

# **Expansion of Bristol Airport to 12mppa**

PINS Ref APP/D0121/W/20/3259234  
Planning Application Ref: 18/P/5118/OUT

# **Proof of Evidence**

## **for PCCA**

Hilary Burn

## **Parish Councils Airport Association Proof of Evidence – Residential Amenity**

### **1. Personal Details – Hilary Burn**

- 1.1. I have been a resident of Cleeve village since 1984, living directly under the flight path. I have a degree in Environmental Studies. I have been a Councillor for Cleeve Parish Council since 1998 serving as Chair for several years. I am the representative for Cleeve Parish Council on the Parish Councils Airport Association (PCAA) and on the Bristol Airport Consultative Committee (BACC). I have been Chair of the PCAA since 2006 and in this role represent its membership of 30 parishes and one town council who wish me to be the voice of their residents on matters concerning the Airport. Although I am not a subject expert, I have become knowledgeable in respect of the concerns of parishes.
- 1.2. All members of the PCAA are democratically elected, follow the mandate of their electorate and are held accountable. We now represent more than 50,000 people and this has grown considerably as 9 additional parishes have joined the PCAA since the Airport's planning application was submitted. The growth of the PCAA reflects the gravity of the many impacts caused by Airport operations over three neighbouring districts: North Somerset (NSC), Bath and North East Somerset (BANES) and Sedgemoor. This has been brought into sharper focus with the knowledge that action is required to avert the impending climate and biodiversity crises. All Parish Councils in the PCAA have objected to the planning application alongside NSC, BANES, Bristol City Council and Mendip Council. We believe this gives Inspectors a mandate to support a recommendation of dismissal. Attached in Appendix A are witness statements from many parishes and individuals.

### **2. Scope of Evidence**

- 2.1. Owing to the complexities surrounding aviation policies, we have engaged three experts to represent the PCAA and give evidence: Tim Johnson from the Aviation Environment Federation on emissions; Alex Chapman from the New Economics Foundation on the economic case; and Lawrence Vaughan on noise. For my part, I am providing evidence on residential amenity: the impacts of traffic, car parking, green belt, noise, health, runway length and Conditions. The North Somerset

Council (NSC) Decision Notice, 'Reasons for Refusal', adequately reflects the issues raised by parishes and lists the relevant policies within the Local Development Plan<sup>1</sup>.

2.2. We are acutely aware that national policy surrounding airport expansion is in flux, evident from the email from the UKACCs Secretariat to the BACC Committee which shows that the Department for Transport's 'Making Best Use' policy may not be fit for purpose<sup>2</sup>. The PCAA believe that there are ample grounds for a dismissal either by the Government or the Inspectorate. There are two key issues, one of national importance and one of local importance:

2.2.1. Firstly, there is the issue of greenhouse gases and reaching the Net Zero target.

2.2.2. Secondly, there is the set of local issues particular to Bristol Airport, notably the inadequacy of the road network surrounding the Airport, the significant noise impacts, intrusion into green belt land, air quality and health impacts, loss of biodiversity and all of this balanced by very meagre economic benefits.

2.2.3. Both issues are of equal importance and both are worthy of this Appeal being unconditionally dismissed by whoever takes the final decision.

2.3. Bristol Airport is situated in a rural location with inadequate surface access infrastructure, discussed below.

2.4. This proof should be read in conjunction with our response to the Addendum to the Environmental Statement and our original response to the planning application.

### **3. Traffic**

3.1. All parishes in their witness statements have highlighted issues with surface access to Bristol Airport (excluding Timsbury Parish, 13 miles away). I highlight in particular two witness statements from Winford and Chew Magna PCs which comment on their experience of traffic through their villages in 2019 when the Airport reached 9 mppa<sup>4</sup>. (Appendix A.)

3.2. Around 82.5 % of passengers will travel by private car at 12 mppa; there is no rail link, no dual carriageway and the airport is not situated close to a motorway. There will be no rail link or mass transit within this period of growth<sup>5</sup>. The only proposals to mitigate the impacts of increased traffic to the Airport to 2030 -2034 are highway improvements along the A38. The draft 106 Agreement/Conditions include surface

access highway works, parking and enforcement and the A38 / Downside Road / West Lane Improvement Scheme do not alleviate the concerns of parishes, as highlighted in their witness statements<sup>6</sup>. At peak times there is a more substantial increase of traffic: both the Northern roundabout giving access to the Airport terminal and the Southern roundabout giving access to the silver Zone show an increase of 17%<sup>7</sup>. The proposed improvements are a mere tweaking of the road network with car travel remaining dominant on a single carriageway 'A' road, and increasing.

- 3.3. Traffic to the Airport constantly seeks new routes to avoid congestion which inevitably means increased traffic on rural lanes such as Brockley Combe, Stock Lane and West Lane close to the Airport. This results in congestion elsewhere, poorer air quality and an increase in emissions. This will increase further due to the Bristol Clean Air Zone (CAZ) commencing October 2021 as some petrol and diesel cars, taxis and HGVs become non-compliant. The map for the CAZ has emerged and shows that the route from the M5 along Portway to reach the south Bristol Link Road will require a charge<sup>8</sup>. Many travellers will change their route to avoid payment. To date, no assessment has been given on the potential impact on airport-related and other traffic distribution or on air quality all of which remains unknown<sup>9</sup>.
- 3.4. New housing developments also add more traffic to our road network surrounding the Airport, particularly as North Somerset residents have a larger proportion of cars and vans than other regions in the South West<sup>10</sup>.
- 3.5. The PCAA conclude that further Airport growth, new housing developments and the CAZ will increase traffic and congestion through villages surrounding the Airport which will further reduce the well-being of residents.
- 3.6. The modal split target of 17.5% public transport usage still allows car movements to the airport to increase. It is also the worst modal split of any major airport in the UK. The split should be set higher at 25% in order to reduce traffic in the surrounding area and to improve sustainability<sup>11</sup>.
- 3.7. The Airport infrastructure is being examined by the Western Gateway Sub-regional Transport Body, made up of Local Authorities and West of England Combined Authority. Their Strategic Transport Plan 2025 -2050 is in its infancy and is to incorporate the

Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan, soon to be announced. Minutes from the organisation show that it recognises connectivity to the Airport is poor with no direct link on to the motorway network and is served by the single-carriageway A38. The possibility of a rail link is possible for 2040, if selected for development<sup>52</sup>

- 3.8. The JTLF 4 led by the WECA shows details of a Mass Transit Scheme as rail or a tram service and commenced a detailed study in late 2020 to be delivered in the long term. Meanwhile, the Airport is reliant on bus services to reduce car travel. The JTLF 4 assumes the four-line mass transit network to the region would cost approx. £2.5bn to deliver, and that, if there is a need to deliver some sections underground, this cost will rise further, which is the case to the Airport, due to topography, South Bristol urban area and Barrow Tanks <sup>53</sup>. The PCAA question whether the Mass transit to the Airport will ever be delivered due to affordability.

#### **4. Car parking in surrounding villages**

- 4.1. Car parking occurs on village streets, Felton Common and on the rural lanes surrounding the Airport as described in the parish witness statements from all parishes in North Somerset excluding Barrow Gurney parish who comment generally on the parking at the Airport. (Appendix A). Some of the car parking is by passengers catching the bus to the Airport to avoid car parking fees<sup>12</sup>. This can clog up local villages, especially some of the highly inconsiderate parking which gets in the way of access for local residents. Car parking also brings anti-social behaviour such as noise from car doors opening and shutting, light impacts late at night and the dropping of litter<sup>13</sup>.

#### **5. Green Belt & Silver Zone Car Parking**

- 5.1. Although the land south of the Airport is green belt land and should be protected, parishes have already seen the erosion of the 'openness of the green belt' under the planning consent to 10 mppa. The Airport freely uses its permitted development rights over the wishes of the community. The prime example is Lulsgate House, the 3-storey administration block on the South side. Planning Conditions stipulated that this development should have been on the North side and only two storeys high<sup>14</sup>. On behalf of parishes, I cannot adequately express the anger and dismay at this development which has been allowed in a rural landscape. I note that the Airport is currently trying to rent out Lulsgate House. This would seem to suggest it is not

being used for operational services at the airport and therefore doesn't have permitted development rights (Class F Part 8 GPDO 2015). If this appeal is not dismissed then at least aviation permitted development rights should be removed within the airport boundary, as happened as part of planning conditions for the A38 to be diverted which was completed in 2001. This is requested because even small changes at the airport have the ability to create lasting and long term effects in a rural area immediately adjacent to an AONB.

5.2. The green belt is not just used for car parking but also for activities that come with car parking such as the car rental hire building. Further encroachment on the green belt with the extension of the Silver Zone car park encourages and enables more car traffic to the airport and creates a range of negative effects. These are:

5.2.1. The effect on the Mendip Hills AONB which is 3 km away from the Airport with the nearest point being at Butcombe. Negative impacts are caused by associated road traffic through the Chew Valley and Mendip Hills with airport-related, car movements on the A37 and A39 to reach the A38 via the A 368, B 3134, B 3114, and the B 313. Other impacts include noise from cars and flights, light pollution which can be seen from the Mendip Hills, air pollution and erosion of the fabric of the landscape (road verges, stone walls). Natural England advises that flights and traffic be directed away from the AONB<sup>16</sup>.

5.2.2. There will be more air, noise and light pollution at the Silver Zone site from the airport operations on the south side, which is green belt land. This includes more aircraft movements on the taxiways, more car and bus movements. The reduction in meadow land and green fields to allow for more airport operations and car parking inevitably brings a loss of biodiversity. This is not just the loss of foraging for Greater and Lesser Horseshoe Bats (protected species) but a decline in insects and wildlife generally, such as badgers.

5.2.3. The development of the green fields brings more lighting which affects the foraging of the bats.

5.2.4. There is an assumption within the application that the replacement land providing foraging for bats will be sufficient to maintain the current population but no survey has been undertaken to substantiate this claim. Natural England states this land must

be functional before car parking commences on site and this could take many years<sup>17</sup>.

5.2.5. The loss of green fields is a loss of open countryside and further urbanisation in a predominantly rural landscape. It enables an increase in aviation emissions and car emissions from more traffic, the change of land use from agricultural pasture to car parking and the removal of hedgerows and trees which act as a carbon sink and cleans the air<sup>18</sup>.

5.2.6. Natural England encourages NSC to seek a net gain in biodiversity<sup>19</sup>. The PCAA do not believe that this has been demonstrated in the application.

5.3. The parking strategy for passengers cannot be considered sustainable and, importantly, there has been no attempt to allocate any costs to the negative impacts in order to facilitate a cost-benefit assessment. The negative impacts include:

5.3.1. The undermining of public transport to and from the Airport. There is a conflict of interest between the Airport appearing to support an increase in public transport whilst being dependent on parking as a source of revenue – this is low cost for the airport to provide because the car parking is on open land but highly profitable for the airport representing around 33% of their annual revenue.

5.3.2. The parking strategy encroaches on green belt and other open land and, as stated in the Officers Report, is inappropriate development in the greenbelt<sup>20</sup>.

5.3.3. Flying is one of the most carbon intensive activities an individual can do and should not be encouraged by a low-cost parking strategy. A more sustainable approach would be to:

5.3.3.1. Insist that parking is in multi-storey car parks thereby removing the need to use open and green belt land

5.3.3.2. Charge a higher price to help fund the cost of the car parks. This will also help to increase use of public transport

5.3.3.3. Understand that higher charges may lead more people to park away from the airport including on rural lanes and neighbouring villages. To help prevent this, public transport needs to be efficient and low-cost and

enforcement needs to be used to constrain levels of inappropriate parking.

5.3.4. The car parking addendum states that the average wealth for the region is due to increase which then increases the proportion of passengers who will pay to park<sup>21</sup>. If the wealth in the region increases, passengers will be able to afford to pay for car parking in the MSCP 2 & 3.

5.3.5. Currently Bristol Airport has a near monopoly position on car parking and they will wish to retain this. The Airport's business model is predicated car parking that costs them little to provide. This undermines sustainability and is not a valid reason to harm the local environment when alternative approaches are available and practical.

5.4. Under the 10 mppa planning consent MSCP 2 was originally agreed to be developed along with the Public Transport Interchange (PTI) at 9 mppa and they have still not been delivered. The MSCP 2 and PTI have always had the support of the PCAA. The PTI would help deliver the modal split so vital to reduce traffic and emissions and reduce the need for car parking on the green belt. The MSCP also provides additional car parking spaces, reducing the need for green belt land and the need for passengers to be bussed to the terminal, again reducing emissions. This supports the view of Jacobs that the MSCP should be constructed before the commencement of any 12 mppa development<sup>22</sup>.

5.5. The MSCP 2 has not been developed as the Airport is financially dependent on low cost parking and receives approximately a third of all revenue from car parking<sup>23</sup>.

5.6. Conclusion: If the Airport developed the MSCP 2 and 3 at the same time with passengers charged a reasonable fee, there would be no need for the Silver Zone extension and this would reduce car parking in villages and rural lanes.

## **6. Noise**

6.1. Part of the PCAA role is to respond to all consultations, local, regional and national, concerning airport noise. The airport is situated in a rural location and airport noise dominates the locality. It operates 24/7 with no relief provided.

6.2. The noise modelling is all done on the basis of average noise levels over a 92 day period and success is claimed when, for example, a quieter plane reduces the



average noise level by say 2dB. This certainly helps but, importantly, residents hear individual noise *events* not an average of noise. Large numbers of aircraft movements, even if they are a fraction quieter, still represent a massive intrusion into the rural environment and residents' homes and gardens.

- 6.3. There is a significant increase in noise early in the day: between 06.00 and 07.30 hrs with a flight every three minutes in the summer months of July, August and September and likewise, between 23.00 – 23.30 hrs to avoid the night movement limit. The Airport is always busier at weekends, holiday periods and half-terms, when residents most want to use their gardens or be outside. Growth to 12 mppa would make this the case throughout a 16-hour day.
- 6.4. The 2011 planning consent has allowed a gradual increase in flights during the day and at night. Further growth will mean that as one aircraft is overhead, another aircraft is taxiing into position giving additional background noise. Meanwhile there will be aircraft on stands, testing their engines and preparing to depart which again means additional noise.
- 6.5. At 12 mppa there will be no tranquillity left. Every day will become similar to the current busy periods when there is constant interference and annoyance. You have to raise your voice and shout when having a conversation or apologise on the phone stating that there is a flight overhead. The noise is stressful and you find yourself waiting for and anticipating the next plane. The only way to escape is to leave your home and go somewhere out of the flight path. All parishes have concerns on noise.
- 6.6. BAL mentions in their growth case scenarios a proposed timetable for the introduction of a new generation of marginally quieter aircraft. It is claimed that these are quieter by around 3dB but it is important to note that the human ear cannot distinguish volume changes of less than 3dB so this is a marginal improvement. In any event, the increase in movements (noise events) will negate any benefits for residents, and by any standard these aircraft are still noisy<sup>24</sup>. Furthermore, the fleet mix of the airline operators is totally beyond BAL's control. It is driven by economic and operational factors determined by the airlines. Any attempt to determine or even to influence the fleet mix by a planning condition is unrealistic<sup>25</sup>.

- 6.7. To date, the Airport has yet to penalise an airline for noise infringements or incorrect flying procedure, even a significant instance described in the local press <sup>26</sup>. It is not in the interests of an airport to impose a fine on an airline as they are important customers and may move their services to another airport.
- 6.8. This was highlighted at the Airport Consultative Committee July 2015 and taken to the Civil Aviation Authority<sup>27</sup>. The final CAA report on this incident went to the Bristol Airport Consultative Committee meeting in January 2016. The recommendations made by the CAA were never made known on their website or to the committee. I highlight this example to show how difficult communication is within the ACC and how impossible it feels for any penalties to be placed by Bristol Airport on an airline.
- 6.9. We have consistently called for a night-time ban on aircraft movements. Bristol Airport is well aware that night noise is disrupting to residents as every meeting and consultation has led to a request for a reduction in night time flying leading to a ban. The Airport is aware that sleep disturbance causes health impacts from all the reports we highlight in a number of consultations<sup>28</sup>. Residents are unable to sleep with their windows open because of noise disturbance.
- 6.10. On behalf of parishes and at every opportunity we have requested no further increase in night flights. Screen shots of night flight schedules and examples of complaints are given in the night noise section of our submission to application 18/P/5118/OUT with a map of the area<sup>29</sup>. Flights at night are not for business travel but for leisure and are primarily the domain of low-cost operators.
- 6.11. We note that the Aviation Policy Framework has a policy objective that indicates airports must make every possible effort to reduce noise<sup>30</sup>. Bristol Airport is trying hard to move in the opposite direction – they wish to remove the seasonal caps on night movements in order to create an annual cap. This is so as to allow for significantly more night flights in the summer months. The draft Conditions indicate that over a 92 day period there may be up to 53 flights during the hours of 23.00-07.00, one every 9 minutes<sup>31</sup>. This goes completely against the wishes of local residents who must bear the pain of this noise intrusion. In our view there must be no more night flights.

6.12. The main compensation for noise offered to residents is the noise insulation grant for a dwelling. It does not take account of lack of enjoyment of one's garden and irritation outside from the constant noise of aircraft movements 24/7. It fails to follow the Treasury Green Book Guidance<sup>32</sup>. For residents living in the 57 db noise contour the sum of £2,500 is granted. This is pitiful and relies on the home owner to fund the rest of the cost.

## **7. Health**

- 7.1. Residents complain to Parish Councils on a regular basis about the road network and noise from airport activities under the current permission to grow to 10 mppa. These complaints will only increase with growth to 12 mppa. Many parishes have highlighted that the impacts are affecting the health, well-being and quality of life of parishioners<sup>33</sup>. There is the added concern arising from the pandemic that the virus will mutate as seen by the Indian variant and will be brought back by travellers to the UK<sup>34</sup>.
- 7.2. BAL plays down the health risk to communities stating that, overall, there are no significant effects<sup>35</sup>. Throughout our responses to these documents we have highlighted, along with many individual parishes, the risks to health citing many peer-reviewed health papers<sup>36</sup>.
- 7.3. I live directly under the flight path and feel that my health does suffer from the incessant noise from the airport - flights overhead and background noise of aircraft getting ready to depart, often happening at the same time. I get headaches from the noise and very angry that the airport just monitors noise and shows no willingness to reduce night flights. All residents have a right to be able to sleep at night and get up in the morning feeling refreshed. Covid-19 has allowed communities to have a blissful night's sleep and it is with dread that we anticipate airport operations going back to normal.
- 7.4. WHO Europe guidelines state that policy-makers should aim to keep noise below 45 dB Lden on average, and below 40 dB Lnight for night noise exposure, to avoid adverse health effects. A growing body of evidence shows a link between night noise from aviation and adverse effects on sleep and health. The World Health Organisation recommends 7 – 9 hours of sleep a night for adults. This is impossible

to achieve if living under a flight path with flights every few minutes throughout the night and the barrage of flights that depart from 06.00 hrs<sup>37</sup>.

7.5. There are an overwhelming number of objections on the issue of climate change.

Climate change is threatening mental health, causing anxiety and depression. This point has been omitted from BAL's documents<sup>38</sup>.

## **8. Residential Amenity**

8.1. To parishes, the meaning of residential amenity is the benefit derived from

enjoyment of their homes, gardens and local environment. Residents within the PCAA are blessed with an outstanding local environment: the Mendips AONB, Felton Common and Goblin Combe to name a few. The parish witness statements and individual statements indicate how the amenity value for residents is now eroding from airport operations. Most statements give details of traffic and noise but other impacts which directly affect residents include:

8.1.1. Litter is dropped out of cars passing through villages and on rural roads such as Brockley Combe and from cars parked on rural lanes <sup>39</sup>.

8.1.2. Airport-related cars parked in villages bring inconvenience and at night bring the associated problems of lights shining into dwellings and the noise of engines being started and the slamming of doors<sup>40</sup>.

8.1.3. Cars travelling on the rural lanes degrade the sides of the road affecting the rural landscape<sup>41</sup>.

8.1.4. Lights at the Airport can be seen from villages in the Mendip Hills. The Chew Valley has a dark skies policy <sup>42</sup>.

8.1.5. The impact of over-crowded roads leading to traffic jams and inconvenience to local people<sup>43</sup>.

8.1.6. The Winford parish statement is particularly relevant and covers a multitude of impacts with statements attached, from residents<sup>44</sup>.

8.2. The PCAA foresee a future concern regarding employment with or without expansion. The availability of jobs is clearly of interest to local people but increased automation of airport operations is significantly reducing the need for local labour<sup>45</sup>. For example, the Airport showed, on the BBC Points West, their latest 'employee' -

a robot cleaning the floor in the terminal on Wednesday 18 May. <sup>46</sup>

## **9. Runway Length**

- 9.1. Bristol Airport has a short runway of just 2011m (Take Off Run Available, TORA), with associated take-off and landing Runway End Safety Areas of 140m (runway 27) and 215m respectively (the CAA recommended length is 240m). It has no Stopways.
- 9.2. The fleet mix Table 4.1 shows that the Aircraft A321 XLR (Extra Long Range) and Boeing MAX will be in use under growth at 12 mppa.<sup>50</sup> These aircraft require longer runways. The US/European airlines are promoting these aircraft for long distance travel. This has implications as the runway is only 2011m and the PCAA believe that a distance of 2800m is required. We note that the justification for Liverpool Airport to extend its runway is to accommodate the Boeing Max and Airbus Neo series for long distance travel.<sup>51</sup>
- 9.3. If the aircraft have to take off from shorter runways they need to use much more power (and generate more noise) or fly with fewer passengers. Either way this is inefficient in fuel consumption, it increases carbon emissions and is disrespectful of local residents who have to suffer increased levels of noise and/or a greater number of flights.
- 9.4. The short runway acts as a constraint and is not in line with MBU policy. The Government is aware that MBU could lead to increased air traffic which could increase carbon emissions. In this case the adverse impacts of reducing carbon and noise are not mitigated but continued as business as usual. Reference MBU Point 1.11 and Point 1.22.
- 9.5. The length of the runway brings up safety issues although the Public Safety Zones are not being reviewed under the application. The licence allowing the type of aircraft to operate is Code 4D and states that a higher reference letter is required for larger aircraft such as the B787. This aircraft is part of the fleet mix for growth to 12 mppa <sup>54</sup>.

## **10. Conditions**

- 10.1. The Airport can easily escape the strictures of planning conditions, as we have seen on the non-delivery of the Public Transport Interchange and MSCP2 under planning consent of 2011<sup>47</sup>. The fact that this happened, along with the regular use of permitted development rights, has resulted in a lack of trust between the Airport and parishes. The disregard for the wishes of the communities has left us with no alternative but to take Rule Six Status in order to get the best outcome for parishes.

- 10.2. Tighter Conditions and enforcement should not be seen as an adequate response to local people who seek a refusal for further expansion. Residents want to be able to enjoy their own homes, gardens and local area which is predominately rural without being forced to travel out of the locality to escape airport activities and the associated noise and traffic. We do not believe that the suggested conditions would make the expansion acceptable in planning terms. However, if the decision makers are minded to grant permission then greater controls need to be placed on the airport to alleviate the effects of the development.
- 10.3. The PCAA has submitted a list of roads and villages for the Inspectors to visit to experience noise and the local rural road network. We fear the experience will not be truly representative due to airport operations being reduced by the pandemic. Parish witness statements show the many impacts residents receive daily.
- 10.4. The PCAA are aware that night flights are different at other airports such as Heathrow which allows approximately 16 flights per night<sup>48</sup>. We also know of major European airports with no night flights. It is clearly possible to reduce the number of flights at Bristol <sup>49</sup>.
- 10.5. Currently the Airport only mitigates noise inside a dwelling with a pitiful funding allowance. It does not compensate for the any outside noise as stated and advised by the Treasury Green Book.
- 10.6. The modal split between car travel and public transport and the tweaking of road improvements on the A38 cannot possibly resolve traffic problems on the A38, A370 and rural lanes. It is simply inadequate. As we suggested in point 3.6, the modal split should be at least 25% for public transport.
- 10.7. The removal of foraging for Greater and Lesser Horseshoe Bats in order to provide low-cost car parking on green belt is unsustainable and is wrong at a time of a biodiversity crisis. At section 5.2.1 -5.2.4 of this document I outline all the negative effects of developing the Silver Zone and show why it encourages more parking and driving to the airport. To my mind all these negative effects could be removed very easily by just not allowing the extension of the Silver Zone to go ahead. This is why we have suggested a condition preventing the development of the Silver Zone extension.

- 10.8. Permitted Development Rights must be removed from the Airport in their entirety in order to prevent another development such as that described in point 5.1. There is precedent for this when Bristol Airport previously had these rights removed.

## **11. Conclusion**

- 11.1. Thank you for allowing me to speak on behalf of parishes. If expansion goes ahead the consequence will mean more noise, more traffic, poorer air quality, more carbon emissions and loss of green belt. The pandemic has allowed residents to sleep at night, open their windows and hear the birds sing. We should build back a greener future; a dismissal of this Appeal will allow parishes the benefit of knowing that they have done their best in enabling '*future generations to meet their own needs*'<sup>19</sup>.

Word count 5,235

## Appendix A

### Parish Council Witness Statements

#### References

1. North Somerset Decision Notice to planning application 18/P/5118/OUT CD4.16
2. Email from the UKACC's to Bristol Airport Consultative Committee CD14.13
3. [https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bristol\\_Airport](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bristol_Airport)
4. Appendix A Winford PC Witness Statement p22 and Chew Magna PC p35
5. Joint Transport Local Plan 4 <https://travelwest.info/app/uploads/2020/05/JLTP4-Adopted-Joint-Local-Transport-Plan-4.pdf> CD7.5
6. NS Officers Report to the Planning and Regulatory meeting February 2020, Appendix 3. CD4.11
7. Environmental Statement Addendum Main Report: Point 5.6. CD2.20.1
8. <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/streets-travel/bristol-caz/view-map>
9. NS Officers Report to the Planning and Regulatory meeting February 2020,p99 CD4.11
10. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/2011censuskeystatisticsforenglandandwales/2012-12-11#:~:text=The%20number%20of%20cars%20and,12%20cars%20per%2010%20households>
11. NS Officers Report to the Planning and Regulatory meeting February 2020, public transport modal split p85 CD4.11
12. Appendix A, Cleeve PC Witness Statement p14.
13. Appendix A, Butcombe PC and Wrington PC Witness Statements p5 and p33.
14. Bristol Airport Planning Application 09/P/1020/OT2 planning conditions CD17.4
15. unused



16. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bristol\\_Airport#:~:text=The%20airport%20has%20one%20of,displacement%20of%20140m\(510ft\).](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bristol_Airport#:~:text=The%20airport%20has%20one%20of,displacement%20of%20140m(510ft).)
  
17. [https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/172EB23119272068F3C9511CDD4B9102/pdf/18\\_P\\_5118\\_OUT-NATURAL\\_ENGLAND-2772681.pdf](https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/172EB23119272068F3C9511CDD4B9102/pdf/18_P_5118_OUT-NATURAL_ENGLAND-2772681.pdf) p4
  
18. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/810197/NPPF\\_Feb\\_2019\\_revised.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf) point 7  
  
[https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/88E6860B6A6469C19B307B17BFA0D224/pdf/18\\_P\\_5118\\_OUT-28\\_11\\_2019 - NATURAL ENGLAND RESPONSE-2871120.pdf](https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/88E6860B6A6469C19B307B17BFA0D224/pdf/18_P_5118_OUT-28_11_2019_-_NATURAL_ENGLAND_RESPONSE-2871120.pdf)
  
19. [https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/172EB23119272068F3C9511CDD4B9102/pdf/18\\_P\\_5118\\_OUT-NATURAL\\_ENGLAND-2772681.pdf](https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/172EB23119272068F3C9511CDD4B9102/pdf/18_P_5118_OUT-NATURAL_ENGLAND-2772681.pdf) Net Environmental Gain p4
  
20. NS Officers Report to the Planning and Regulatory meeting February 2020 p143 penultimate paragraph on the page CD4.11
  
- 21.. [https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/67EBA50610CF243C411D71EA2146BF3D/pdf/20\\_P\\_2896\\_APPCON-UPDATE TO THE PARKING DEMAND STUDY-2988082.pdf](https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/67EBA50610CF243C411D71EA2146BF3D/pdf/20_P_2896_APPCON-UPDATE_TO_THE_PARKING_DEMAND_STUDY-2988082.pdf) p15 Figure 9
  
22. [https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/8AA048549DB58ED0E1840866C2454535/pdf/18\\_P\\_5118\\_OUT-BAL S RESPONSE TO NSC TRANSPORT COMMENTS-2878333.pdf](https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/8AA048549DB58ED0E1840866C2454535/pdf/18_P_5118_OUT-BAL_S_RESPONSE_TO_NSC_TRANSPORT_COMMENTS-2878333.pdf) p23 para 4
  
23. PCAA response Addendum Ch 5 car parking p22-26 and PCAA Statement of Case point 29 CD17.5
  
24. PCAA Final response to planning application 18/P/5118/OUT, 1 February, Section Future Aircrafts, p86 CD17.1

25. PCAA Final response to planning application 18/P/5118/OUT 1 February, Section Noise, p70, point 8. CD17.1

26.

<https://www.chewvalleygazette.co.uk/article.cfm?id=100084&headline=Crew%20%27lost%20awareness%27%20of%20Easyjet%20plane%20that%20flew%20low%20over%20Dundry&sectionIs=news&searchyear=2015>

27. Email to CAA on Easyjet aircraft arrival event.

28. PCAA submission to consultation 20/P/2896/APPCON. Section 9, Human Health, p33 CD17.3

29. PCAA Final response to planning application 18/P/5118/OUT, 1 February, p78 Figure 1 map of noise complaints, Figure 2, 3 and 4 screen shots of night flights CD17.1

30.

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/153776/aviation-policy-framework.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/153776/aviation-policy-framework.pdf) point 3.12 CD 6.1

31. NSC Draft Noise Conditions

32. PCAA Final response to planning application 18/P/5118/OUT, 1 February, Compensation and Treasury Green Book, p133 CD17.1

33. Parish Witness Statements: Butcombe, Cleeve, Chew Magna, Chew Stoke, Congresbury, Kingston Seymour, Winford, Wraxall and Ubley and more

34. Parish Witness Statement Churchill Parish Council point 2.1 – 2.3.

35. Non-Technical Summary Addendum to consultation 20/P/2896/APPCON, point 4.6.3 CD17.3

36. PCAA submission to consultation 20/P/2896/APPCON. Section 9, Human Health CD17.3

37. PCAA submission to consultation 20/P/2896/APPCON. Section 9, Human Health, point 9.4.8 CD17.3

38. PCAA submission to consultation 20/P/2896/APPCON. Section 9, Human Health, point 9.8.4 CD17.3

39. Appendix A, Parish Witness Statement highlighting litter - Butcombe p4, Wrington p29
40. Appendix A, Parish Witness Statement highlighting multitude of impacts - Butcombe p4
41. Appendix A, Parish Witness Statement highlighting degradation to road verges – Butcombe p4
42. Appendix A, Parish Witness Statement highlighting light impacts – Compton Martin p43, Ubley p57
43. Appendix A, Parish Witness Statement highlighting impact of airport traffic majority of parishes excluding Timsbury
44. Appendix A, Winford parish statement p22
45. PCAA Final response to planning application 18/P/5118/OUT, 1 February, Section titled ‘Maximise operational efficiencies’ p29 point 16 – 19 and PCAA submission to consultation 20/P/2896/APPCON,p15 point 3.7.5 and p17 point 3.8.7. CD17.1
46. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/m000w8d4/points-west-evening-news-18052021>
47. Bristol Airport planning Application 09/P/1020/OT2 planning conditions CD17.4
48. Night flight restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted Airports: CD17.7  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/night-flight-restrictions-at-heathrow-gatwick-and-stansted-airports-between-2022-and-2024-plus-future-night-flight-policy/night-flight-restrictions>
49. PCAA Final response to planning application 18/P/5118/OUT, 1 February, p82 point 14 CD17.1
- 50 [https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/760E9A6787C88ACCA10D94638CE37A3F/pdf/20\\_P\\_2896\\_APPCON-PASSENGER\\_TRAFFIC\\_FORECAST-2988080.pdf](https://planning.n-somerset.gov.uk/online-applications/files/760E9A6787C88ACCA10D94638CE37A3F/pdf/20_P_2896_APPCON-PASSENGER_TRAFFIC_FORECAST-2988080.pdf)
- 51 <https://www.liverpoolairport.com/about-ljla/liverpool-john-lennon-airport-master-plan-to-2050>
- 52 <https://westerngatewaystb.org.uk/>
- 53 Joint Transport Local Plan 4 <https://travelwest.info/app/uploads/2020/05/JLTP4-Adopted-Joint-Local-Transport-Plan-4.pdf> CD 7.5
- 54 Licence Details of UK Airports