at the lack of consultation on the proposals last year; City Airport just put a technical document on its website and informed the Consultative Committee. It was left to HACAN East to hold public meetings in the areas which would be affected.

The airport argued it only had to carry out a minimal consultation. Local people, backed by many local authorities, MPs and members of the GLA, said that a full consultation should have been carried out as some areas would get 30% more planes than now. The CAA was inundated with letters calling for a fresh consultation, but the new announcement means it has ruled this out. For those who barely had planes over them in recent years, facing living under a concentrated flight path indefinitely is a miserable prospect. Hacan East say the CAA is not fit for purpose, and being funded largely by the airlines, it should not make these decisions. 27.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28749>

### **Jeremy Corbyn reported as saying we should "look at the under-used capacity" of other airports**

During a visit to a pre-school in Crawley, Jeremy Corbyn was reported as implying a 2nd runway at Gatwick would be better than a 3rd runway at Heathrow. He is known to oppose a Heathrow runway, due to inadequate air pollution controls. He is quoted as saying: "Gatwick already has spare capacity at the moment and does have facility to expand beyond 2019..." "Gatwick is a possibility but I also think we should look at the under-used capacity all around the South and the South East so there's also a question of expanding flights in Stansted and even Southampton and further afield in Birmingham." The recent briefing produced for the AEF states: "The South East accounts for one third of the UK population but its airports handle nearly two-thirds of UK air travel. The Airports Commission argues that a new runway

would be good for everyone. But in fact its own modelling suggests that traffic at regional airports would fall on average if a new runway was built at either Heathrow or Gatwick compared to a 'no new runways' scenario. Due to the limit of - at the maximum - 60% increase in air passengers, recommended by the Committee on Climate Change, it would make no sense to build a new runway if it simply redistributed traffic around the UK and increased congestion in the South East."

12.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28491>

### **Lands Tribunal rules that residents near Farnborough can claim if their homes have been devalued by more flights**

In May 2010 Farnborough airport expanded their West One Apron from 19,800 square metres to 32,600 square metres. This Apron was considered to be a substantial alteration built with the purpose of providing facilities for a greater number of aircraft. The Lands Tribunal recently ruled there can be claims, against the airport's operators, for compensation under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 if residents have had their property values decreased due to Farnborough expansion.

Hugh James is the law firm representing well over 230 claimants, who say their homes have lost value. A partner at Hugh James said: "It's yet to be determined whether any depreciation has been caused to property values and if so by how much, but it will now be the subject of on-going proceedings." Neil Stockdale, head of environmental law at Hugh James commented: "TAG Farnborough Airport has developed a huge operation widely regarded as Europe's leading business aviation centre and my clients feel the impact on them hasn't been taken into account and that's what they're pursuing these claims....It doesn't take much for each claim to be worth £ X, you multiply that by the number of properties affected and you would expect many hundreds of thousands if not millions of ££s in compensation." Claims can be made before 28 May 2017, which is the expiry of the statutory limitation period. But cases will need to be prepared for lodging with the Tribunal. That takes time so people should get their claims in sooner rather than later. Other claims for work done at the airport in 2002 cannot be made, as these are now out of time.

25.10.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28197>

### **BA pilot's eye damaged by 'military' laser shone into cockpit at Heathrow – plus many less serious attacks**

A British Airways pilot has reportedly been left with significant damage to his eyesight after a "military-strength" laser was shone into the cockpit of his plane landing at Heathrow, in what appears to be the most serious laser attack to date in the UK. The pilot suffered a burned retina in his right eye and has not worked since, according to the head of BALPA. The incident has escalated concerns over the problem of laser attacks, as this was a military weaponry type laser. BALPA claims that 50% of pilots have been in a plane targeted with lasers in the last 12 months. The risk to safety of a pilot having his vision disturbed by a laser, while coming in to land, is obvious. Many incidents appear to have come from a particular block of flats in Glasgow. Lasers have become easy to buy on the internet, and though those usually available are not strong enough to cause eye damage, they cause distraction. "When it comes into the flight deck, it bounces around the walls of the cockpit" and with the effects intensified as light is dispersed by the cockpit windows. Now military strength lasers can be obtained on the black market. There are around 4 - 5 laser attacks on planes every day in the UK, with 400 this year. The highest number of laser incidents in the UK are at Heathrow, though other airports have a higher frequency per number of planes. There have been 3,700 incidents in the USA this year. 25.11.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28685>

### **Work on the new Nantes airport at Notre-Dame-des-Landes might start by early next year**

In 2008 plans to build a new airport for Nantes, 20 miles north of the city at Notre-Dame-des-Landes, were approved. The plan is to move the airport from its current site to the south of the city, Nantes Atlantique Airport, and build over farmland and wetlands, that are rich in wildlife and have good agriculture. The new "Aéroport du Grand Ouest" is intended to be a "gateway to western France" with up to 9 million



site, and they would have to be removed. Opponents do not believe any work can start yet. They say the airport is not needed, it is not consistent with climate targets, and the damage to farmland and habitats cannot be justified. 31.10.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28308>

A convoy of 200 bicycles and 5 tractors left Notre-Dame-des-Landes (Loire-Atlantique) on 23<sup>rd</sup> November, going to Paris for the COP21 talks, to demand the abandonment of the proposed new Nantes airport. They will "denounce the blatant hypocrisy between the will of the government to fight against global warming and the destruction of more than 1,600 hectares of farmland and wetlands in order to build a new airport." 23.11.2015 More details of the cycle ride <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28641>

### **Solena, the company meant to be producing jet fuel from London waste for BA, goes bankrupt**

In February 2010 it was announced that British Airways had teamed up with American bioenergy company Solena Group to establish "Europe's first" sustainable jet fuel plant, which was set to turn London's domestic waste into aviation fuel. The plan was for BA to provide construction capital for a massive plant somewhere in East London. BA committed to purchasing all the jet fuel produced by the plant, around 16 million gallons a year, for the next 11 years at market competitive prices. BA had hoped that this 2% contribution to its fuel consumption - the equivalent to all its fuel use at London City airport - would give it green credibility. [UK aviation have great hopes "biofuels" or "alternative fuels" will enable continuing growth, claiming to be "low carbon"]. The timescale for the Solena plant to be built kept slipping. Nothing had been heard of it for a long time. Now it has been announced that Solena has gone into bankruptcy in the USA. It was never clear, if genuinely low carbon fuels could be produced from London's waste, why these should not be used for essential vehicles (ambulances etc) in London - and why they would instead become a PR exercise for an airline. 29.10.2015 <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/?p=28239>

### **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/>
- For daily transport news in the UK - **Transportinfo** at [transportinfo.org.uk](http://transportinfo.org.uk)
- European **Transport & Environment (T&E)** <http://www.transportenvironment.org>  
**Twitter @transenv**
- News and expert analysis on the **AEF** website at [www.aef.org.uk](http://www.aef.org.uk) and **on Twitter @The\_AEF**
- **HACAN** [www.hacan.org.uk](http://www.hacan.org.uk) **Twitter @HACAN1**  
and **GACC** [www.gacc.org.uk/latest-news](http://www.gacc.org.uk/latest-news)
- **Stop Heathrow Expansion (SHE)** <http://www.stopheathrowexpansion.co.uk>
- **Communities Against Increased Aircraft Noise (CAIAN)** <http://caian.co.uk/> - Heathrow flight paths
- **Gatwick Obviously NOT** <http://www.gatwickobviouslynot.org/>
- **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. 1.12.2015*  
[www.airportwatch.org.uk](http://www.airportwatch.org.uk)