

# HEATHROW EXPANSION MEANS FEWER FLIGHTS TO YOUR REGION



www.no3rdrunwaycoalition.co.uk

## **BREAKING: East of England to lose over 50,000 flights per year by 2050 if Heathrow expands**

In order to maximise the numbers of MPs voting for the Tory Government's Heathrow plans on Monday 25 June, the Government and Heathrow are embarking on a series of last minute promises to devolved nations and regions on increasing the numbers of flights to and from Heathrow with a third runway.

The Airports National Policy Statement (NPS) analysis forecasts that there would be just 5 domestic routes with a third runway at Heathrow (compared to 3 without expansion) which is down from 8 today. Without a regional slot allocation preference or some sort subsidy that these new routes may not be commercially viable.

The Department for Transport (DfT) forecasts that growth at non-London airports between 2016 and 2030 will be 24% less due to a third runway at Heathrow and 17% less at between 2016 and 2050.

The Transport Select Committee concluded that in total there will be **170,000 fewer flights** from non-London airports compared to a no expansion scenario. This is based on data extracted from the DfT's Aviation Forecasts 2017. This can be viewed here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-aviation-forecasts-2017> (see disaggregate data) or the aggregated data attached to this briefing.

### **Across the East of England, the number of flights lost by 2050 as a result of Heathrow expansion are as follows:**

Airport	No. of flights per year in 2050 <b>without</b> Heathrow expansion	No. of flights per year in 2050 <b>with</b> Heathrow expansion	No. of flights <b>LOST</b> per year by 2050	Percentage of flights <b>LOST</b> per year by 2050
<b>NORWICH</b>	39,651	25,020	<b>-14,631</b>	<b>-36.9%</b>
<b>SOUTHEND</b>	48,400	10,906	<b>-37,494</b>	<b>-77.5%</b>

This means that there will be at least **52,125 fewer flights at airports across the East of England by 2050** if expansion at Heathrow proceeds.

## **PUBLIC SERVICE OBLIGATIONS**

The Airports Commission report recognised that 'reserving' slots for domestic routes is not currently an option as it would be in breach of EU regulations. Public Service Orders would be possible, but there are restrictions on which routes would qualify and these would be entirely dependent upon the willingness of the UK Government to provide subsidies.

The NPS still does not recognise the considerable restrictions in the use of PSOs - including on their scope and timing (can only be used for city-city connections not airport to airport).

The DfT has responded with promises to keep passenger charges flat but this means Heathrow expansion then has a black hole in its funding. Promises to ringfence slots for regional airports are undeliverable in law - Heathrow cannot instruct airlines to fly to a place any more than the DfT can - but more than that, as someone once said, you can't buck the markets.

Is there evidence the DfT can really "buy" routes to be viable? No, in fact we know it cannot.

The DfT Regional Air Connectivity Fund launched 11 routes in 2016, under existing already expensive Heathrow passenger charges. Of those 11 routes launched, 9 failed entirely and only 2 are left, but operating at reduced frequency. The economics that led to these paltry results then get worse after expansion.

Further, Government has yet to make clear whether it is prepared to financially support these regional connections. Alternatively, Heathrow could potentially subsidise links with UK regional airports in perpetuity. However, this is not something that they have committed to.

## **COST**

As a result, keeping your regional airports connected to London Heathrow will require long term taxpayers' subsidy for private airlines which will be in the gift of whichever Government to decide, and is likely to be unsuccessful. To use taxpayers' money to support a private company to become more like a monopoly to grow and stifle competition everywhere else in the country seems nonsensical. To have a strategy that centres on London at the direct expense of connections for the rest of the country also seems wrong.

Why should people living hundreds of miles outside London have to travel there, requiring extra time and expense, when we could actually be delivering more connectivity on people's doorsteps?

Moreover, in the CBI's 2016 *Unlocking Regional Growth* report, businesses recognised the need to better link regions to international markets to increase and encourage export capabilities.<sup>1</sup> It is clear that businesses want to fly directly to centers of trade and commerce without the need to transfer before reaching their destination.

**It is clear that direct flights to and from regional airports will bring much greater benefit to the people and economy of the East of England than an expanded Heathrow ever could.**

**STAND UP FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND BY VOTING AGAINST THE AIRPORTS NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT ON MONDAY 25<sup>TH</sup> JUNE**

For more information, contact Paul Beckford, Parliamentary Officer, 07775 593928  
[info@no3rdrunwaycoalition.co.uk](mailto:info@no3rdrunwaycoalition.co.uk)

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cbi.org.uk/insight-and-analysis/unlocking-regional-growth/>