

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

I'd like to follow on from the points made this morning about whether this is a local, national or international issue. The government has committed to the Paris Agreement and while that hasn't been enshrined in law, the government this year pledged to enshrine in law a 78% reduction in emissions by 2035. That is a national commitment within which all local projects, particularly those with significant carbon loads must fit. Since last submitting my statement re the airport expansion at the beginning of the year, Stanstead, Southampton and Leeds airports have been given the green light. So given the 78% reduction target, any decision on Bristol therefore has to take into account the additional millions of tonnes the above three airports are now potentially permitted to emit and how the rest of the economy is going to function if airports and aeroplanes are being allowed to increase on this scale. Where is that 78% reduction going to come from? And while it could be said that one airport's increased emissions could be accommodated, it is another thing to allow a this adhoc, incremental expansion and it is difficult to see how it fits the criterion of sustainable development even if you try to limit the definition of this phrase.

There is another aspect of this. Dave Lee, CEO of Bristol Airport has recently pointed out that passenger numbers will take several years to recover following the decline caused by the Covid pandemic. That means the expansion of the airport's infrastructure could lead to overcapacity, particularly when added to the expansion ambitions of other airports (both with granted permission and at the application stage). Dedicating resources (including manpower in this post Brexit world) to something which may be surplus to requirements

means other projects may find it difficult to go ahead, while not achieving the airports objectives.

This in combination with increased noise, congestion and effects on health may well mean the airport becomes a drain on the region not an asset.

I'd like to add that while climate change and CO₂ levels seem remote and intangible. They are having a real effect. April this year saw global temperatures 1.4°C higher than base line, for two years in a row we have seen record temperatures at high latitudes (Siberia has had huge fires two years in a row, and Canada and the US have broken heat records and the US is now covered in smog as a consequence of forest fires, while for the last two months countries across the Middle-East have been fighting to adapt to temperatures reaching almost 50°C. We are already at 419 ppm of CO₂ in the atmosphere. Scientists previously thought 450 ppm was the limit. From where we are now in terms of extreme climate events it is difficult to see how the planet can sustain an extra 30ppm. And indeed many climate scientists and even ex Exxon scientists say that we are at the point where tipping points could be triggered leading to run away disaster. Indeed, if there is further increase the frequency of these heat events will increase the pressure on governments to reduce emissions more quickly. This could lead to what Mark Carney calls stranded assets. That is businesses that are forced to close because they are too damaging, such businesses include airports.. In light of this, putting all our carbon eggs into airports looks very short-sighted: bad for the climate, bad for the economy and bad for investors.

We have to get away from looking at one development at a time and from the point of view short-term local economic advantage. We are intelligent beings we should be able to do the

maths. We have to start recognising that the consequences of our actions are much wider, they involve human health, the ability to sustain food production, loss of coastal settlements. They will last for well over a hundred years, much longer if we are reckless, and will cost billions of pounds to mitigate. We should not be jeopardising the next generations' prospects for short-term gain. That is not sustainable development.

1 [UK enshrines new target in law to slash emissions by 78% by 2035 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-enshrines-new-target-in-law-to-slash-emissions-by-78-by-2035)

Jacqueline Walkden

BS7 9QJ