

## Notes for presentation - Guildford Zero 160125 Final.pdf

### Page 3

- Link between noise, pollution & health is well known with clear research.
- Long term impact of emissions on climate change & biodiversity loss also well understood.
- Governments have a duty to protect public from harm Human Rights legislation.

### Page 5

- Climate Change Act legally binding.
- Jet Zero strategy is the aviation sector's roadmap to Net Zero.
- Jet Zero already off-track.
- **2024 – Supreme Court clarified Environmental Impact Assessments must include all downstream emissions – impact airports.**
- Looking increasingly likely government will abandon Jet Zero and aviation's environmental targets.
- **IF EMISSIONS REDUCTION FROM AVIATION IS DROPPED – WHERE WILL REDUCTIONS COME FROM?**

### Page 6

- UK Aviation's emissions were forecast to be 71MtCO<sub>2</sub> - Note 14.4MtCO<sub>2</sub> for SAF.

### Page 7

- Total emissions forecast for 2050 now reduced to 62MtCO<sub>2</sub> and SAF nearly tripled.
- Carbon Capture was supposed to be the "last resort for unabated emissions".
- Aviation industry's growth forecast much higher than Jet Zero numbers.
- Jet Zero forecast will breach global warming limits in Climate Change Act.
- **DEEP EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS NEEDED NOW – REDUCE FLYING.**

### Page 8

- Various solutions suggested by aviation industry that are aimed to fool the public and decision makers. All are unrealistic/unviable.

### Page 9

- Aviation industry wants governments (us) to pay for SAF infrastructure. Government gave £900m to fund the industry's growth. Passengers should pay.
- Most SAF isn't sustainable. If anyone suggests used cooking oil for SAF, they haven't a clue.
- Even if vegetation could be used, growing vs consumption time are not comparable.
- E-kerosine requires huge amounts of green electricity – that everyone else wants.

### Page 10

- Carbon Capture will be too late to avoid catastrophic climate change.

### Page 12

- Cost of flying needs to increase to cover cost – Environment Act 2021 says “polluter Pays.

### Page 13

- Millions of people now under flightpaths.
- Ironically, areas near airports often don't have many overflying aircraft.
- Policy has been set to put flightpaths over rural areas (including national parks).
- Noise impact is greatest in quiet rural areas that are often designated as public spaces for mental wellbeing and protected by Air Navigation Guidance 2017.

### Page 14

- Must include environmental protection and public health protection – not just focussed on reduced travel time for the few.
- Can't treat airspace the way we have treated rivers.
- CAGNE working on challenging new Gatwick runway.

### Page 15

- Gatwick & Heathrow can't handle more flights without more runways.
- GPS allows a concentration of flights along a very narrow track.
- That allows more flightpaths.
- That reduces the opportunity for respite.
- That means more people disturbed by noise.
- Hence the terms “sewers in the sky”.

### Page 16

- Farnborough Airspace change in 2020 applied the same solutions and processes that will be used for AMS.
- Many areas saw a big increase in flights and noise disturbance.
- Impact on health, environment. £2bn Waverley house prices.
- People selling houses (and estate agents) now legally require to inform buyers of changes to flightpaths and flight numbers.
- Review of impact of change in airspace has been delayed by FOUR YEARS (PIR).
- **LITTLE PUBLIC FAITH IN THE PROCESS.**

### Page 17 (see P37)

- Macquarie owns Thames Water/Southern Water. History is to convert debt to dividends.
- Airport is loss making with £550m debt but paying £55m to Macquarie/dividends. Few operators (ie those who operate the aircraft/ maintain aircraft) based in UK.
- Airport employs only ~ 200 people, 400 in total including hotel. Most low skill (cleaning, catering, security). Some high skill jobs but with other businesses and not dependent on private jet flights
- Debt/losses mean FAL unlikely to invest to create new jobs.

### **Page 18**

- Business case needs more detail and data.  
CAA data shows only 15% - 30% flights are for “Business”. Most flights are leisure.
- Offering “scheduled” per seat flights and flights for pets – not allowed.
- Business case didn’t include any disbenefits – just benefits to FAL and RBC.
- No consideration of health impacts.
- No measurement of noise. Only measured in Churt and only Farnborough aircraft.

### **Page 19**

- Consultation and justification was on set flightpaths
- First to introduce Performance Based Navigation which means narrow flight paths.
- Evaluation of impacts (PIR) still not completed
- Impacts Guildford already suffering from Heathrow along A3.

### **Page 20**

- Data provided by CAA is misleading and they won’t explain it.

### **Page 22**

- Should be easy to define and assess those “significantly” affected by noise.
- Only one limited noise assessment completed (Churt).
- CEO of CAA (Richard Moriarty) committed to MPs to measure all noise.

### **Page 23**

- Flightpaths and heights not being flown as set out. Using all airspace.
- Churt report suggest they are affected by a significant noise.

### **Page 24**

- Does not include all aircraft
- Churt report counts 1,208 flights. 39 per day vs 100+ actually experienced.

### **Page 25**

- Churt noise already measured at Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level.
- CAA’s “Overflown” guidelines was not intended for noise measurement.

### **Page 26**

- Average noise over 16 hours is not relevant as it is point noises that cause disturbance.
- Takes a lot of noise to result in average of 54dB over 16 hours in a rural area.

### **Page 27**

- Not just Farnborough that impacts locally.
- Each airport has its own noise budget, ie each may have 54dB noise budget.
- People on ground experience combination of much more than 54dB combined.