

Response to PINS on matters raised at the CMC 8th March 2021 – Bristol Airport

From: XR Elders

March 12th 2021

1. We are very glad that the Inquiry will be blended, with people able to attend virtually if they are not comfortable with an actual appearance. Thank you for that.

2. We welcome the recognition that other Rule 6 participants will need time to consider the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) once it has been submitted, and support Amanda Sutherland in her request that we have a week for this.

3. Comments on Main Issues Identified

3.1 We understand that the identification of the Main Issues sets out the key concerns for the Inquiry to address. The topics are then suggested as a way to schedule the Inquiry so that these issues are dealt with. We prefer in principle the original issues as suggested by PINS, to the issues suggested in the BAL/NSC letter. We find the PINS version more 'neutrally' phrased, and planning policy is identified as a main issue. We are arguing the application is premature and not justified, and we do that with reference to planning policy as well as changed and changing circumstances. Planning policy is definitely a main issue for us.

3.2 We support the amendments suggested by BAAN to Issue g) as better reflecting the reason for refusal, and do not think the attempt by BAL to narrow the focus in their alternative framing to be useful or appropriate at this stage. They are raising issues properly considered at the appeal in our view.

3.3 We support amendment to Issue b) as discussed at the meeting: that it acknowledge the view held by all parties that the proposed development in the Green Belt is inappropriate; the issue is 'have special circumstances' been justified.

3.4 Generally we support the concerns of other Rule 6 parties on specific aspects of the Main issues as well. The sustainability of transport provision should be specifically mentioned in Issue d) in our view.

3.5 It was suggested that Issue h) should mention social benefits as well. We would suggest that the Issue should be re-drafted with reference to the need for the development to be sustainable development. This has not been mentioned in the Issues, but it is of course the over-arching requirement of the NPPF. It also encompasses consideration of social, economic and environmental benefits.

3.6 We understand your point that our suggested additional Issue around the impact of the revised supporting evidence and pandemic will be included in all the topics automatically. We welcomed your assurance that the impact of the new situation is of course important, and would be further reassured if this was noted in the report of the meeting.

4. Topics for the Appeal The BAL/NSC letter has identified a series of topics for the Inquiry. We like the suggested running order, but feel topic 4 would be best identified as 'transport and parking' to keep it as broad as the others.

5. Holiday Arrangements Liz Beth, as the planning consultant presenting our case, has a pre-arranged holiday commitment between the 6th and 13th August. We understand the Inquiry cannot come to a halt due to this, but there are several topics that XR Elders will not be involved in, including air pollution, noise impact, carbon emissions and climate change. Perhaps this week could be used for one of these topics?

6. Timetable This is generally acceptable to us, but we may not be able to name all our witnesses by April.

7. Site Visits We do not feel a need to join these, and hope this makes arrangements a bit easier.