



Figure 4.1 International aviation emissions from the Appeal Proposal

Janet Grimes' submission to the Bristol Airport Planning Inquiry. July 2021

In the report by Matthew Osund-Ireland, for Bristol Airport, on the climate impact of the planned expansion, there is repeated reliance on the statistics which show the ghg emissions from the planned expansion as a percentage of the total UK planning assumption for such emissions.

This is inevitably very small.

But a small percentage of a very large and problematic number can still be a large and problematic number in itself – especially where ghg emissions are concerned.

The percentage increase in passengers the airport is asking for **is still** a 20% increase. It is still an increase of 2million passengers a year from a base of 10million.

We could try to imagine what this increase means by saying that Bristol has a population of just under half a million. So we could imagine this increase allowing every person in Bristol 4 single flights a year on top of what they already take.

Now the emissions tally seems more significant.

Add to this the fact that CO₂ lasts in the atmosphere for around 100 years, then we can see that emissions in any one year are in effect, cumulative. They add and they add to the problem.

Let's not let statistical manipulations get in the way of the need for extreme caution where climate change is concerned.

If we look at the graph Matthew Osund-Ireland uses fig 4.1 on page 46 of his 'Proof of Evidence' (BAL W6/2) then we see again a reference to the percentage of the UK planning assumption for aviation emissions.

But is one line missing from this graph? One which runs almost along the bottom of the horizontal axis representing what would happen if the expansion didn't go ahead? Then we could visualise in graph form the difference between allowing the expansion and not.

And the fig 4.1 graph should also be seen as a small addition to a graph showing the emissions from the 10 million passenger per annum capacity, which the airport already has.

The airport will say that the CCC uses similar graphs. But since its' December 2020 report, the CCC has moved away from relying on the planning assumption for aviation emissions alone, and is now talking consistently about the need for demand management within the sector. It now advises that the 'unknowns' for low emissions aviation and carbon capture are too great for this alone to be relied upon.

Baroness Worthington, a lead author of the UK's climate change Act, was interviewed by Roger Harrabin for the BBC recently, as the 'heat dome' affected Canada just a few weeks ago. She said:

"Concerned scientists are no longer concerned - they are freaked out.

"They're worrying there might not be a 'safe landing' on the climate. We are working on the idea of safe carbon budgets (the amount of carbon we can put into the atmosphere without badly disrupting the climate). But what if there is no safe carbon budget?

"What if the 'safe' carbon budget is zero. We can't sugar-coat the potential realities of this."