

## **Committee on Climate Change makes it clear that UK aviation policy has to change, if we are to meet climate targets**

On the 8th December, an important report from the CCC said that UK aviation policy should be based on the assumption that demand growth between now and 2050 cannot exceed 60%. This is hugely lower than the current plans in the Aviation White Paper, for around a 200% increase. If the UK is to meet the Government's target that aviation emissions in 2050 do not exceed 2005 levels, 60% (which is 138 million passengers per annum) growth is the maximum. In contrast to the 4.4 million air traffic movements predicted for 2050 in the Department for Transport's January 2009 forecasts, only 3.4 million ATMs can be accommodated under the CCC's carbon cap.

Aviation is still getting special privileged treatment. Other sectors must make their cuts in relation to 1990. However, aviation is allowed to base their cuts on 2005. Because of the growth in emissions between 1990 and 2005, the target for aviation of just having to get back to 2005 levels by 2050 is equivalent to a 120% increase on 1990. Other sectors have to make 80% cuts.

The CCC report goes on to say that the 60% increase figure does not take account of non-CO2 effects of aviation emissions. It therefore may need to be halved. The report is also doubtful that the industry will solve its future problems either through biofuels, or miraculous new technologies yet to emerge.

The report, advising Government, effectively makes the Aviation White Paper - which contained expansion plans for 30 airports - out of date and irrelevant. With the new CCC growth recommendation, only a few airports could expand, and not all 30. The CCC does not specify at which airports the 60% increase should take place. If new runways are allowed at two London airports, almost no other growth would be possible elsewhere. How air travel is to be limited, and how it is to be distributed between UK airports will need to be decided in the aviation National Policy Statement due to be produced in 2011. Until then it is obvious that no planning permissions for airport expansion should be granted.

The report is well aware that current policies will be insufficient to constrain demand growth for flights to the necessary level. Even with the anticipated carbon price, modal shift and increased use of video-conferencing in business, it is unlikely that demand growth will be constrained to 60%. Carbon taxes or other regulatory measures will be needed to help close the gap.

*There is more information from the [Aviation Environment Federation](http://bit.ly/6DBS48), <http://bit.ly/6DBS48> and [news and comment on the CCC report](http://bit.ly/4MRwGU). <http://bit.ly/4MRwGU>*

## **No progress on aviation emissions at Copenhagen. What happens next?**

The UNFCCC Copenhagen conference ended on 18th December, having made no progress on how to treat emissions from international aviation. There are no targets for any emissions cuts. The Copenhagen Accord, which was agreed by several states but not unanimously approved, included a commitment to combat climate change, "recognizing the scientific view that the increase in global temperature should be below 2°C", and committed



developed countries to “mobilizing jointly \$100 billion dollars a year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries.” There was no agreement on how to treat emissions from international aviation and shipping (known as bunker fuel emissions), which had been left out of the targets agreed in the Kyoto Protocol. Japan, Saudi Arabia, China and the US have been blamed for blocking progress on tackling emissions from the two sectors.

The International Air Transport Association (IATA) is trumpeting the Copenhagen Accord as an endorsement of global measures and a vindication of its own position on emission reductions. It is neither. The Accord only makes reference to aviation briefly under 'innovative sources of finance'. The International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), a 'sister' UN agency, made clear at its Copenhagen side event that it believes the 2% fleet efficiency improvement aspirational goal (which is nothing new, and just on-going improvements as new planes are bought, and efficiencies are made) is a target in itself. However, there is no means of enforcing it. This rather feeble ICAO aim might possibly be supplemented by some version of IATA's carbon neutral growth in 2020 concept - which depends on extensive use of "sustainable" biofuels, and access to carbon markets in future decades.

What is needed is a way to make global mitigation policies fair to the developing world, and this has now become the central element, with many forgetting the need to reduce the emissions in the first place. Meanwhile, aviation emissions continue to grow and the industry's reputation continues to decline.

In the absence of new measures from UNFCCC, the very weak deal from the ICAO is the best agreement we now have from the United Nations process. NGOs will continue to work with ICAO with the aim of strengthening its policy on emissions. Don't hold your breath. In the post-Copenhagen world it seems that agreements among small groups of nations may be more likely to succeed than global measures on aviation emissions.

*Further comment and analysis from the [Aviation Environment Federation](http://www.aef.org.uk/?p=991), <http://www.aef.org.uk/?p=991> and from [Transport & Environment](http://bit.ly/7zwRib). <http://bit.ly/7zwRib>*

**From the Chair of AirportWatch - John Stewart**

### **2010 – The Year of the General Election**

It is rare, in not unique, for aviation campaigners to know that a General Election will make a real difference to their campaigners. If, as expected, the Conservatives win the election, plans for new runways at Heathrow, Stansted and Gatwick will be dropped. That will be seismic. Never in its worst nightmares could the aviation industry have foreseen this. It is also a credit to the work of AirportWatch and to campaigners across the country. The terms of the aviation debate have been changed. But the Conservatives are saying that they will look favourably on expansion at regional and Scottish airports where that expansion has local support. Expansion at regional airports will increase noise, emissions and possibly cause community destruction. It is also very doubtful if it will do anything for the local economies. The clear focus of AirportWatch's work in 2010 will be on the regional and Scottish airports.



### **50,000 filled London's streets for The Wave ahead of Copenhagen**

On Saturday 5th December, the largest climate protest ever seen in the UK took place. Stop Climate Chaos had hoped 30,000 people would march through the streets of London - but there were estimated to have been 50,000 people. That resounding success demonstrates the depth of feeling there is in Britain on climate change. Anti aviation campaigners from many airport groups and NGOs joined in enthusiastically.

## Heathrow – Life after the 3<sup>rd</sup> Runway

If Labour are unexpectedly returned after a General Election and do not drop a third runway at Heathrow, expect a campaign of civil disobedience. But we think the Conservatives will be returned and all plans to expand Heathrow will be dropped – see, below, the speech given by Theresa Villiers on December 7<sup>th</sup> to an aviation industry audience. But, for residents under the Heathrow flight paths, the unrelenting noise will go on. That is what HACAN will focus on. Within the coming months it is expected to launch two new campaigns: one on **night flights**; the other on **flight paths**. More information in the next bulletin. *(from HACAN)*

### *Extract from Theresa Villiers' speech*

Fourthly, and most controversially, we have made it clear that if we win the general election we would not allow new runways to be built at Stansted or Gatwick and we would stop a third runway at Heathrow. We believe that the commitments on climate change to which all parties have now signed up will be much harder to achieve with the flight growth that a third runway would involve - an expansion in flight movements that would be the equivalent to bolting on to Heathrow a new airport the size of Gatwick. And nor do we believe that there is any realistic prospect of meeting the EU limits on Nitrogen Dioxide pollution if expansion is permitted on the scale proposed.

The airport is already in breach of the limits contained in the EU Air Quality Directive. So the increase in pollution which would come from the additional flight movements, as well as the millions of extra car journeys that would come with them, are almost certain to provide a legally binding barrier to expansion. Moreover, adding another flight path over a densely populated area would compound an existing noise problem which is already a genuine concern in areas as far apart as Greenwich and Reading. The Government's environmental pre-conditions on both noise and Nox depend on hugely optimistic forecasts, not just for an entire fleet of significantly cleaner cars on our roads, but also the widespread adoption of planes which have not yet even reached the drawing board of the major manufacturers. I also believe that the economic case for Runway Three has been over-stated and that the business community is by no means united in supporting the massive expansion the government would like to see. This was illustrated by the opposition to Runway Three expressed by the CEOs of some of our major high street brands. Nor is there any evidence to back the 'expand or die' theory that Heathrow will face a spiral of decline and lose its hub status without a third runway. There is every reason to believe that millions of people will still wish to use the airport regardless of whether expansion is permitted or whether it is not. Now I'm well aware that many of you in this room will disagree with this analysis, but where I hope I am in complete accord with you is in recognising that how crucial it is that Heathrow does become a much better airport. As David Cameron has made very clear, we believe Heathrow should be better not bigger. And I want now to set out a number of proposals to help make that happen.

*Full speech can be seen at*

[www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2009/12/Theresa\\_Villiers\\_The\\_Conservative\\_position\\_on\\_aviation.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2009/12/Theresa_Villiers_The_Conservative_position_on_aviation.aspx)

## Stansted 2nd runway public inquiry still uncertain after BAA partial victory against Competition Commission



On 21st December, BAA won a partial victory against the Competition Commission, into whether it should be made to sell three of its 7 airports in the UK. The Competition Appeal Tribunal agreed that the ruling panel was affected by "apparent bias" because one of the panel members, Professor Peter Moizer, had long standing connections with the Manchester Airports Group (MAG), which was in the bidding for Gatwick Airport. The Competition Commission is facing the

embarrassing prospect of being ordered to re-do its high-profile two-year investigation of BAA's near-monopoly, after a stinging tribunal judgment found the probe displayed "apparent bias." However, the Appeal Tribunal rejected BAA's argument that it was being forced to sell the airports too quickly, and said it would now allow more time to hear arguments as to what should happen next. It is unclear whether BAA will have to sell the other airports in the original timeframe. The CC said it was disappointed by the ruling and was looking for grounds to appeal. It is frustrated and embarrassed by both the manner of its defeat and criticism of its handling of the case. It could not rule out the possibility of a fresh inquiry.

Stop Stansted Expansion (SSE) responded that BAA should now withdraw its 2nd runway plans as issues over the future ownership of Stansted Airport threaten to drag on for years, prolonging the blight and uncertainty for the local community. It remains to be seen how the Government will decide to deal with the 2nd runway public inquiry, having previously put this on hold until the uncertainty about the future ownership of the airport was resolved. SSE expects BAA and the Competition Commission to meet fairly quickly to determine a way forward. After that there may be a statement from the Secretary of State on the public inquiry.

*More information on SSE's website:* <http://www.stopstanstedexpansion.com/news.html> (21 & 22/Dec)

### **High Court Gives Fight the Flights Green Light to Judicial Review on London City Airport Expansion**

On 7th January 2010 the High Court granted permission for Fight the Flights - the community group at London City Airport - to take their legal challenge against Newham Council to a full hearing in the High Court. The Judicial Review will look at the legality of Newham Council's decision to approve the expansion of the airport, aiming to increase flights by 50%. The Court granted permission to proceed on all 3 limbs of Fight the Flight's case, saying that all aspects of the case were properly arguable. The 3 points are that Newham failed to take account of climate change, failed to consult relevant neighbouring local authorities, and failed to consult the residents of those boroughs.

Earlier, in October, the High Court gave FtF costs protection for their legal challenge to Newham. Without costs protection, Fight the Flights would have been at risk of unlimited costs liability and could not have proceeded with the case. Costs protection is only normally given where the Court recognises the public importance of the case.

On 15th December, James Brockenshire MP secured an adjournment debate in the Commons, on London City airport, and his concerns about the changes to flight paths that were recently made by NATS. These flight path alterations were made, even though other changes they proposed in the Terminal Control North consultation have been withdrawn. The changes were requested by the CAA, making the whole NATS consultation process pointless, with regard to London City airport.

*More information from* [Fight the Flights' blogsite](http://londoncityairportfighttheflights.blogspot.com) <http://londoncityairportfighttheflights.blogspot.com> and [news stories about London City Airport](http://bit.ly/8hUImK) <http://bit.ly/8hUImK>

### **Bristol airport expansion planning decision expected in February**

Despite being eager to reach 10m passengers in its expansion plans, in the last 12 months Bristol Airport (BIA) has carried only 5.6m - which is 11% below 2008 and even below 2006 levels. The airport's [planning application](http://bit.ly/4TTIpz) (<http://bit.ly/4TTIpz>) is now due to be decided by North Somerset Council on Feb 10th. The necessary reports on climate change, economics etc for this have not yet appeared. The airport made a raft of minor changes to the plan, but no real concessions, and put these out for a mere 3 week consultation over Christmas, ending on 5th January. The earlier deadline had been December 9th.

Since people haven't had a proper chance to respond to the new changes, North Somerset Council has agreed to accept comments after the closing date. These can still be sent in for the next few days.

Stop Bristol Airport Expansion (SBAE) remains deeply opposed to the airport's plans because:

- 1). **There is no cap on passenger numbers or flight movements.** There should be a cap of 8 million passengers per year, with no further growth until road and transport improvements can be guaranteed.
- 2). **Traffic:** The vast majority of passengers will still travel by car. There would be serious and increased problems of congestion around the airport and through the neighbouring villages.
- 3). **Night flights:** Despite proposing a lower cap on night flights, BIA has plans for a significant increase in the number of night flights, 25% above 2008 levels.
- 4). The **Green Belt** is still under threat.
- 5). Increased flights mean more **climate change impacts** - just when everyone else is meant to be cutting emissions. The plans would cause a 60% rise in carbon emissions from the airport's activities by 2016.
- 6). The **number of jobs** BIA claims it will generate is inaccurate. The airport has a net effect of reducing tourism jobs in the region.
- 7). As the airport only handled 5.6m passengers in the last 12 months, below the level seen in 2006, it is totally **unnecessary** to increase capacity to 10m passengers

*More info on Stop Bristol Airport Expansion's website. <http://www.stopbia.com/pressreleases.php>*

### **New Bristol report - Local tourism jobs decrease as the airport grows**

Thousands of jobs in the local tourism industry have been lost despite Bristol Airport's huge growth in recent years. This is shown in a new report from Stop Bristol Airport Expansion (SBAE), which for the first time compares tourism data for the South West with airport growth figures. The soaring passenger numbers at Bristol International Airport (BIA) between 2001 and 2007 did not result in a boom for local tourism. In fact the tourism sector shrank by 10% in real terms. The SBAE Report author, Jeremy Birch, said that given the figures in the study, there was no reason to think that BIA's proposed 60% expansion is likely to reverse this trend.

While passenger numbers at BIA more than doubled – from 2.67 million in 2001 to 5.88 million in 2007 – the former Avon area lost 3,340 full-time jobs in tourism. In the same period, a staggering total of 44,761 full-time jobs in tourism were lost across the whole of the South West.

Between 2001 and 2007, day trips within the South West fell from 148 million to 96 million, a drop of 36%. Most day trips are likely to be made by people resident in the South West, suggesting that as people use Bristol airport more, they spend less on local day trips. The study indicates that the rise in outbound tourism is the most likely cause for the diversion of spending on trips that would otherwise fuel jobs in South West tourism.

The study also shows that including day trips, 86% of tourism spending in the region is by UK citizens. Most of these arrive by car and almost none by plane.

Analysis of tourism figures, tourism jobs and airport passenger numbers could be carried out, in a similar manner, for other UK regions.

*For more information, see [Bristol airport and tourism study press release http://bit.ly/683BFE](http://bit.ly/683BFE) and the study itself (10 pages) is at [http://www.stopbia.com/files/sw\\_tourism.pdf](http://www.stopbia.com/files/sw_tourism.pdf)*

## No carbon is saved by diverting Heathrow passengers to Bristol

A new study, by Stop Bristol Airport Expansion, shows that - contrary to arguments by the industry - the expansion of Bristol airport is highly unlikely to divert much of the 'leakage' of passengers, who choose to go to London airports, rather than local ones, for their trips. The industry claims that by getting people to fly from their local airport saves CO2 emissions. This study shows that carbon savings would not be made, unless services from London airports were reduced as Bristol services increase. The introduction of even one extra route from Bristol airport would actually increase rather than decrease the UK's total carbon emissions.

Currently 4.7 million South West travellers use airports in the South East each year. The report reveals that even if the 2.8 million of these using Heathrow, the closest SE airport, were diverted to Bristol, this would fall far short of the 4 million extra passengers BIA is planning to handle by 2019. The large numbers of locals using Heathrow to access long-haul destinations show they prefer direct routes, a preference that is unlikely to change in the future. Popular short haul routes accessed through Heathrow such as Munich, Frankfurt and Zurich have previously failed at Bristol. Introduction of just one of these services would increase total UK greenhouse gas emissions unless a corresponding Heathrow service was removed

More information from the [SBAE press release on the report](http://bit.ly/4tqA1t) <http://bit.ly/4tqA1t>  
and [read the Leakage report](http://bit.ly/7olmdn) (13 pages) <http://bit.ly/7olmdn>

## Manchester Airport freight growth - 10 Downing Street petition to sign

Below is a petition you might like to sign. It has been put together by the group of people opposing expansion at Manchester Airport. <http://petitions.number10.gov.uk/aviation-growth>

"We the undersigned petition the Prime Minister to explain how the UK will meet its 2050 80% reduction in CO2 emissions whilst expanding aviation in line with the 2003 Air Transport White Paper.

In 2006, the Centre for Air Transport and the Environment at Manchester Metropolitan University published a report commissioned by DEFRA which calculated that aviation emissions would contribute between 86% and 128% of the country's total CO2 budget by 2050, if allowed to expand in line with the 2003 Air Transport White Paper.

Manchester airport has seen its air freight halve since 2007, but despite this Manchester City Council has recently given approval to double the Airport's air freight capacity, demolishing two 200 year old family cottages and a large section of greenbelt land in the process.

We respectfully ask the Prime Minister to explain how the UK will meet its carbon reduction target by 2050 if airports like Manchester continue to expand."

*See back to the item on the Committee on Climate Change, which puts this in context too.*

## Southend runway extension: Call it in! We need a public inquiry

The consultation on Southend airport's [300 metre runway extension](http://bit.ly/7jLZVh) (<http://bit.ly/7jLZVh>) ended on 10th December. Southend Borough Council's Development Control committee is due to sit to discuss the application on the 20th



SAEN campaigners have fought tirelessly for months

January 2010. This is a serious case of cart before horse, because the decision is due to be taken long before publication of the result of the consultation on the Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP), into local opinion on a variety of matters including growth of the airport. The JAAP result was due to be released in January, but is now delayed till February.

Southend's planning committee will not be able to take the JAAP information into account when making its decision about extending the runway. Stop Airport Extension Now (SAEN), the local community group, believe the results of the Joint Area Action Plan should have been properly discussed before the planning application was considered at all.

SAEN is hoping that the application will be called in by GO-EAST, the Government Office for East of England. Details of how to write to GO-EAST and John Denham (Sec of State at DCLG) about this are at <http://www.saen.org.uk/contact/>

Some of SAEN's concerns, requiring a full public inquiry, are:

- The confusion over Government Policy on regional airport expansion
- The effects of expansion on 70,000 people in terms of noise, etc
- The substantial controversy that the application has given rise to in local press
- The accepted 'infringement' of the church on the runway as a hazard
- The presence of several schools beneath the flightpath of a predicted 53,300 flights per annum

Council members fear that if the vote goes against the Stobart Group's £30million development plans, then Southend Council could face a judicial review of its decision, and considerable expense. Meanwhile it has been revealed that Southend council tax will rise by almost 4% in 2010, at the same time as plans for £2 million to be spend on roads near the airport. The airport is hoping to benefit from transport to and from the 2012 Olympics.

*More information on the SAEN website at <http://www.saen.org.uk>*

### **Farnborough Airport appeals against blocked expansion plans**

On 8th December, TAG Farnborough lodged an appeal against the decision to block its plans to almost double the number of planes using the airport, from 28,000 to 50,000 per year. Council tax payers in Aldershot and Farnborough could be left with a hefty legal bill after Brandon O'Reilly, TAG's chief executive, said he could not rule out pursuing the company's costs - likely to run into hundreds of thousands of pounds. Rushmoor BC's planning committee last month decided to reject their own expert advice that TAG's request to increase flights to 50,000 a year should be allowed.

[More information about Farnborough airport and recent news](http://bit.ly/5od9XE) <http://bit.ly/5od9XE>

### **Coventry Airport closed down**

Coventry Airport has been closed due to financial difficulties. West Midlands International Airport, which owns it, had been due to appear in the High Court on 9th December, to respond to a winding-up petition. The board and shareholders decided to shut it. It means the runway in Coventry is now unlicensed and planes carrying passengers can not use it. Passenger airline Thomsonfly stopped flights out of the airport in November 2008 and a year earlier the airport saw plans for a new terminal rejected. Some cargo flights continued. About 70 people have lost their jobs and up to 300 jobs could be at risk if the airport closes permanently, the BBC understands.

[BBC report on Coventry closure](http://bit.ly/675DPF) <http://bit.ly/675DPF>

## **Campaigners call on Southampton airport to soundproof 12,000 homes**

Environmental campaigners have called for Southampton Airport to soundproof the homes of almost 12,000 Hampshire residents. They claim noise from aircraft could be affecting the health of residents living nearby. Environmental Protection UK also says 7 local schools under the flight path should be provided with sound proof glazing. Southampton is one of the few English airports that does not have a Sound Insulation Grant Scheme. <http://www.environmental-protection.org.uk/>

*Details from [Southampton Echo story 16th December](#) <http://bit.ly/6W65TE>*

## **Appeal court gives farmer consent to continue Carlisle airport legal challenge**

There are now 4 farmers with grazing rights on land earmarked for warehousing and offices who have refused to give up those rights, and one of them - a Mr Gordon Brown - has been granted leave by the Court of Appeal to apply for a substantive judicial review of Carlisle City Council's decision to give planning permission to the airport in 2008. The Rt Hon Lord Justice Sullivan allowed the judicial review because, he said, it has a "real chance of success". The High Court twice rejected Mr Brown's application, most recently in October.

This will be the first time the matter has been in front of a planning judge. The application will be heard in the Court of Appeal in London, in the spring. Andrew Tinkler, CEO of Stobart Group, said he was frustrated by the farmers who had refused the company's offer to surrender their grazing rights. Mr Brown says that, under the terms of a lease granted to his father in 1962, he cannot be evicted until March 2011.

[More information about Carlisle airport and recent news](#) <http://bit.ly/84cmbr>

## **Study: Airport Noise Increases Risk of Strokes**

On 15th December, German researchers released information which indicates that people who are exposed to jet noise have a substantially increased risk of stroke, high blood pressure and heart disease. The findings - due to be published in January - are bound to provide further ammunition to anti-airport campaigners. The study is based on analysis of data from public health insurers that were drawn from more than 1 million Germans ages 40 and over who live near Cologne-Bonn Airport. According to the unpublished study, commissioned by Germany's Federal Environment Agency, men who are exposed to jet noise have a 69% higher risk of being hospitalized for cardiovascular disease. Women living under flight paths have a 93% higher risk and a raised risk of breast cancer and leukaemia. It also indicated that women who are exposed to jet noise (of about 60 decibels) during the day are 172% more likely to suffer a stroke.



People living close to Cologne-Bonn Airport also tended to suffer from psychological illnesses, particularly depression. Women may be slightly worse affected than men. A professor of epidemiology at Bremen University asked: "When it comes to expanding airports, governments and the courts all over the world will have to weigh the benefits of commercial interests against the danger to public health." *More information about [Airport Noise Increases Risk of Strokes](#) <http://bit.ly/5IVj1A>*

## **Aircraft energy efficiency has not improved in a decade**

A new study by ICCT (the International Council on Clean Transportation) on aviation says the pace of improvements in aircraft energy efficiency is very slow, and no progress has been made in the last decade. It calls for a CO2 emissions standard for aircraft already in production. The ICCT has examined emissions from more than 25,000 planes produced between 1960 and 2008. It shows improvements in fuel efficiency for the first 3 decades, but virtually no improvements in the last 20 years when there have been few new aircraft designs. Airbus said technology to make planes quieter was available, as was technology to combat emissions, but that combined technology tackling both noise and emissions concerns was still in development and 'would not be available for around another 10 years.'

The ICCT study (20 pages) is at [http://www.theicct.org/documents/ICCT\\_Aircraft\\_Efficiency\\_final.pdf](http://www.theicct.org/documents/ICCT_Aircraft_Efficiency_final.pdf)

## **Air Transport Association sues to halt EU ETS**

On 18th December, three US airlines, Continental, American and United, and the Air Transport Association filed suit in a UK court, seeking to block implementation of the EU ETS. It is the first legal action brought by US airlines in a European court to halt the inclusion of international aviation in the ETS. They are claiming that "ICAO continues to be the appropriate UN body for establishing climate change targets and measures for aviation" and they want a global, sector-focused approach.

More information about [the court action](http://bit.ly/6uugF0) <http://bit.ly/6uugF0>  
and [more information from AEF on the EU ETS](http://www.aef.org.uk/?p=503) <http://www.aef.org.uk/?p=503>

## **Airlines' profits to soar from emissions trading, says Carbon Trust**

A Carbon Trust report for investors, soon to be published, says that airlines could make large windfall profits - billions of pounds - from the EU ETS. The draft document argues that airlines can and will pass through the costs of buying carbon allowances onto their passengers, even though the carriers will actually be granted the great majority of these allowances free of charge.

In 2012, the cap for aviation will be 97% of the sector's emissions in 2004-06. From 2013, the cap will be tightened to 95% and stays at that level unless changed by the European Commission. Under pressure from airlines concerned about the cost of the scheme, the Commission has chosen to give 82% of its allowance allocation to the aviation sector for free. Airlines will only have to buy 15% of the total EU ETS allowances (EUAs) allocated to airlines through auctions. The remaining 3% will be held in reserve for new entrants to the scheme.

Peter Lockley, head of transport policy at WWF-UK, said: "We have always argued that airlines would make windfall profits from free allowances, just as the power sector did. We hope the EU will quickly move to require airlines to pay for 100% of their emissions allowances." He emphasised that, in any case, companies should pay for all their polluting carbon emissions as an important matter of principle.

The ENDS report is at <http://www.endsreport.com/index.cfm?action=report.airlines>

## **Edinburgh climate change study, in relation to that for Gatwick**

Edinburgh airport has produced a study of its carbon emissions, including all those over which the airport has control, and the emissions for other things over which the airport has less control. They include emissions of planes on the ground, and their take offs up to 1,000 feet, and landings from 1,000 feet. Gatwick produced a similar study in summer 2009. Neither study includes emissions from planes

during all of their flights, which massively outweigh - dozens of times over - the emissions of the airport itself, even including local transport of passengers and staff on the ground. The study gives comparative figures for emissions per passenger at the airports, showing considerable differences between airports. Heathrow is hugely higher per passenger than other UK airports, and Edinburgh is considerably lower than Gatwick. The total emissions accounted for in the studies show Edinburgh airport, in 2008, was responsible for 163,000 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>, and Gatwick for 700,000 tonnes.

Details of [the Edinburgh study](http://bit.ly/79rRQ2), <http://bit.ly/79rRQ2>  
[the Gatwick study](http://bit.ly/66APDT), <http://bit.ly/66APDT> (figures on pages 17 and 18 of emissions in the "Landing and Take off cycle" LTO) and [GACC Critique of Gatwick Climate Change Report](http://bit.ly/64py5b) <http://bit.ly/64py5b>

### **The Blind Expansion of Glasgow Airport**

Amanda McMillan, managing director of Glasgow airport, has stated BAA's determination to blight the lives of locals and further disrupt the global climate.

Glasgow airport has been hit hard over the past year, losing over an eighth of its passengers for the 2nd year running, seeing most Ryanair flights move to Edinburgh, the collapse of Zoom, and more recently Flyglobespan. Further to this, Terminal 2 closed over the winter to save costs in an obviously struggling airport. All good news for the residents of Clydebank, Paisley and Yoker, but Amanda McMillan has now revealed the airport's £25 million expansion plans over the next two years, including £1 million towards the M74 which rips through the heart of the city and some of the poorest areas of Renfrewshire. There is rarely a more obvious example of an attempt at demand creation.

There is no strategy that Glasgow Airport fits into. The still sparkling new Scottish Climate Change Bill is in complete contradiction to plans for increased passenger numbers, and in times of financial struggle, increased flight frequency would put more drain on a damaged economy. This outrageous behaviour adds to that late in 2009 when BAA responded to appeals by residents for double glazing with an offer to pay for fitting in - incredibly - just 2 farm buildings in close proximity to the airport.

We won't take this lying down!

*(from Johnny, at Plane Speaking, Scotland).*

### **IATA predicts a US\$ 5.6 Billion Loss in 2010 - low yields and rising costs to keep the industry in the red**

IATA forecasts the full net losses for the global aviation industry for 2009 will be US\$ 11 billion. They now forecast the loss for 2010 will be US\$ 5.6 billion - much larger than the US\$ 3.8 billion forecast earlier. IATA says "We are ending an Annus Horribilis that brings to a close the 10 challenging years of an aviation Decennis Horribilis". A total of 2.28 billion people are expected to fly in 2010, bringing total passenger numbers back in line with the peak recorded in 2007. European carriers are expected to generate the largest losses of any region at US\$ 2.5 billion.

[Click here to view full story...](http://bit.ly/6JhqiG) <http://bit.ly/6JhqiG>

### **November traffic figures at UK airports**

BAA's UK airports handled a total of 9.9m passengers in November. This was an increase of 0.8% on Nov 2008. It was the first time since March 2008 that BAA's airports have recorded a collective increase, and follows a 6-month run of gradually improving results. Compared to last November (when figures were down on 2007) Heathrow grew by +1.1%; Gatwick by 4.5%; Edinburgh by 1.3%; Stansted was down -2.7% and Glasgow, Aberdeen and Southampton were down.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="494 937 519 954" data-label="Page-Footer">
<p>10</p>
</div>

## CAA figures for November 2009

November 2009 terminal passenger figures compared to November 2008

[http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/80/airport\\_data\\_prov/200911/November\\_2009\\_Provisional\\_Airport\\_Statistics.pdf](http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/80/airport_data_prov/200911/November_2009_Provisional_Airport_Statistics.pdf)

October 2009 terminal passenger figures compared to October 2008.

[http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/80/airport\\_data\\_prov/200910/October\\_2009\\_Provisional\\_Airport\\_Statistics.pdf](http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/80/airport_data_prov/200910/October_2009_Provisional_Airport_Statistics.pdf)

These are declines, on declines. Total UK terminal passenger numbers were already down -9% (to 15,383,412) in November 2008 compared to November 2007, and down - 5% (to 20,349,444) in October 2008, compared to October 2007. [CAA airport statistics](http://bit.ly/5KcWap). <http://bit.ly/5KcWap>

[2009-10 http://bit.ly/40Aaqr](http://bit.ly/40Aaqr)

[2008-11 http://bit.ly/4t4mSh](http://bit.ly/4t4mSh)

[2008-10 http://bit.ly/7RrqL8](http://bit.ly/7RrqL8)

| Largest 25 UK airports                  | Terminal passengers in November 2009 | % change compared to November 2008 | Terminal passengers in October 2009 | % change compared to October 2008 |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Total for all reporting airports</b> | <b>15,107,045</b>                    | <b>- 2.6%</b>                      | <b>19,544,277</b>                   | <b>- 4.7%</b>                     |
| <b>HEATHROW</b>                         | 5,028,985                            | + 1.1%                             | 5,687,474                           | + 1%                              |
| <b>GATWICK</b>                          | 2,065,881                            | + 4.5                              | 2,826,923                           | + 1.9                             |
| STANSTED                                | 1,311,732                            | - 2.6                              | 1,775,787                           | - 10.2                            |
| MANCHESTER                              | 1,123,857                            | - 11.6                             | 1,601,313                           | - 11.2                            |
| <b>EDINBURGH</b>                        | 647,411                              | + 1.4                              | 824,151                             | + 3.8                             |
| LUTON                                   | 599,124                              | - 4.8                              | 811,161                             | - 8.5                             |
| BIRMINGHAM                              | 566,704                              | - 8.6                              | 795,335                             | - 5.3                             |
| GLASGOW                                 | 489,008                              | - 4.6                              | 714,794                             | - 9.2                             |
| LIVERPOOL                               | 360,193                              | + 8.2                              | 456,688                             | - 1.8                             |
| BRISTOL                                 | 338,389                              | - 4.8                              | 530,468                             | - 1                               |
| BELFAST INTERNATIONAL                   | 291,379                              | - 6.7                              | 383,720                             | - 11                              |
| EAST MIDLANDS                           | 269,857                              | - 16.8                             | 416,271                             | - 13.4                            |
| NEWCASTLE                               | 260,608                              | - 12                               | 438,777                             | - 5.3                             |
| LONDON CITY                             | 248,672                              | - 6.6                              | 250,645                             | - 14.4                            |
| ABERDEEN                                | 229,331                              | - 4.2                              | 275,718                             | - 8.3                             |
| <b>BELFAST CITY (George Best)</b>       | 229,238                              | + 12.5                             | 242,203                             | + 7.9                             |
| LEEDS BRADFORD                          | 134,249                              | - 8.9                              | 232,374                             | - 12.9                            |
| SOUTHAMPTON                             | 131,251                              | - 2.5                              | 155,089                             | - 6.4                             |
| PRESTWICK                               | 113,169                              | - 27                               | 153,170                             | - 28.4                            |
| JERSEY                                  | 96,697                               | - 3                                | 125,112                             | - 6.4                             |

### Useful Info

- For information from the many **local groups at airports in the UK**, see the **Campaign Community** section of the AirportWatch website. <http://www.airportwatch.org.uk/campaigncommunity.php>
- For more about the growing problem of biofuels, see **Biofuelwatch** [www.biofuelwatch.org.uk](http://www.biofuelwatch.org.uk) and biofuels and aviation at [http://www.biofuelwatch.org.uk/docs/aviation\\_biofuels\\_article.pdf](http://www.biofuelwatch.org.uk/docs/aviation_biofuels_article.pdf)
- For more information about aviation, and aviation stories, see the AEF (**Aviation Environment Federation**) website at <http://www.aef.org.uk> and the AirportWatch website
- **Transport & Environment** have useful information and updates about aviation, especially in relation to Europe. <http://www.transportenvironment.org/tag/aviation>

Bulletin compiled by Sarah Clayton - with thanks to many for advice and contributions 8.1.2010

[www.airportwatch.org.uk](http://www.airportwatch.org.uk)