



Appeal by: Bristol Airport Limited

Appeal Reference: APP/D0121/W/20/3259234

North Somerset Council Application Reference: 18/P/5118/OUT

**Summary proof of evidence of
Dani Fiumicelli BSc (Hons), MSc, MCIEH, MIOA
Noise**

Reference: NSC/W2/2

Vanguardia

BRISTOL AIRPORT PLANNING APPEAL

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE: APP/D0121/W/20/3259234

VC-103362-AA-RP-0001

R00

15TH JUNE 2021

SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE ON NOISE

DANI FIUMICELLI

FOR THE NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL

NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL REFERENCE: 18/P/5118/OUT

PROOF OF EVIDENCE ON NOISE AN APPEAL BY BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED PURSUANT TO SECTION 78 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 AGAINST THE DECISION OF NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL TO REFUSE TO GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION, WITH SOME RESERVED MATTERS INCLUDED AND OTHERS RESERVED FOR SUBSEQUENT APPROVAL, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF BRISTOL AIRPORT, NORTH SIDE ROAD, FELTON, WRINGTON, BS48 3DP PINS REF: APP/X5210/Y/20/3248003 & APP/X5210/W/20/3248002

VANGUARDIA
| | | | | | | |

15TH JUNE 2021

DOCUMENT CONTROL			
DOCUMENT TITLE	BRISTOL AIRPORT PLANNING APPEAL - NOISE	REVISION	R00
DOCUMENT NUMBER	VC-103362-AA-RP-0001	ISSUE DATE	15TH JUNE 2021
PLANNING INSPECTORATE REF: APP/D0121/W/20/3259234			
NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL REF: 18/P/5118/OUT			
PROJECT NUMBER	103362	AUTHOR	DANI FIUMICELLI
STATUS	ISSUE		
ISSUED TO	PINS		

REVISION HISTORY		
REVISION	NOTES	DATE ISSUED
R01		15 TH JUNE 2021

This report was prepared on behalf of the Client ("Issued to") and takes into account any particular requirements and instructions from the Client. Its use is governed by the Contract between the Client and Vanguardia Limited. Where reproduced, the document shall be reproduced in full. Any other use shall be subject to the prior written permission of Vanguardia Limited. Unless indicated otherwise, all material in this document is the property of Vanguardia Limited.



VANGUARDIA LIMITED

HEAD OFFICE

21 Station Road West, Oxted
Surrey RH8 9EE

Tel +44 (0) 1883 718690

office@vanguardia.co.uk
vanguardia.co.uk

15TH JUNE 2021

15TH JUNE 2021

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION, SCOPE OF EVIDENCE & REASONS FOR REFUSAL	5
2. QUALIFICATIONS & PERSONAL STATEMENT	7
3. POLICY AND GUIDANCE	9
4. CONCLUSIONS	10

1. INTRODUCTION, SCOPE OF EVIDENCE & REASONS FOR REFUSAL

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This summary proof of evidence is submitted to the inquiry on behalf of the North Somerset Council (NSC) regarding an appeal by Bristol Airport Limited (BAL) pursuant to section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against the decision of NSC to refuse to grant outline planning permission, with some reserved matters included and others reserved for subsequent approval, for the development of Bristol Airport, North Side Road, Felton, Wrington, BS48 3DP PINS ref: APP/X5210/Y/20/3248003 & APP/X5210/W/20/3248002.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 1.2. The noise related reasons for refusing planning permission are reproduced below:

"1. The airport has planning permission to expand to a throughput of 10 million passengers per annum (mppa) which allows for further expansion in passenger growth of approximately 1 mppa above the current passenger level. The further expansion beyond 10mppa now proposed would generate additional noise, traffic and off airport car parking resulting in adverse environmental impacts on communities surrounding Bristol Airport and which would have an adverse impact on an inadequate surface access infrastructure. The claimed economic benefits arising from the proposal would not outweigh the environmental harm caused by the development contrary to policy CS23 of the North Somerset Core Strategy 2017.

2. The noise and impact on air quality generated by the increase in aircraft movements and in particular the proposed lifting of seasonal restrictions on night flights would have a significant adverse impact on the health and well-being of residents in local

communities and the Proposed Development would not contribute to improving the health and well-being of the local population contrary to policies CS3, CS23 and CS26 of the North Somerset Core Strategy 2017."

2. QUALIFICATIONS & PERSONAL STATEMENT

2.1. Qualifications and Experience

2.2. I am a technical director of Vanguardia Limited, a company whose services include specialising in the field of acoustics, noise, and vibration. I was awarded the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health's Diploma in 1986 and a Master of Science (MSc) in Environmental Acoustics from the Southbank University in 1999; and have over 30 years of experience in the field of acoustics having worked as an Environmental Health Officer in London from 1986 until 2002, and as an acoustic consultant in the private sector since then. I am a corporate member of the Institute of Acoustics (IoA) and the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health Officers (CIEH), and I am a member of the IoA Environmental Noise Committee. My airport specific experience includes being an expert noise witness at public inquiries for the Heathrow, London City, Farnborough and Ronaldsway, Isle of Man Airports; advising the Heathrow Community Engagement Board, supporting Slough Borough Council on the Heathrow Airport Expansion – 3rd Runway and Independent Parallel Approaches plans; developing a methodology for assessing the Impacts of Aviation Noise on Heritage Assets for English Heritage; and being the discipline lead and project manager for the noise and vibration chapter of the ES for a second parallel main runway at Calgary International Airport.

2.3. I have visited the vicinity of the proposed scheme and viewed the existing airport layout and the relationship with the nearest noise sensitive properties affected by ground and air noise from publicly accessible areas around the scheme. I have also visited communities and settlements further away that are affected by the noise from aircraft travelling to and from the airport.

2.4. Personal Statement

I, Dani Fiumicelli declare that:

2.4.1. The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this appeal reference APP/D0121/W/20/3259234, in this proof of evidence is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institutions, and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

3. POLICY AND GUIDANCE

POLICY CONCLUSIONS

3.1. In summary National and local planning policy and guidance require that:

- The number of people in the UK significantly affected by aircraft noise is to be limited and where possible reduced.
- Future growth in aviation should ensure that benefits are shared between the aviation industry and local communities. This means that the industry must continue to reduce and mitigate noise as airport capacity grows. As noise levels fall with technology improvements the aviation industry should be expected to share the benefits from these improvements.
- Aviation growth is only acceptable where noise is reduced and residual effects mitigated.
- The worst, unacceptable, effects of noise on its own that remain despite mitigation, must be prevented; and,
- That the significant adverse effects of noise should be avoided; and,
- The adverse effects of adverse impacts should be mitigated and minimised;
- Harm to amenity and health by noise must be limited to acceptable levels;
- Quality of life shall be protected against adverse noise effects.
- Health should be improved where possible.

4. CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1. The ES and AES conclude that the likely noise effects of the 12MPPA scheme are "*Not significant*".
- 4.2. The rationale for finding that the noise impacts will not be significant is broadly that the ES and AES found there are no receptors subject to significant operational noise and vibration effects due to the change in noise between the 'Without Development' (10 MPPA) and 'With Development' (12 MPPA) scenarios.
- 4.3. The AES and ES conclusion that no significant adverse noise effects are likely is considered unsafe for reasons including the following:
- Use of the LAeq,T metric is appropriate, but not as the sole metric against which to assess the significance of noise effects. In addition, supplementary metrics should also be considered.
 - Established direct impacts of aviation noise on health such as cardiac effects, stroke, hypertension etc. are not evaluated in either the ES or AES noise or human health chapters. The ES and AES both show that in 2030 noise from the 12MPPA scheme will affect a wider area, a greater number of dwellings and more people than the 10MPPA scheme. Consequently, the attendant risks of direct health effects of aircraft noise are greater for the 12 MPPA scheme than for 10MPPA.
 - The air noise impact ratings - change in noise level, used in the ES and addendum underestimates the degree of impact of small increases in LAeq16 hr day and LAeq8 Hr night noise levels caused by substantial increases in numbers of ATMs.
 - The fleet mix in future is likely to retain a larger proportion of noisier aircraft and a smaller proportion of the less noisy aircraft types than assumed in the noise predictions

for the ES and AES. This means that the future noise levels could be higher than assessed in the ES and AES and affect a greater number of people more adversely than described in the ES and AES.

- The proposed development results in a worsening of an already stressed adverse and significantly adverse noise environment for the local community and not the improved one which the APF and MBU requires to be delivered if additional use of existing capacity is to be permitted.

4.4. However, notwithstanding the issues described above, it is also considered that the findings of the ES and AES that there are no receptors subject to significant operational noise and vibration effects due to the change between the 'Without Development' (10 MPPA) and 'With Development' (12 MPPA) scenarios is over optimistic because as described in detail in my evidence this evidence the Proposed Development would:

- Increase the number of people experiencing significant adverse and adverse impacts on health and quality of life from air noise e.g. with the 12MPPA scenario in 2030 an additional 247 persons are predicted experience an increase in noise to above SOAEL at night compared to 10 MPPA; and 1100 and 4000 more persons respectively above LOAEL during the day and at night .
- Not sufficiently mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life e.g. the proposed noise insulation scheme is insufficient in terms of spatial scope and only addresses internal noise impacts and not those in private and public outdoor amenity spaces; at the cost of requiring residents to keep windows closed, which is itself a significant adverse impact on quality of life in rural and locations that would otherwise be relatively quiet.

- Contribute to a deterioration in health and quality of life by worsening already significant adverse and adverse effects of noise associated with the operation of the airport.
- Not ensure that impacts are reduced to an acceptable level since the population adversely impacted by noise increases, including those experiencing noise above SOAEL
- Not demonstrate satisfactory resolution of impacts, particularly those on surrounding communities
- Not contribute to improving the health and well being of the local population; rather it contributes to a reduction in health, well-being and quality of life of the local population.

Registered in England 05666276



VANGUARDIA LIMITED

LONDON OFFICE

The Ministry
79-81 Borough Road
London SE1 1DN

MANCHESTER OFFICE

Jactin House
24 Hood Street
Manchester M4 6WX

HEAD OFFICE

21 Station Road West, Oxted
Surrey RH8 9EE

Tel +44 (0) 1883 718690

office@vanguardia.co.uk
vanguardia.co.uk