

Thank you for the chance to address this inquiry. I'm addressing you as a grandmother of three, who have become increasingly anxious about climate change news. It is hard to reassure them when the people with power are not behaving as rational adults should – that is, are not applying the precautionary principle to safeguard the lives of children alive today and of generations to come.

Most people don't realise that setting emissions reduction goals and choosing a pathway to them is like making a bet - you need to calculate the odds and work out whether you can afford them. It's also not generally understood that if the world does manage to reach net zero by 2050, and if the UK plays its proportionate and equitable part in this effort, we are still likely to overshoot 1.5 degrees of global warming. We are already experiencing the disruptive effects of 1 degree. We will then have to get rid of carbon through negative emissions technologies, many of which are as yet in embryo, in order to get the temperature down by 2100.

The IPCC report of 2018 took all this into account. It outlined and evaluated various pathways to net zero by 2050. The slogan in summary was 'sooner is safer'. The earlier you make radical cuts in emissions, the less the impacts and the less likelihood of dangerous overshoot. And this calculation was on the basis of models which did not, could not, include the feedback effects we are already seeing, could not calculate the additional risk of triggering catastrophic, 'run away' climate change. To quote the IPCC: 'no pathways achieved greater than 66% probability of limiting warming below 1.5 degrees during the entire 20th C.' I would never take my family onto a plane with those sorts of odds.

Much has happened in the real world since the airport's application to expand was rejected by North Somerset councillors. None of it justifies the airport's extraordinary optimism. Just one of many examples: the World Meteorological Organisation now says that the chance of exceeding 1.5 degrees in the short term has risen from 10% to 20%. No wonder climate scientists are said to be no longer concerned, but terrified.

The various branches of UK law, I understand, have not yet been realigned to meet the government's 2050 target, and the appeal seeks to get in fast before this necessary work is done, and before there is a coherent national aviation policy. Mr Henderson pointed out that the Paris agreement has not been not incorporated, and is therefore not really binding. One result of that has been that the Government is able to ignore its undertaking in that agreement to consult with and work in tandem with local authorities such as North Somerset. Another example of how this chaos has helped the airport's case: there is as yet no accepted scientific definition of the degree of danger from aircrafts' non-CO2 emissions, so their likely effects could just be ignored.

This inquiry will determine whether the airport's application to expand is consonant with UK law, despite last year's democratic decision of North Somerset Council to reject it. Expanding may arguably be in the rational economic interests of the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan, although that is by no means certain. There is no way it can be in the interests of the citizens of North Somerset, or of the UK, or of future generations all over the world. Even if the airport's appeal is finally decided to meet current legal standards, it represents a cynical betrayal of the interests of children alive today and of generations to come.

Most people don't realise that carbon budgets are probabilistic. They offer degrees of likelihood of not overshooting 1.5 degrees of warming by 2100. Most of the discussions of a planetary carbon budget after the Paris agreement aimed at

The IPCC 2018 report outlined various pathways to net zero by 2050. Some of these pathways involved early big reductions in extracting and burning fossil fuels, and some involved leaving most of the necessary work to a time closer to 2050. Even if net zero *were* achieved by 2050, global temperatures would overshoot 1.5 degrees, and would hopefully be reduced over the next half

Basically, the sooner we reduce emissions the less impact on human life and biodiversity. The Paris agreement is weaker than most people realise. The subsequent discussions of a planetary carbon budget mostly I can't imagine taking my family on a plane with that chance of crashing.