

BRISTOL AIRPORT

12MPPA PLANNING APPEAL

SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE

NOISE

Report to

Bristol Airport

A11339_01_RP004_1.0

15 June 2021



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 I am Nicholas Anthony Williams, an Associate at Bickerdike Allen Partners LLP (BAP). I work as an acoustic consultant and have over 12 years' experience, the majority of which has been in the field of aircraft noise. I am a Member of the Institute of Acoustics.

1.1.2 My Proof of Evidence (POE) deals with noise. It includes a summary of the key findings of the Environmental Statement (ES) and Environmental Statement Addendum (ESA), and addresses the Reasons for Refusal given by North Somerset Council (NSC), as well as issues raised by NSC and the Parish Councils Airport Association (PCAA) in their Statements of Case and elsewhere, in relation to the noise effects of the proposed development.

2.0 SUMMARY OF ES AND ESA FINDINGS

2.1.1 The methodology in the ES and ESA is in accordance with current UK Government policy and adheres to relevant guidance.

2.1.2 Both the ES and ESA concluded that adverse noise effects arising from the proposed development were negligible.

2.1.3 The underlying reason for this conclusion is that the changes in noise level when comparing the 'with' and 'without' development scenarios for the same year are small.

2.1.4 A number of measures have been proposed by BAL to limit the noise impacts. Of particular relevance are a reduction in the daytime noise contour area limit, and a new night-time noise contour area limit.

2.1.5 In recognition of the fact that the proposed development will give rise to some (not significant) adverse impacts, BAL have proposed enhancements to the noise insulation scheme. The proposed changes are to increase the grant amount available, add in a new eligibility threshold for those exposed to noise levels of at least 55 dB $L_{Aeq,8h}$, remove the requirement for homeowners benefitting from the scheme to match fund (i.e. pay 50% of the cost) and improve the minimum specification of windows and ventilators to be used as part of the scheme.

3.0 NSC REASONS FOR REFUSAL

3.1.1 There are two primary noise issues raised in NSC's Reasons for Refusal 1 and 2 to which I respond in my POE.

3.1.2 Firstly, there is the issue of whether significant adverse noise effects arise due to the development. I conclude that they do not. This is primarily on the basis that the changes in noise level due to the development are negligible and are not considered to be significant.

3.1.3 Secondly there is the issue of whether (not significant) adverse noise effects are adequately dealt with. I conclude that they are. This is based on the additional noise controls, and enhanced noise insulation scheme which goes beyond the minimum requirements of both current and emerging UK Government policy.

3.1.4 These conclusions are consistent with the conclusions of the ES and ESA, and the opinion NSC Environmental Officers presented in their Officer's Report after they had reviewed the ES and received advice from their independent noise consultants.

4.0 OTHER ISSUES

4.1 Uncertainty of forecasts

4.1.1 A separate issue is consideration of the uncertainty in the future forecasts and how this affects the confidence in the assessment. This has been brought into focus by the announcement that Jet2 will be commencing operations from Bristol Airport in 2021.

4.1.2 In response it is noted that while there is always some uncertainty associated with future forecasts, this can be mitigated by the setting of suitable planning conditions which result in the noise effects being controlled to acceptable levels.

4.1.3 The uncertainty would also be expected to have a similar effect on both the 10 mppa and 12 mppa scenarios and therefore would be unlikely to materially affect the change due to the development. Even assuming that only the 12 mppa scenario was affected, analysis of a faster growth scenario shows that the proposed development would still not give rise to any significant noise effects.

4.2 Assessment Methodology

4.2.1 The other issues raised relate to NSC and PCAA challenging the assessment methodology on a number of points.

4.2.2 I have demonstrated in my POE that the assessment methodology is robust, being in line with the industry standard approach which is supported by current policy and guidance.

4.2.3 NSC Officers previously accepted the assessment methodology for the ES, and the same methodology has been used for the ESA.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1.1 The Environmental Statement found no significant noise impacts due to the proposed development and found that the conditions and mitigation put forward were an acceptable way to mitigate the adverse noise impacts. This assessment and its conclusions were accepted by North Somerset Council (NSC) Officers.
- 5.1.2 The Environmental Statement Addendum reaches the same conclusions.
- 5.1.3 Despite these conclusions, NSC went against the advice of its Officers and refused the application. NSC stated in their Reasons for Refusal that significant adverse noise impacts would arise but offered no explanation or evidence to support this statement.
- 5.1.4 NSC and other parties have raised a number of issues relating to uncertainty of the forecasts and the assessment methodology, which I have dealt with in my Proof of Evidence. Uncertainty can be dealt with by the setting of appropriate conditions and as I have demonstrated in my Proof, the methodology is robust.