

Response to All Party- Parliamentary Group on Aviation. (Draft)

1. APD

- a. In so far as it is not matched by other countries it does place the UK at a competitive disadvantage. In particular the UK, being on islands, is dependent on Tourists flying in. Tourists from the European mainland can access other mainland countries by land. Tourists to the UK have to put up with overcrowded airports plus APD. This is one reason why the UK tourist trade does so badly compared to, say, France. The doubling of the rate from 1st March 2012 with a further increase from 1 April 2013 increases this disadvantage. UK resident tourists have no choice but to use UK airports.
- b. Visit Britain together other travel organisations should be able to supply this quantification.
- c. Surely the Treasury did this before recommending increases in APD?

2. Economic Impact

- a. The main constraint is the lack of convenient Airport capacity in the SE i.e Heathrow at about 99% of capacity and Gatwick not far off. Even minor mishaps cause delays because there is no recovery reserve. The next constraint is ground access especially to airports other than Heathrow and Gatwick.
- b. No, it is the role of the Government to provide an economic environment which so far as possible leaves demand to undistorted market forces. All too often Government attempts to manage are politically motivated and tend to be to oppose change.

It should however be the role of Government to encourage the UK aerospace industry which is the world's second largest in output and technological skills. This industry will do more than any other, through the diffusion of advanced technology, to regenerate the UK's manufacturing industry. The Government should however avoid the temptation to encourage glamour projects lacking a commercial basis i.e SR Princess flying boat, Concorde, the early Tridents and many more.

- c. Germany and France in particular have encouraged airport expansion (Frankfurt and Charles De Gaulle) to the benefit of their airlines, aircraft support and maintenance industries, their tourist industries and the location of international companies..

3. Environmental Impact

- a. Impossible to answer, there are too many variables and many environmental problems, like noise, dumped fuel and soot, are very localised.
- b. Negligible except for members of the population who are directly exposed as in the Windsor area. It should be noted that few complaints come from residents who live close to, say, Heathrow and work at, or supply, the airport but residents who live further away but within earshot are more likely to complain, possibly because they have less noise insulation or because the noise is more intermittent.
- c. What is enough? In terms of noise the Government should support development of airports like Gatwick and Stansted which are surrounded by open countryside and also have more scope for the development of ground access. By contrast Heathrow is aligned so that aircraft fly East/West over densely populated areas while the

Response to All Party- Parliamentary Group on Aviation. (Draft)

existing development of the area makes the provision of more ground access difficult to engineer and expensive to build.

- d. Yes. See 1a above. Some consideration should be given to modify APT so that it encourages less emissions and noise per passenger. This could be done by reconsidering charging aircraft takeoffs rather than passenger takeoffs and by relating the duty to noise and emission levels. The latter aspect would encourage earlier replacement of old aircraft by new low noise and low fuel consumption aircraft. This would also benefit UK manufacturing because of the comparatively high UK input into the latest aircraft produced by Airbus and Boeing.

Cllr John Lenton

RBWM Councillor

Horton and Wraysbury

Member Wraysbury Parish Council

Chairman RBWM Aviation Forum

01784 482001

07889 991877