

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

FROM: MR RICHARD ALLARD
(ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION)

Date Consultation Response Sent: 11 April 2019

Application: Outline planning application (with reserved matters details for some elements included and some elements reserved for subsequent approval) for the development of Bristol Airport to enable a throughput of 12 million terminal passengers in any 12 month calendar period, comprising: 2no. extensions to the terminal building and canopies over the forecourt of the main terminal building; erection of new east walkway and pier with vertical circulation cores and pre-board zones; 5m high acoustic timber fence; construction of a new service yard directly north of the western walkway; erection of a multi-storey car park north west of the terminal building with five levels providing approximately 2,150 spaces and wind turbines atop; enhancement to the internal road system including gyratory road with internal surface car parking and layout changes; enhancements to airside infrastructure including construction of new eastern taxiway link and taxiway widening (and fillets) to the southern edge of Taxiway GOLF; the year-round use of the existing Silver Zone car park extension (Phase 1) with associated permanent (fixed) lighting and CCTV; extension to the Silver Zone car park to provide approximately 2,700 spaces (Phase 2); improvements to the A38; operating within a rolling annualised cap of 4,000 night flights between the hours of 23:30 and 06:00 with no seasonal restrictions; revision to the operation of Stands 38 and 39; and landscaping and associated works.

Reference Number:
18/P/5118/OUT

Location: Bristol Airport North Side Road Felton Wrington BS48 3DP

Updated formal comments from Richard Allard regarding the above.

Noise

Bickerdike Allen Partners (BAP) have provided a response to the comments made by North Somerset Council and Jacobs Consultants. These comments have been reviewed by North Somerset Council and Jacobs. Jacobs have provided comments dated 10 April 2019 and should be read alongside the comments made below. The further points raised by the comments will need to be addressed before the noise impact of the application can be addressed.

Future Fleet Mix

My previous comments noted that the noise chapter has based its predictions for future scenarios on the fact that the aircraft fleet mix will change and incorporate quieter aircraft. Whilst this seemed logical there is no justification provided for the future fleet mix. Additionally, there does not seem to be any assessment carried out if fleet replacement continues at its current rate and is not updated as quickly as forecast.

In response BAP note that Bristol Airport commissioned an independent consultant (Mott Macdonald) to produce a report on the likely rate of fleet modernisation in the 2021 (10mppa) and 2026 (12mppa) scenarios. This report verified that the modernisation assumptions made by Bristol airport were reasonable. BAP's response also provides response from Easyjet and Ryanair.

The Mott Macdonald report was included as Appendix F in the Planning Statement. Whilst the report provides a forecast for air traffic movements and night flying requirements, it does not seem to provide any justification or validation of the predictions for the future fleet mix. The only reference made is in paragraphs 110 and 111 of the report which state:

110. BRS Management have forecast the future airline fleet mix in 2026. Based on these fleet forecasts, average QC per movement is expected to decrease from 0.38 in 2018 to around 0.31 by 2026 (under the London QC system).

111. Mott Macdonald has reviewed these assumptions and consulted with the airport's main airlines on the fleet assumptions. Incorporating airline feedback, Mott Macdonald has calculated sensitivities on further (2026) QC requirements, which produce average QC per movement values in the range 0.27 to 0.30. therefore, the BRS Management fleet assumptions are reasonable and slightly on the conservative side overall.

As the noise chapter relies heavily on the future fleet mix, in order to be able to have confidence in the predictions for future scenarios justification for the assumptions made and validation of the predictions will need to be submitted.

Noise Insulation Scheme

BAP have provided an outline of the current noise insulation scheme. Table 2 of the response also provides details of the number of properties treated as part of the scheme. However, it would also be useful to include the number of properties that were eligible for the scheme in order to determine its effectiveness.

Tranquillity

As per my previous comments, Paragraph 180 of the NPPF, 2018 states that:

Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:

- b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason;

However, the Planning Practice Guidance recognises that there are no precise rules for the factors for identifying areas of tranquillity. However, it also notes that an area to be protected for its tranquillity it is likely to be relatively undisturbed by noise from human caused sources that undermine the intrinsic character of the area. Such areas are likely to be already valued for their

tranquillity, including the ability to perceive and enjoy the natural soundscape, and are quite likely to be seen as special for other reasons including their landscape. In light of this an assessment of the noise impacts on the AONB is required.

BAP have provided a response with regards to the impact on the AONB. Noise levels of individual events for an Airbus A320 arriving on runway 27 have been calculated to be approximately 56 dB L_{Amax} , in the worst-case situation of a location directly under the flight path. The average noise level from such aircraft at the AONB is estimated to be in the region 35 dB $L_{Aeq,16hr}$. This is a very low level of noise (below level where adverse effects on health and quality of life are detected) and may be lower than some other noise sources in the AONB. I am satisfied that the impact of increased flight on the AONB has been adequately addressed.

In conclusion, both my comments above and those provided by Jacobs will need to be addressed before I am satisfied that the proposed development will not have a detrimental noise impact. Until the points are addressed I am not in a position at this stage to suggest any planning conditions that may be required.