

**BRISTOL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

**DRAFT MASTER PLAN CONSULTATION**

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM CONSULTEES**

**NOVEMBER 2006**



## CONTENTS

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. General</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Regulatory and policy context</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Forecasts</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5. Economic and social considerations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6. Terminal Building</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>7. Car parking</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>8. Runway</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>9. Hotel</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>10. Air routes</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>11. Air quality</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>12. Community effects</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>13. Landscape and visual impact</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>14. Noise</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>15. Night flying</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>16. Surface access</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>17. Climate change</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>18. Mitigation</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>19. Sustainable development</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>20. Sustainability appraisal</b>	<b>22</b>

### **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Comments from North Somerset Council	24
Appendix 2: Comments from Bristol City Council, Bath & North East Somerset Council, South Gloucestershire Council and Government Office for the South West	48
Appendix 3: Responses from Parish Councils	53
Appendix 4: Other stakeholder responses	77

**BRISTOL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**  
**DRAFT MASTER PLAN CONSULTATION**  
**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM CONSULTEES**

**1. Introduction**

This report sets out Bristol International Airport's responses to comments made by consultees on the draft Master Plan. Individual comments and responses are provided in the appendices attached. Responses are provided below to particular themes and questions that run through a number of responses.

**2. General**

C1 Comment: The Master Plan should be subject to full environmental impact assessment. Full environmental impact assessment is required before planning permission is given.

Response: The planning system requires that projects meeting certain criteria, in terms of scale and impact, are assessed to determine the impact that the development will have on the environment. The assessment, known as the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is an important consideration when the local planning authority decides whether or not to grant planning permission. The development proposed at Bristol International Airport (BIA) will require an EIA. BIA is developing the initial environmental appraisal in the Master Plan into a full EIA for submission with the planning application for the extension of the Terminal Building. The EIA will be an over-arching assessment of all impacts relating to the proposed increased capacity of 9 million passengers per annum (mppa).

C2 Comment: The expansion of the airport will have a major and detrimental effect on local residents and the world environment.

Response: BIA is seeking to develop in a way that continues to support the regional economy and meets people's desire to travel more whilst reducing and minimising the impact of the airport on those who live nearby, and on the natural environment. The Master Plan has appraised these impacts and we believe that for the development proposed BIA can achieve an acceptable balance between the adverse effects of aviation growth and the overall benefits of expansion. At the same time the aviation industry, through its Sustainable Aviation Strategy is seeking to minimise its overall impact on the environment. The Master Plan proposals, particularly in respect of car parking, will be reconsidered in the light of comments received during the consultation.

**3. Regulatory and policy context**

C3 Comment: The current protection to the Green Belt is to be maintained. Expansion land should not be developed. Open landscapes to be maintained. Plans do not merit building in Green Belt.

Response: Since the draft Master Plan was published the Inquiry into objections to the Replacement North Somerset Local Plan has been completed and the Inspector's report with recommendation for modifications to the Plan has been published. It has been recommended that the north side of the airport should be redesignated as a 'Green Belt' inset. BIA will re-evaluate proposals for development outside the existing operational boundary in the light of the Inspector's conclusions. The Master Plan will be adjusted accordingly.

#### 4. Forecasts

C4 Comment: The growth rate and proposed size of the airport is not acceptable. Cap at 6 mppa.

Response: The growth proposed by BIA is consistent with the parameters and policy set out in the 'Future of Air Transport', Air Transport White Paper (ATWP). Any adverse impacts of growth to 9 mppa will occur gradually over time, with opportunities for appropriate controls and mitigation to be put in place.

C5 Comment: Growth in the low cost sector is undesirable.

Response: Low cost or low fares airlines distinguish themselves by providing a low cost 'no frills' service. This model, originally developed in the USA, has been successfully propagated in Europe through deregulation of the market. It involves minimising costs and maximising efficiency in order to offer lower fares to consumers. Characteristics of the low fares model include:

- Efficient operations that maximise aircraft utilisation and minimise fuel burn;
- Use of standardised and modern aircraft fleets that aim to reduce operational and maintenance costs for the airline;
- A focus on serving uncongested regional airports, which have fewer delays and necessitate less fuel loss due to holding patterns and long taxi times;
- The use of regional airports means that passengers have shorter distances to travel to catch their flights thereby reducing greatly the number of miles travelled by road which is the greater polluter;
- A 'no frills' in flight service that costs less to deliver and reduces aircraft payload and therefore requires less fuel burn; and
- More passengers per flight and therefore less fuel and emissions per passenger.

The low cost airlines operating at BIA operate with a young aircraft fleet which is associated with more efficient engines and lower fuel consumption per passenger kilometre and therefore less CO<sub>2</sub>. These airlines serve both the business and leisure market.

C6 Comment: The taxation situation with respect to aviation may change. The growth forecasts may not be achieved.

Response: BIA will phase its development plans to match the growth in passenger numbers. In the event that passenger growth slows, due to changes in the taxation regime or as a result of world events, then the development plans would be adjusted accordingly. The Master Plan will be regularly reviewed and adjusted if necessary.

C7 Comment: Provide further information on the routes that are expected to operate in the future.

Response: Further details of potential routes will be provided in the final Master Plan.

## 5. Economic and social considerations

C8 Comment: The economic benefits of growth set out in the draft Master Plan have been disputed in a report by Professor John Whitelegg commissioned by the Parish Councils Airport Association, Campaign to Protect Rural England and Friends of the Earth.

Response:

- The Whitelegg report is based on an early working draft of the BIA Master Plan which was released at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry in July 2005. The chapter on economic effects was subsequently rewritten on completion of the BIA economic impact report, but the Whitelegg report has been unable to take account of the final conclusions of this work. In fact the entire report was written before the draft Master Plan was published, without consideration of the detailed work that went into the Master Plan's preparation. It is clear that the report has been prepared for political campaigning purposes and it cannot be considered as an academic work on BIA.
- The report is largely based on criticisms of work, unrelated to the BIA Master Plan, which consider the relationship between aviation and the UK economy as a whole. There is little attempt to consider the regional circumstances in the South West. The arguments are based on Whitelegg's fundamental beliefs on the unsustainability of aviation growth taking into account its environmental impacts. The case for unsustainability is asserted generally without any specific reference to hard facts or the local circumstances applying at BIA.
- Responses to particular arguments are provided below.

C9 Comment: Airport expansion cannot be justified on the grounds of job creation.

Response:

- BIA does not advance an argument in the draft Master Plan that direct job creation is the reason for expanding the airport. The need to expand arises from the demand for air travel which is rising. However job creation will have benefits for the deprived wards of the South Bristol and Weston-super-Mare, which is generally accepted.
- Whitelegg's discussion on employment and airport expansion is based on an evaluation of reports by the Standing Advisory Committee on

Truck Road Assessment (SACTRA) and Oxford Economic Forecasting (OEF) which are now over five years old. These reports relate to the UK as a whole and are not specific to the South West. The SACTRA report in particular is concerned with road transport, not aviation. The OEF report is concerned with the contribution of aviation to the UK economy but it should be noted that the research undertaken by BIA on economic impact does not rely on this work, particularly because of the criticism it has received from the environmental movement.

- The evaluation of the SACTRA and OEF reports is based on aviation and its effect on the UK as a whole. These results may not be applicable to the South West and there is no attempt to consider the impact at a regional and sub regional level. SACTRA concludes that the effects of transport on the economy are strongly dependent on local circumstances. Both the Government and BIA have examined the local circumstances in detail in the preparation of the ATWP and the draft Master Plan. The Government's conclusion that expansion of air services in the South West will bring economic benefits is backed up by BIA's further research and the response from the local business community (CBI and Business West) to the consultation.
- The SACTRA recommendations were (presumably) aimed at domestic transport issues with an emphasis on road traffic. It is unclear to what extent they can be applied to international travel. The Government subsequently carried out extensive research and consultation on air travel as part of its air services studies in preparation for the Air Transport White Paper. The SACTRA conclusions may no longer be applicable in this context.

C10Comment: The aviation industry is subsidised.

Response:

- The lack of taxation on aviation fuel and zero rating for VAT purposes of tickets is taken to mean that aviation is subsidised. However VAT is not charged on any form of public transport in the UK and registered public transport services by bus and rail receive a rebate of 80% of the fuel duty. BIA pays £1.3m rates per annum and passengers from BIA contribute £16.5m<sup>1</sup> to the exchequer in Air Passenger Duty. In addition air passengers pay VAT on commercial spend at BIA such as car parking.
- Taxation is a means of collecting money for the Exchequer. The lack of taxation on a particular form of transport should not be construed as meaning that this form of transport is supported by public funds. The air transport industry in the UK, both airports and airlines, is not in receipt of any public funding. Investment in new airport development is entirely funded by the private sector. This is not the case for other transport sectors such as bus and rail.
- Subsidies to airlines like Air France and Olympic are cited as examples of airlines being funded by government. However this is not relevant to BIA as these airlines do not operate here. None of the airlines operating at BIA are in receipt of any public subsidy.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2005 estimate

C11 Comment: The links between aviation and economic growth are weak.

Response: The arguments set out in support of this claim ignore a whole body of evidence and opinion to the contrary. There is overwhelming contextual evidence for the importance of connectivity to the economy and the Economic Impact Report has been updated to set this out. Claims that there are more efficient uses of resources are assertions, which are not backed up by any evidence.

C12 Comment: The employment forecasts are incorrect and the methodology is flawed. No account has been taken of future productivity gains and cost cutting exercises.

Response:

- Whitelegg has misunderstood the methodology used by BIA to calculate future employment forecasts. This is because the report was written **before** the BIA economic impact report was published. He has therefore clearly made up his mind before considering the evidence.
- This factor is most obvious in the section where the techniques for estimating employment using 'multipliers' are evaluated and criticised. BIA has not used multipliers for the very reasons he sets out. Employment forecasts have been built up by a 'bottom up' method examining operational practices and the likely changes in the future. Future productivity levels and changes in technology have been included as far as they can be currently anticipated.
- It is claimed that aviation is a volatile industry and that jobs created are fragile and liable to be lost in job cuts, citing evidence relating to United, US Airways, and Qantas. These airlines do not currently nor are ever likely to operate out of BIA. There is speculation on the potential for future job reductions at British Airways. However the risk to BIA jobs is low as BA only account for 6% of BIA passengers. The BIA passenger mix is dominated by efficient and profitable airlines and the exposure to future airline cost cutting measures is very small.

C13 Comment: Airports have a negative effect on the economy by contributing to road congestion.

Response:

- The assessment of the economic effects of traffic congestion caused by airport traffic is largely qualitative using unofficial national figures for the effects of congestion. The section has been written in advance of the publication of the BIA Highway Capacity study and is not based on any detailed analysis of the actual circumstances applying at BIA. The congestion supposedly caused by BIA is considerably overstated.
- Figures relating to the cost of traffic congestion have in any case to be treated with caution. There are no official statistics for the costs of traffic congestion and the basis of Whitelegg's figures is unclear. In particular it is not clear what is included in these estimates – pollution, health impacts, accidents etc? It is perhaps ironic that Whitelegg seeks to decouple

economic growth from transport in one section of his report whilst in another section he argues that traffic congestion is damaging the economy.

- The economic loss from national road congestion derives from delays to time sensitive business trips and logistics services. It is alleged, without any evidence or quantification, that car drivers gaining access to the airport for cheap holidays will delay these trips and so damage regional and sub-regional economy. However the particular local circumstances at BIA have not been considered. The main access route to BIA, the A38, is primarily a commuter route used by commuters from the rural areas around Bristol using their car to get to their workplace in Bristol. Furthermore the flows to the airport generally flow in the opposite direction to the peak commuter flows. Away from the A38 and its immediate feeder roads the impact of airport traffic flows is very small.
- Whitelegg overlooks the issue of clawback of South West passengers from South East airports and the savings in time and reductions in traffic on roads that result.
- It is therefore most unlikely that the traffic accessing BIA has a negative effect on the local economy as a result of traffic congestion.

C14 Comment: BIA contributes to the UK tourism deficit and this is a net drain on the financial resources of the country.

Response:

- It is incorrectly assumed that the 80% of passengers who are travelling for leisure reasons are all taking holidays abroad. However the 80% figure also includes domestic passengers. The proportion of passengers flying to international destinations for leisure purposes was actually 57% in 2004<sup>2</sup>.
- The international leisure passenger category covers a wide range of reasons for travel apart from 'holidays'. This includes for example visiting friends and relatives, educational trips, students returning home, cultural exchanges. The proportion of BIA passengers using the airport for 'cheap' foreign holidays is therefore less than the 57% of the total passengers referred to above.
- The South West as a whole is a net importer of tourism. However the majority of South West residents (63%) take holidays outside the region. We can only speculate on how people might spend their holidays if growth at BIA were not to take place. However it is reasonable to assume that the majority would continue to holiday outside the South West and therefore only a proportion of the additional trips from BIA are potentially diverting spend from the regional and local economy.
- Constraining growth at BIA will not act as a control on outbound international tourism. There is no restriction on travel in the UK and ferries, trains and other airports are available to take the demand, possibly with greater environmental impact.

---

<sup>2</sup> Calculated using CAA survey journey purpose data and 2004 passenger figures.

- Research by the British Tourist Authority (BTA)<sup>3</sup> indicates that tourism to the UK is highly competitive and price sensitive. As an island nation most visitors to the UK arrive by air. If the cost of air travel to the UK increases, through constraints in capacity (for example by not expanding airports), then the majority of potential visitors to the UK will simply choose to travel to a different country resulting in a significant fall in the UK's earnings from inbound tourism. Conversely the research shows that UK residents are much less sensitive to increases in travel costs. Therefore if capacity is constrained, outbound travellers from the UK will out-compete inbound travellers for the available seats. As a result a greater percentage of the people on the available flights will be British outbound travellers. The effect of constraining aviation growth would therefore be to make the current tourism deficit worse in contrast to the claims made by Whitelegg.
- It is interesting to note that in recent years there has been an upward trend in overseas visitors to the UK – Whitelegg quotes figures for the UK as a whole which reflect this trend. At the same time Weston-super-Mare has also recorded an increase in visitor numbers, expenditure and employment in tourism<sup>4</sup>. Any decline in the popularity of traditional UK holiday resorts reflects long term changes in fashion (which may be changing as resorts reinvent themselves) and is not therefore linked to recent growth of low cost airlines, such as has occurred at Bristol International Airport. In fact low cost airlines are probably contributing to recently recorded rises in overseas visitors to the UK.
- South West Tourism's strategy is to achieve sustainable growth of the South West tourist industry<sup>5</sup>. This is concerned with growing the value of visitors to the region rather than just the volume. Domestic tourism is heavily reliant on the car and is concentrated on visits to rural areas. The increase in domestic tourism promoted by Whitelegg is potentially unsustainable and could have a negative economic effect. Furthermore increased domestic tourism would tend to displace international tourists, given that the market is finite and operating at capacity already. Promotion of domestic tourism therefore could worsen the trade imbalance. International tourists, on the other hand, tend to use more sustainable means of transport such as public transport and concentrate their visits to cities.
- The debate about tourism cannot ignore the social and health benefits of international leisure travel and the quality of life benefits that this brings. There is real benefit in visiting the destinations served by BIA (particularly the European capitals, Venice, etc).
- Whitelegg has asserted that jobs in aviation are fragile and low value. He omits to refer to the same issue in respect of jobs in the tourist industry which also tend to be low value and seasonal in nature.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Price Sensitivity of Tourism to Britain, BTA, 2001.

<sup>4</sup> As noted in 'Towards a 10 year Economic Development and Regeneration Strategy for North Somerset' by North Somerset Council, 2006.

<sup>5</sup> Towards 2015 Shaping Tomorrow's Tourism: South West Tourism/SWRDA

C15 Comment: The link between connectivity, transport and inward investment is disputed. The net deficit in investment results in an annual loss to the South West of 104,850 jobs.

Response:

- Whitelegg draws sweeping conclusions from a high level analysis of investment figures provided by the pressure group HACAN. Job losses for the South West claimed are 25% higher than the entire unemployment figures for the South West suggesting that the logic is flawed.
- The analysis ignores a substantial quantity of contextual evidence regarding the linkages between the economy and connectivity. Further details are provided in the updated Economic Impact Report.
- In response to comments raised to the consultation we have assessed the cost and time savings that are made by South West business passengers using BIA. It is estimated that these savings could be approximately £120m per annum by 2030.

C16 Comment: There should be more emphasis on local economic benefits.

Response:

- The main local economic benefit of BIA is in terms of jobs. The airport as a whole is the largest private sector employer in North Somerset. Surveys of staff working at BIA suggest that up to 43% of staff live in North Somerset. The towns of Nailsea, Portishead and Clevedon account for around 9% of staff, 19% are from Weston-super-Mare, 15% are from the rural villages, including those in the immediate vicinity of the airport.
- The local community is expected to continue to provide a significant proportion of the airport's labour requirements. Weston-super-Mare has been an important source of labour historically and this will continue. South Bristol also has an important role to play in meeting airport employment requirements.
- There are important links between BIA and the regeneration objectives for South Bristol and Weston-super-Mare. The close proximity of the airport is expected to be an important factor in securing the establishment of quality businesses in these areas. BIA aims to contribute to regeneration by providing quality employment and by raising skill levels. To this end a lot of BIA's work on skills and employment has been focussed on North Somerset through the Council, Go Skills, the Learning Skills Council and Business West. The Airport's 'Passport to the Future' publication has been prepared in conjunction with Clevedon JobCentrePlus to highlight the Airport employment opportunities.
- In 2005 approximately half BIA's capital expenditure of £15m, was spent with local construction companies, including companies located in North Somerset. The labour for most building trades is locally sourced.
- BIA and the businesses located at the airport use local suppliers where possible. Local garages, caterers and food and beverage suppliers benefit in this way. Airportcarz, the airport taxi company have fleet of 60 Ford Galaxies, supplied by a local garage, which are replaced every six months. The Airport is also one of the largest outlets for the locally brewed Butcombe Beer.

- The area in the immediate vicinity of the airport supports a number of businesses providing overnight accommodation, particularly for air travellers, including 116 hotel rooms on the A38 and up to 20 bed and breakfast establishments with 101 bedrooms in total. Similarly local taxi companies and coach operators benefit from airport business.

## 6. Terminal Building

C17 Comment: Improved use of technology will mean that the existing facility can accommodate additional passengers removing the need for the extension.

Response: The size of the Terminal Building is determined by the number of passengers and staff to be accommodated and the facilities required to service the passenger operation. Technology and use of the internet will benefit a number of processes but the effect on the overall size of the building is expected to be limited. The current trends in the airline industry are to use self service check-in facilities or on-line check-in. Check-in can also benefit from the use of Common User Terminal Equipment (CUTE) allowing any airline to use any desk. These developments, which have been factored into the terminal plans as far as they can be anticipated, will allow better utilisation of facilities but the need to expand check-in in the future is likely to remain, in order to accommodate increased quantities of baggage. Technology will have little influence on the need to expand other areas of the Terminal Building (e.g. security search, departure lounge, departure gates, immigration, baggage reclaim etc). The facilities need to be flexible enough to respond to changing regulatory requirements, particularly in respect of security.

C18 Comment: Add-ons resembling 'tin sheds' should be avoided.

Response: BIA is committed to high quality cost effective design for the extended Terminal Building.

## 7. Car parking

C19 Comment: The demand for additional car parking should be met within the existing airport boundary. Underground, off site and multi-storey car parks should be pursued. A holistic assessment of car parking is required taking into account the cost of land and impact on the Green Belt. Use two storey decked structures. South side expansion should be avoided.

Response: Further detailed work on car parking and surface access has been organised to address the comments made on the proposals in the draft Master Plan. This work includes a detailed reassessment of car parking options, taking into account the views expressed. A holistic assessment is proposed as part of the formal Transport Assessment for the proposed development taking into account:

- Proposed public transport strategy;
- Car parking management strategy;
- Staff travel arrangements;

- Demand for car park spaces;
- Appraisal of potential car park sites against sustainability criteria;
- Highways impact; and
- Mitigation measures.

The formal Transport Assessment will be issued with the final Master Plan. The Master Plan will be amended to reflect any proposed changes in the car park strategy.

## 8. Runway

C20 Comment: North Somerset Council have expressed concern at the proposal not to safeguard the runway extension and queried the future use of aircraft for long haul flights. Other consultees have inquired about constraints on aircraft type imposed by the runway length.

Response: The issues associated with aircraft performance and range are explored further below.

- The following aircraft have the potential to serve long haul destinations from BIA:
  - Boeing 757-200
  - Boeing 767-300
  - Boeing 737-700ER
  - Boeing 787
  - Airbus A319
  - Airbus A330-200
  - Airbus A350

Aircraft larger than those listed above are unlikely to be able to operate satisfactorily from BIA. Payload penalties may apply to some of the aircraft listed on some routes.

- The regional long haul scheduled service market in the UK is currently reliant on the Boeing 757 and 767. The range of these aircraft was considered in the draft Master Plan (see Table 12 on page 112). The Master Plan research shows that all the forecast long haul routes can be served by these aircraft.
- The last 757-200 was delivered by Boeing in 2005 and this aircraft is now out of production. These aircraft can be expected to continue to be in operation during the Master Plan period but a gradual phasing out and replacement by new generation aircraft can be expected. The 767 aircraft is a potential replacement in the medium term. This aircraft remains in production with orders still being placed with Boeing in 2005. The 767 can be expected to remain in operation during most of the Master Plan period.
- In response to demand from airlines Boeing are now developing the 787 Dreamliner, a mid size, long range aircraft with superior environmental performance, ideally suited to the UK regional market. This aircraft provides, possibly, the best opportunity to grow BIA's long haul market in the long term. Detailed discussions between BIA and Boeing, and with airlines that have placed orders for this aircraft, lead us to be a lot more

confident about its ability to serve the long haul market from BIA than York Aviation have indicated in their report for North Somerset Council. Information provided by Boeing would indicate that the aircraft would have the capability to serve destinations on the west coast of America and Cape Town, removing any effective constraint on the long haul market.

- Boeing's development programme for the 737 also includes aircraft that are specifically designed for the long haul market. In particular the recently launched 737-700ER is capable of trans-oceanic flights with a maximum range of up to 10,200 kilometres. The technical characteristics of the 737-700ER would suggest that it would be capable of operating from the existing runway at BIA.
- Airbus also feature aircraft that have long haul capabilities in their commercial aircraft programme. The A319 is capable of transatlantic flights and the A350 is under development as a competitor to the 787 Dreamliner.
- BIA remains of the view that the long haul market for services is broadly as set out in the draft Master Plan. York Aviation, in their report for North Somerset Council, discuss the prospect of services to other destinations including Toronto, Bangkok, Miami, Hong Kong, Singapore, Atlanta, Bahrain, Cape Town, Las Vegas and Kuala Lumpur. We doubt whether the market for these routes will be strong enough for airlines to offer dedicated services out of Bristol in competition to Heathrow. A more likely scenario is that BIA will have the capability to serve destinations in the Far East and Australia via a hub in the Middle East, such as Dubai or Abu Dhabi. Similarly US and Canada destinations would be adequately served through hubs on the east coast of America, well within range of BIA.
- Another factor that could affect the demand for long haul is the possibility of an 'open skies' policy with America which could see some US airlines migrating from Gatwick to Heathrow, subject to capacity constraints.
- Having considered the views expressed by York Aviation/North Somerset Council we have concluded that there is no reason to change the approach proposed in the draft Master Plan in respect of long haul services.

## 9. Hotel

**C21 Comment:** There is no need for a hotel. The hotel is not effective use of the site. Locate the hotel away from the site rather than take up valuable car park space.

**Response:** The Master Plan research shows that there is a shortage of bed space for air travellers and there is a strong demand for this facility. The highest quality facility with the least traffic impact can only be achieved by locating the airport hotel on site as close as possible to the Terminal Building. The benefits of so doing are set out in the draft Master Plan. The hotel can be designed with minimal impact on the capacity for car parking. The benefits of an on-site hotel are considerable and there are no grounds for reconsidering this proposal.

## 10. Air routes

C22 Comment: Provide further information on (local) routing of aircraft. Route aircraft to avoid Bath and Keynsham. Concern about the impact on the UNESCO World Heritage Site and Cotswolds AONB.

Response: Airspace changes are being organised through a separate joint exercise with Cardiff Airport, and this has involved widespread consultation, in addition to that undertaken for the Master Plan<sup>6</sup>. The proposed flight paths have been designed so that aircraft will no longer fly over Bath City Centre on a regular basis. Aircraft from Bristol International will, where possible, avoid large populated areas, and fly at higher altitudes than at present. Combined with the introduction of newer, quieter generations of aircraft this will mean less noise impact for local residents, including Bath and Keynsham, and enhanced safety and environmental benefits to the local area. The proposed flight paths will be included in the final Master Plan for clarification. No further changes are anticipated during the life of the Master Plan.

## 11. Air quality

C23 Comment: Has the air quality assessment considered the impacts relating to airport traffic?

Response: Yes.

C24 Comment: Concern about the impacts of air pollution on the natural environment.

Response: The Environmental Impact Assessment accompanying the planning application will include further assessment of the effects of pollutants on the natural environment.

C25 Comment: General concern regarding air pollution.

Response: The Master Plan research shows that the air quality at BIA will continue to meet the standards laid down by Government in the National Air Quality Objectives. The air quality impacts will be the subject of further detailed technical analysis in the Environmental Impact Assessment of the forthcoming planning application for airport development.

## 12. Community effects

C26 Comment: The Master Plan has not paid sufficient attention to the effects on communities. Consultees have expressed concern about the loss of tranquillity, degradation of the local countryside and the effect on the rural character.

---

<sup>6</sup> The airspace changes come into effect on 31 August 2006.

Response: The Master Plan Environmental Appraisal has considered the effects of airport development on the landscape, ecology, air quality, noise and traffic. These assessments are being developed into a full Environmental Impact Assessment, which will include full consideration of the effects on the community. The EIA Scoping Report (published alongside the draft Master Plan) sets out how the community effects will be further considered. This will include a rural character study which will assess the effects of increased patronage upon the rural area and the character of surrounding villages.

C27 Comment: Is it BIA's intention to undertake a Health Impact Assessment in connection with the future planning applications?

Response: A Health Study is being undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.

C28 Comment: A Government sponsored scheme for compensation for noise disturbance has been suggested, with comparison with the schemes launched by BAA Stansted.

Response: BAA Stansted have launched two schemes, a Home Owner Support Scheme (HOSS) related to properties within the 66dBA Leq contour predicted for the proposed second runway and a Special Cases Scheme (SCS) for those people living just outside the HOSS boundary with severe medical conditions which require them to move at the earliest opportunity. Conditions for such schemes relating to noise impact are set out in the ATWP. These conditions have not been met at BIA and are not predicted to be met before 2015. BIA will regularly monitor this situation.

C29 Comment: BIA should publish a voluntary house purchase scheme to include properties affected by airport surface traffic.

Response: See above. There are no grounds for BIA to offer to purchase property affected by airport traffic.

C30 Comment: BIA should impose a charge on passengers to be used to benefit local villages, bus services etc.

Response: BIA already operates a community fund which invests in local village projects. The Surface Access Strategy includes proposals for new bus services which will benefit the local community. The Master Plan will consider how ways of 'offsetting' climate change impacts through investment in environmental projects.

### **13. Landscape and visual impact**

C31 Comment: Consultees have expressed concern about light pollution from the Airport.

Response: The Environmental Impact Assessment will include a light pollution study and where possible facilities will be designed to minimise its impact.

C32 Comment: Consultees have expressed concern that BIA is overlooked by the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and has an effect on views from the AONB.

Response: The Airport is a minor component in the view from the elevated parts of the AONB and is scarcely visible from the centres of population. The key issue is light pollution which is considered above.

C33 Comment: Consultees have expressed concern about the quality of design for the new buildings.

Response: BIA is committed to developing well designed high quality facilities.

## 14. Noise

C34 Comment: BIA should ensure adherence to flight paths and monitor and enforce routings.

Response: BIA will be introducing Standard Instrument Departure Routes and Standard Arrival Routes as part of the airspace change proposals. It will then be possible to monitor and enforce routings of aircraft and introduce a penalty system for poor track keeping. The Master Plan will include commitments in this respect.

C35 Comment: What measures are proposed to address the effects of ground noise? Does BIA intend to introduce fixed ground power on any of its stands?

Response: The Master Plan includes proposals for a noise barrier to the east of the Terminal Building. Detailed modelling is being undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment to determine the benefits that arise from fixed ground power and how this might be best configured.

C36 Comment: Please state clearly the extent to which the current fleet mix meets the ICAO Annex 16 Chapter 4 standard. Confirm that all the year 2006 fleet will meet Chapter 4.

Response: The Chapter 4 standard applies to all newly certified aircraft after 1st January 2006. There is no definitive data for compliance of aircraft manufactured before this date. However we estimate that around 70% of the aircraft operating at BIA in 2006 would meet the Chapter 4 standard. There are no plans to recertify the existing aircraft fleet.

C37 Comment: The inclusion of the Ryanair 737-200 in the 2004 data will distort appreciation of the contours. The contours should be rerun with the 737-200 replaced by a 737-800.

Response: The 2004 contours have been included to show the actual noise climate in that year. They need to reflect the aircraft that actually operated.

C38 Comment: BIA should provide data on actual aircraft types and routings.

Response: The Master Plan will include further details on the destinations expected to be served from BIA. The input data used for the noise modelling is extensive and its inclusion in the Master Plan is not appropriate. The Environmental Impact Assessment will however include technical appendices with further detail.

C39 Comment: BIA should display the 50dB Leq contour which some consultees believe reflect the threshold of annoyance for rural areas.

Response: Planning Policy Guidance 24 notes that a considerable amount of research has been carried out in respect of air traffic noise. Based on noise measurements and social surveys 57dBA Leq relates to the onset of significant community annoyance. In the case of aircraft noise a 2dBA adjustment to the WHO guideline figure of 55dBA Leq is included in PPG24 to take account of ground reflection effects. BIA's approach to noise mapping is therefore consistent with the criteria established in the UK planning system, and follow the criteria set out in the ATWP. The 54dBA Leq contour has also been illustrated to provide a further measure of noise impact. The inclusion of a further contour will only serve to confuse. The noise monitoring exercise indicated that background noise levels can be up to 50dBA and mapping at lower levels would have to take account of noise sources other than aircraft. The lower WHO guideline figure of 50dBA Leq is not designed for aircraft noise assessment. The correlation between aircraft noise and annoyance breaks down below 57dBA and estimates of population annoyed have to be treated with caution.

C40 Comment: What was the actual runway modal split in 2004?

Response: The actual modal split in 2004 was 87/13. However 65/35 is the typical split from historical records and 2004 appears to have been an exceptional year. The typical modal split has been used to allow better comparison with future years. The Master Plan will be amended to make this clear. The Environmental Impact Assessment will consider the sensitivity of contour to variations in assumptions on modal split.

C41 Comment: Provide noise contours for 2030.

Response: There are too many uncertainties regarding long term growth to enable noise modelling to be undertaken with any degree of accuracy.

C42 Comment: Provide information on the calibration of the noise model, or use ANCON2 to give comparisons with contours included in the Master Plan.

Response: ANCON2 is operated by the CAA and is used by them to produce noise maps for airports that are designated under the 1982 Civil Aviation Act. This is currently Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted Airports. Elsewhere it is standard practice to use the FAA Integrated Noise Model (INM). In their consultation on the implementation of the European Noise Directive DEFRA indicate that both models produce comparable results. All the aircraft types operating at BIA are well accommodated within INM and we can see no need for additional calibration. The use of INM has been accepted by the CAA in their consideration of proposals to extend the BIA and Cardiff controlled airspace.

C43 Comment: Provide details of the area and population within each noise contour.

Response: This information will be provided.

C44 Comment: Use economic incentives to encourage the use of quieter aircraft. There should be restrictions on the types of aircraft according to noise. BIA should do more to encourage modern, less noisy and less polluting aircraft.

Response: The Master Plan will include commitments to enhance the noise monitoring regime and introduce penalties for the breaching of noise limits at the monitors. The aircraft operating at BIA, particularly those operated by Ryanair and easyJet are amongst the quietest and most modern available to airlines.

## 15. Night flying

C45 Comment: Is BIA prepared to enter into a binding commitment in respect of the proposals for future restrictions on night flying? Confirm that BIA has no intention of seeking any change to the current night quota level before 2015.

Response: BIA is prepared to accept a suitably worded condition attached to a planning approval of future development related to night flying. BIA would propose that the current restrictions remain in place until 2015.

C46 Comment: Consultees have expressed concern that there will be an increase in night flights and this will cause an increase in noise.

Response: The night quota system is based on the noise classification of the aircraft. It is therefore designed to ensure that the noise climate should not deteriorate. In practice the aircraft movements at night are almost all by aircraft rated at the low end of the noise quota scale (quota count 0.5 or 1) and there is little opportunity for an increase in flights. It should be noted that the number of night flights has declined slightly in recent years.

C47 Comment: Reduce the night quota, eliminate night flying, or change the hours of the night restrictions.

Response: The implications of reducing or eliminating night flying have been set out in the Master Plan and most consultees have welcomed our proposal to continue to work within the current night restrictions. The night quota system is consistent with the systems in operation at other airports in the UK particularly in the South East. Reviews of the system by Government have supported the retention of the current operating hours.

C48 Comment: Provide information on flights in the night shoulder periods.

Response: Movements in the shoulder periods are expected to be in line with the movement levels indicated in the Master Plan for the day time periods.

C49 Comment: Provide future Lden, Lnight and LAeq average summer night. Include 45dB:LAeq and 60dB:Lmax night contours.

Response: The preparation of Lden and Lnight contours are a requirement of the European Noise Directive (END) which is being transposed into UK law with regulations expected to be published in 2006. The objective of the END is to map historical noise. Airports will be required to prepare noise maps in 2007 and every five years thereafter. The END is not designed to forecast future noise climates and this cannot be undertaken reliably using Lden and Lnight contours because the calculation requires a whole year's data. Future noise impacts have been determined using Leq for a typical summer day. LAeq average summer night contours could be potentially misleading. No change in the night flying regime is proposed so the noise impact between 23:30 and 06:00 will remain the same. LAeq summer night contours would cover the period 23:00 to 07:00 so the effects in the shoulder periods would be averaged over the whole night period and would not be properly represented. On balance we feel that these further contours could cause confusion regarding noise impact. 2004 Lden and Lnight contours were included in the Master Plan in response to requests from consultees.

## **16. Surface access**

C50Comments: BIA should set out strategies including bus links to the rest of the sub region. Provide bus services to locations other than Bristol City Centre. The public transport target is not challenging enough. Monitor demand for additional bus services and provide them when reasonably practical to do so. Bus services to be subsidised.

Response: The public transport strategy has been comprehensively reviewed taking into account:

- The origin and destination of passengers within the West of England (former county of Avon);
- The usage of public transport by residents of the West of England;
- The usage of public transport at other airports in the UK;
- Existing public transport services; and
- Potential routes for new services.

The Master Plan will propose a public transport network that will offer improved connectivity with the City of Bristol, the wider public transport network and key urban areas within the sub region. We also envisage a role for community based bus services linking the local villages with the airport, for the local community to use whether they are using the airport or wish to make use of the airport's public transport network. The proposals are ambitious and after due consideration the Master Plan will retain the 13% target for public transport use at 9 mppa. The review shows that this is an ambitious target. The demand for additional bus services is monitored through the Airport Transport Forum and new services will be provided as soon as it becomes reasonably practical to do so. The introduction of the new service to the city centre and Clifton from 10th July 2006 demonstrates BIA's commitment in this respect. The Bristol International Flyer was subsidised until patronage reached a level when the service became commercially viable. BIA will apply this approach to the proposed new services.

C51 Comments: What road infrastructure/strategy does BIA require in order to deliver the growth anticipated in the Master Plan? New link roads to the M5/M4 required. A370/A38 link road required.

Response: The priorities for BIA in terms of new road infrastructure are:

- Improved connectivity to the motorway network and relief to Barrow Gurney through the construction of the A38/A370 link road;
- Improved connectivity to the south and east of Bristol and Bath through the construction of the South Bristol ring road;
- Improved connectivity to Weston-super-Mare; and
- In the long term, capacity improvements on the A38 south of Bristol.

We recognise that there are varying degrees of complexity associated with these schemes. BIA is keen to work with the sub-regional partners to secure the delivery of these schemes at the earliest opportunity.

C52 Comment: Consultees have expressed concern about the effects of increased airport traffic on Barrow Gurney and Chew Magna.

Response: The effects of airport traffic on these communities were the focus of detailed work on the highway capacity study for the Master Plan. It must be recognised that the airport is not the only source of traffic through these communities and the B3130 is widely used by local cross country traffic to the south of the city. There is a pressing need to address the problems of Barrow Gurney and BIA has been working closely with representatives of the Parish Council to develop a traffic calming scheme for the village. It appears likely that a suitable scheme involving a self-enforcing 20 mph speed limit can be developed for implementation in the short term. The longer term solution rests on the delivery of the A38/A370 link road. BIA has worked with North Somerset Council in the recent past on feasibility studies for the delivery of this scheme and we will continue to support the delivery of this road as a priority for improved surface access to the Airport. The South Bristol Ring Road should achieve a reduction in airport related traffic through Chew Magna and BIA strongly supports the delivery of this scheme.

C53 Comment: A rail or light rail link between Bristol and the Airport is desirable or ideal.

Response: A number of consultees commented on the lack of a direct rail link to Bristol International Airport and saw the need to develop a link as a prerequisite for future development. The provisional Surface Access Atrategy and the draft Master Plan concluded that a rail link was not a realistic prospect. Whilst it may be theoretically technically feasible to develop such a link in reconsidering this issue BIA notes:

- The RASCO study concluded that heavy rail is only a realistic option for airports handling in excess of 15 mppa;

- For airports in the 5 to 15mppa category light rail may be an option. However the viability of light rail has been reassessed since the RASCO work was undertaken and most light rail schemes have been dropped due to their poor financial performance;
- A rail link to Bristol International Airport would only ever be a spur link from the mainline and most passengers would need to change trains at Bristol Temple Meads;
- No specific studies have been commissioned into the feasibility of a rail link but an indication of the potential cost of such a scheme can be gained from schemes being considered elsewhere. Plans for rail connections to Glasgow and Edinburgh Airports are being brought forward by authorities in Scotland with an estimated cost of £140m for Glasgow and £500m for Edinburgh. The challenges of the terrain between the airport and Bristol would suggest that a rail scheme for Bristol would be likely to be at the higher end of this range;
- A completely new route for a rail link would be required with complex structures and earthworks required along the route. The Environmental Impact of such works is a great concern.

The public transport strategy therefore reaffirms the airport's commitment to bus based public transport using Bristol Temple Meads as the primary rail head for the airport. Worle Parkway or Nailsea and Backwell stations offer potential as secondary rail heads, the use of Worle being dependent on the delivery of proposals for a transport interchange in this location. The rail network will be the primary means of accessing the wider catchment area by public transport.

**C54**Comment: Improvements are required to junctions on the A38 and the Downside Road access. BIA should fund road improvements.

Response: These matters will be a detailed consideration in the formal transport assessment and proposals for mitigation will be brought forward where appropriate. BIA will contribute to schemes that mitigate the impacts of airport traffic growth based on the impact caused by the proposed development.

**C55**Comment: Airport growth should be capped until surface access issues are resolved.

Response: Traffic growth will be gradual and will not occur all at the same time. A strategy for dealing with surface access issues involving improved public transport services and the phased delivery of new infrastructure is required to cope with this growth. A cap on airport growth would disadvantage the region and sub-region in terms of the economic and social benefits of airport growth and would run counter to national policy.

**C56**Comment: Consultees have expressed concern about the inaccessibility of BIA for potential employees.

Response: A Staff Travel Plan has been prepared to support the Airport Surface Access Strategy. This includes a number of measures to improve the accessibility of BIA for staff and targets to reduce reliance on the car.

## 17. Climate change

**C57 Comment:** Consultees have expressed concern about the impacts of aviation on climate change. BIA has been asked to assess the impact and include realistic measures in the Master Plan to address this issue. Views have been expressed that the proposed growth is not in line with the National Energy Policy or Sustainable Development Strategy.

**Response:** The Master Plan will quantify BIA's contribution to climate change and include specific local proposals for reducing the airport's contribution. The climate change impact of aviation and the measures required to tackle it are enshrined in Government Policy. To have a substantive effect any additional controls must be imposed at national level, by Government, as envisaged by para. 3.42 of the ATWP. The Aviation Industry is taking steps to reduce its impact through the Sustainable Aviation Strategy and through the inclusion of aviation in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. In addition the Master Plan will include commitments to reduce the on site emissions of greenhouse gases by:

- Designing buildings to achieve savings in energy use in excess of that required by the Building Regulations.
- Making best use of renewable energy sources and fuels in future development where possible.
- Reducing emissions from aircraft auxiliary power units through the use of mobile and fixed ground power units.
- Designing the airport layout to minimise aircraft holding and taxiing times.
- Use of low embedded energy products in construction and consumable materials used by the airport.
- Use of a Staff Travel Plan to reduce private car usage by staff.
- The use of ambitious targets to increase the usage of public transport by passengers.
- Providing information to passengers on climate change impacts including advice on carbon offset schemes.

## 18. Mitigation

**C58 Comment:** Mitigation should be in place before any new development takes place.

**Response:** The timing of mitigation will generally be determined by traffic growth. However, where possible, we will ensure that mitigation, such as landscaping and the noise wall will be in place before the relevant development takes place.

## 19. Sustainable development

**C59 Comment:** BIA should take an ambitious approach to sustainability and achieve high quality sustainable design. Sustainable procurement policy is required.

**Response:** The Master Plan will include commitments to achieve this.

## **20. Sustainability appraisal**

C60 Comment: How have recommendations of the sustainability appraisal been incorporated into the plan?

Response: The chosen option for development is consistent with the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal. The mitigation measures set out in para. 11.8 are derived from the plan.

## **Appendices**

- Appendix 1: Comments from North Somerset Council
- Appendix 2: Comments from Bristol City Council, Bath and North East Somerset Council, South Gloucestershire Council and Government Office for the South West
- Appendix 3: Responses from Parish Councils
- Appendix 4: Other stakeholder responses

## Bristol International Airport – Draft Master Plan – Consultation – Comments from North Somerset

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
<b>North Somerset Council</b>				
NSC1	Minutes of Executive 6/12/05 item 3	Landscape and visual impact	Matter to be developed most fully at this stage.	The Master Plan provides a preliminary appraisal of environmental impacts and includes preliminary proposals for mitigation. Landscape and visual impact has been considered in the assessment of development options and is being further considered in the appraisal of car park options (see below). The Environmental Impact Assessment and the accompanying design will develop landscape and visual impact most fully.
NSC2		Car parking, surface access and travel to work	Matter to be developed most fully. Lack of sustainable surface access strategy puts at risk the airport development.	Further detailed work on these topics has been organised to address comments made to the proposals in the draft Master Plan.
NSC3		Engagement with surrounding communities	Matter to be developed most fully.	The process for concluding the Master Plan has been considered with the Council and it has been agreed that consultees will be notified when the Master Plan has been completed and submitted to the DfT and North Somerset Council. Consultees will be invited to provide any further comments directly to North Somerset Council. Consultation for the forthcoming planning application will follow the approach set out on the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
NSC4		Contribution of BIA to positive and negative	Matter to be developed most fully.	This has been further assessed in the light of comments received. See also responses to

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
		aspects of economic performance.		comments C8 to C16.
NSC5		Potential longer term land requirements.	Matter to be developed most fully.	The potential longer term land requirements have been considered but it is not possible to develop these issues fully at this stage because of the uncertainties regarding the nature of the longer term growth. Following the Inspector's report on the Local Plan Inquiry it is understood that the Council have withdrawn their proposal to develop an Area Action Plan for Bristol International Airport and this matter will be considered when the Master Plan is reviewed in five or so years time, at which stage it will be possible to consider these matters more fully.
NSC6		Long-term sustainability and climate change	Concern at the effects.	These matters have been further addressed. See also response to comment C55.
	Annex to report to Executive			
NSC7	Para 12	Consultation	It would be helpful if BIA sought to undertake some consultations with primary schools – St Katharine's Felton, Winford and Wrington.	The Master Plan has been discussed with the heads of the local schools, who have been asked to be kept informed as the proposals develop. BIA work closely with St Katharine's, Felton and the Community Liaison Manager is a governor of the school.
NSC8	Para 13	Surface access	Objectives set out a regional, not sub regional role. Importance of regional	Outside the immediate surroundings of the airport and particularly outside the sub region

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
			surface access links.	the airport component of traffic flows is very small. Improvements to regional surface access links will be generated by the wider transport needs of the region and BIA has no specific requirements for surface access improvements, outside the sub-region, in this respect. Note that the objectives also envisage a regional role as a hub airport (see final objective) linking with Plymouth and Newquay Airports. This potential was considered in some detail in the Government Consultation prior to the publication of the White Paper <sup>7</sup> .
NSC9	Para 14	Green Belt	Threat to degree of openness if Green Belt designation lifted. ATWP does not refer to what is in AMP.	This matter has been discussed extensively at the Local Plan Inquiry and the Inspector has now provided his conclusions. The Master Plan will be adjusted to reflect these conclusions and references to the case for changes to the Green Belt will be removed.
NSC10	Para 15	Green Belt	NSC unable to endorse BIA's view on Green Belt.	See NSC9 above.
NSC11	Para 16	Weston-super-Mare	Lack of detail on role BIA plays in regeneration of WSM.	This is a reference to the case presented to the Local Plan Inquiry. This will now be deleted. Consideration of economic effects will be confined to Chapter 6.
NSC12	Para 17	Permitted development	Clarify what is permitted development.	The scope of permitted development is set out on Part 18 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.
NSC13	Para 18	Public safety zone	PSZ areas to be included in the final Master Plan. Safeguard PSZ associated	The risk contours for future air traffic growth will be included in the Master Plan. These indicate

<sup>7</sup> See 'The Future of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: South West', DfT 2002.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
			with an extension to the runway, if an extension is to be safeguarded.	a small increase in the area of the PSZ in the medium term but in the long term the area will reduce as turbo-prop aircraft are replaced by jet aircraft. A runway extension is not proposed and there is no benefit or need to zone land to reflect this. On this basis no properties are expected to fall within the 1 in 10,000 risk contour and any extension of the 1 in 100,000 contours is likely to be in areas that are not populated.
NSC14	Para 19	Forecasts	Surprising no sensitivity tests undertaken on LHR being unable to deliver third runway.	The forecasting work already assumes that capacity at some London airports will become increasingly constrained, particularly at Heathrow. This included sensitivity tests. It was concluded that the Bristol forecasts are not overly sensitive to these constraints. The White Paper anticipates that the third runway will not come into operation <i>'before some time in the period 2015-2020'</i> . The relationship will therefore not affect the detailed Master Plan to 2015. There is no basis for changing these assumptions until the Project for the Sustainable Development of Heathrow provides greater clarity. If any long term issues might arise from this it will be a consideration for future revisions of the Master Plan. In any case, because the third runway is focussed on domestic and short haul services, any impact is likely to be limited because Bristol has a comprehensive domestic and European flight programme.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
NSC15	Para 20	Forecasts	Overall levels of passenger demand in the AMP appear a reasonable basis for planning future development.	Noted.
NSC 16	Para 21	Forecasts	Growth may be conservative in the short term.	Growth in 2005 and 2006 has been slightly ahead of the Master Plan forecasts but this does not affect the Master Plan proposals for the period to 2015.
NSC 17	Para 22	Forecasts	Aircraft movement forecasts appear reasonable. More detail might be added to explain decline in GA movements.	The structure of the General Aviation market has changed in recent years. Increased activity by commercial passenger aircraft has made BIA less attractive to private flying and this traffic is tending to be displaced to other airfields. In addition private pilot licence training at BIA is declining – training is now almost exclusively for commercial licences. This trend is anticipated to continue.
NSC 18	Para 23	Forecasts	Assumptions about the feasibility of (long haul services) should be further tested. Runway length constraint.	See response to comment C20. BIA does not propose to change the Master Plan in this respect.
NSC 19	Para 24	Forecasts	Surprising no specific air freight forecasts. Longer term pressure for expansion of air freight facilities unclear.	The reasons for not preparing freight forecasts are provided in the Master Plan. BIA maintained a Freight Centre at the Airport until the mid 1990's. Almost all the freight handled arrived by road from Heathrow and consequently the operation was relocated to Avonmouth. In recent years the operation became less and less viable and in 2004 BIA closed the facility. There is no evidence of a market for air freight either now or in the future out of Bristol. The South East Airports appear

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				to be able to meet the South West's demands for air freight with freight transport to the South East by road. In view of this and the significant night noise issues raised by air freight operations this is a market that BIA has decided not to pursue. We also note that there are significant uncertainties associated with forward forecasting of freight demand on an airport-by-airport basis. There is no evidence to suggest that air freight services from BIA might contribute to the South West economy.
NSC 20	Para 25	Economic and social considerations	No specific work on implications of improved air service connectivity.	The Economic Impact Assessment has been updated to include more detailed analysis of connectivity benefits.
NSC 21	Para 26	Economic and social considerations	Should be greater consideration of the general strategic role of BIA in relation to the economy of the South West.	The general strategic role of BIA is comprehensively covered in the South West Region's Air Strategy, the White Paper and the consultation documents published prior to its issue.
NSC 22	Para 26	Economic and social considerations	Master Plan too centred on Bristol. More emphasis on 'local' economic benefits and how maximised.	This section includes many references to Weston-super-Mare. The sub-region is centred on Bristol and the performance of Bristol is important to the city-region. We have nevertheless considered the local economic benefits further in the response to comment C16.
NSC 23	Para 28	Employment	What assumptions on productivity?	The Economic Impact Assessment has been amended to clarify how productivity was considered in the employment assessment. York Aviation have perhaps misunderstood how the employment forecasts have been

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				prepared. The forecasts have been developed by considering the likely changes in operational practices and changing productivity levels are included as far as they can be currently anticipated.
NSC 24	Para 28	Employment	Why was the second methodology not used? Further sensitivity tests should be undertaken.	<p>Both methodologies were included in the Economic Impact Assessment. The inclusion of two estimates of employment in the Master Plan would be confusing so only the scenario 1 figures were included for simplicity. This was thought to be the more realistic estimate, but it should be noted that only the airline component varies between the two estimates. The final Master Plan will be amended to make this clearer.</p> <p>Given the complexity of the issues involved and their inter-relationships it was not considered helpful to conduct a simple sensitivity analysis varying assumptions by random percentages. The use of two scenarios for employment growth in itself provides a range of potential growth and demonstrates the sensitivity of the estimates to a key variable. Sensitivity was also considered by the application of different methodologies and by benchmarking against established multipliers generated through research on regional airports growth.</p>
NSC 25	Para 29	Tourism	Estimate of job numbers inaccurate.	This matter is addressed in the updated report.
NSC 26	Para 30	Tourism	Assessment of balance of impact with outbound trips should be made.	This matter is addressed in the updated report.
NSC 27	Para 31	Wider business	Airport penetration of overall business	The 2003 CAA figures indicate that BIA

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
		benefits	market in South West?	captured 38% of the overall South West business air traffic market in that year. The growth of the route network since then will have increased this figure but an updated estimate will not be available until the next CAA survey is completed in 2006/07.
NSC 28	Para 33	Wider business benefits	Potential long term impact on economy of not safeguarding runway extension. Economic benefit of long haul routes.	The assessment of economic impact of the Master Plan proposals acknowledges the constraint of runway length. BIA does not believe the runway constraint has an undue effect on the ability to accommodate long haul services and BIA's current operations and planned growth will continue to protect and enhance the region's connectivity. Even working within the runway length constraint, BIA provides links to international hubs such as Amsterdam, offering onward journeys to long haul destination, and this traffic is forecast to increase substantially. In the light of this we do not believe the long term impact of not safeguarding the runway extension is significant.
NSC 29	Para 34	Wider business benefits	Need to be more explicit about routes expected and how these will support regional economic base.	Further detail of potential routes will be provided in the final draft.
NSC 30	Para 35	Wider business benefits	Include more structured analysis of connectivity benefits.	This matter is addressed in the updated report. It is estimated that approximately £120m of time and cost savings will be made by South West business passengers per year, by using BIA in preference to other airports, by 2030.
NSC 31	Para 36	Maximising potential	Ability to contribute to regeneration	The airport's contribution to regeneration is as

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
			covered superficially.	<p>follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment;</li> <li>• Providing connectivity and making the South West a more attractive place to do business;</li> <li>• Providing opportunities for travel, widening knowledge of the world, raising aspirations and making the South West a better place in which to live;</li> <li>• Working with schools and raising standards of education in travel and work related areas.</li> </ul> <p>The Weston Area Development Framework (ADF) notes the value that BIA offers in terms of access to markets for businesses seeking to locate in Weston. The ADF economic strategy sets out objectives to achieve high quality employment and the type of businesses that are being attracted are likely to be users of air travel.</p>
NSC 32	Paras 37/38	Maximising potential	Information on Bristol and Weston labour source required. Evidence required to support conclusion that there should be sufficient labour supply.	This evidence is provided in section 10 of the Economic Impact Report.
NSC 33	Para 39	Maximising potential	More information needed about BIA's strategy to tackle labour market issues.	<p>BIA's strategy to tackle labour market issues is concerned with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with local partners to address skills shortages, in particular through schools and local training providers;</li> <li>• Working with Go Skills to provide skills training for those working at the airport</li> </ul>

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				<p>in the service sector;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making it easier for people to access jobs at the airport – see for example the Passport to your Future publication produced in conjunction with the Clevedon JobCentrePlus</li> <li>• Addressing access issues through the a Staff Travel Plan, in particular providing improved opportunities for staff to get to the airport by public transport from both Bristol and North Somerset.</li> </ul> <p>Access issues are considered further in the section on surface access.</p>
NSC 34	Para 40	Maximising potential	Further analysis of future skills needs required.	The Master Plan does not attempt to address the issue of skills needs – this is not a matter for detailed consideration here.
NSC 35	Para 41	Social considerations	Little regard paid to impacts on quality of life in villages affected by traffic and air traffic noise.	This will be a detailed consideration of EIA. See the scoping report.
NSC 36	Para 42	Social considerations	Specific evidence about educational exchanges.	<p>Trips abroad are a feature of the curriculum in many schools and we are aware that many of the trips from local secondary schools make use of BIA including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Music visit to Venice</li> <li>• Art trip to New York</li> <li>• History visit to Berlin</li> <li>• Sport tours</li> <li>• Science trip to CERN (Geneva)</li> <li>• Czech school exchange</li> <li>• Room 13 (Hartcliffe) visit to Dublin</li> <li>• Irish dance competitions</li> </ul>

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				<p>BIA has also supported the Bristol-Bordeaux exchange facilitating the continuation of this programme with flights from the Airport. Many local sports teams take part in tours that include the use of flights from BIA. Hitherto such trips would either not have been possible or would have involved the use of airports outside the South West. There are no practical restrictions to these educational exchanges.</p>
NSC 37	Para 43	Social considerations	<p>Focus on educational opportunities inadequately related to North Somerset establishments. Disappointing that examples from Bristol. More direct working with NS pupils and partnership agencies.</p>	<p>We are surprised by this comment. In addition to the North Somerset initiatives listed in the draft Master Plan BIA has been involved with the following educational activities in North Somerset:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'World of Work Event' with Priory School at Worle;</li> <li>• Worle Community School fire awareness training;</li> <li>• Around the World in 80 days reading project with St Katharine's, Felton and Court de Wicke, Claverham;</li> <li>• St Katharine's School reading recovery</li> <li>• Teacher resource days – including attendance by North Somerset teachers;</li> <li>• Members of staff are Governors of a number of schools, including St Katharine's, Felton</li> <li>• Search for Santa disabled day care event</li> <li>• North Somerset Agricultural Society 'Gate to Plate' project;</li> </ul>

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goblin Combe Environment Centre;</li> <li>• Backwell School assistance with performing and visual arts.</li> </ul> <p>We believe this shows that we are already working directly with North Somerset pupils and partnership agencies.</p>
NSC 38	Para 44	Social considerations	What discussions undertaken directly with children and young people as part of the consultation process.	The agreed Statement of Community Involvement did not include any special measures designed to target children and young people. However the consultation has been accessible to all and measures such as the distribution of leaflets and the exhibitions targeted young and old alike. Furthermore the impacts of the proposed development are the same for adults and children.
NSC 39	Para 45	Relationship with Exeter	Greater detail of BIA's catchment area should be provided, including anticipated future patterns. Query complementary role and rural catchment area.	<p>Details of the catchment area are provided at Appendix A of the Master Plan in so far as they affect surface access. Further details will be provided for clarification.</p> <p>The complementary role means that the two airports operate in a hierarchy. Exeter provides services for destinations where there is sufficient demand for them from the local catchment area. Where the local Exeter demand is not sufficient to support a route, this route may be provided from BIA.</p> <p>Although 45% of passengers come from the former Avon area only about 75% of these originate from the principal urban areas of Weston-super-Mare, Bristol and Bath.</p> <p>Therefore 66% of passengers are from outside</p>

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				the West of England. RPG notes that over half the South West's population live in rural areas or towns of less than 20,000 people. We note that York Aviation reported that NSC will benefit by having two airports serving it and the reason for the comments are unclear.
NSC 40	Para 45	Relationship with Exeter	Unclear how GBSTS proposal for multi modal interchange at Worle Parkway will be taken into account.	BIA will consider the need for a bus service between the airport and Worle Station should the proposals come to fruition and once further details of the onward transport connections proposed are available.
NSC 41	Para 46	Passenger terminal and apron	Shape of apron is sub-optimal. Ancillary buildings and structures dictate the shape and positioning of aircraft parking positions.	Whilst the structures have an influence on the shape of the apron the main constraints are the falling ground to the north and the location of the Terminal Building and Control Tower. Aircraft aprons have to be constructed to very shallow slopes.
NSC 42	Para 48	Passenger terminal and apron	BIA should consider the possibility of further apron development on north side.	The possibility of further development on the north side will be retained as an option for the future longer term Master Plan to 2030. The technical challenges of creating a surface structurally suitable for heavy aircraft use with up to 4m of earth fill are not insignificant. There is also a concern that the single taxiway on the north side may not be able to deliver the required runway movement capacity with a further increase in the number of stands. Some of the existing stands feature 'push back' on to the taxiway which have an effect on movement capacity. There seems to be no prospect of an additional taxiway on the north

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				side so the southern apron option may be more attractive on these grounds.
NSC 43	Para 49	Passenger terminal and apron	Make full use of technology to maximise the use of terminal handling capacity. Provide information to justify statements about efficiency of Terminal Building.	<p>The congestion in the Terminal Building is illustrated in the Master Plan through the use of photographs. This needs to be witnessed first hand to appreciate that the building is fully utilised. The current 30<sup>th</sup> busiest hour is about 1200 pax/hour. The conventional 'rule of thumb' is that there should be 49.5 sq m per pax, or 59,400 sq m. The actual area of the terminal is just over 20,000 sq m. Billund Airport Terminal is a good example of a new 21<sup>st</sup> century Terminal Building – it comprises 40,000 sq m floor area for an annual throughput of 2m ppa. Liverpool John Lennon Airport handled 4.4m pax in 2005 in a Terminal Building that is at least 20% bigger than BIA. We note that York Aviation were of the view that '...BIA has made good use of the available space...'. York Aviation appear to have misunderstood how the current facilities operate. The majority of check in desks are operated by one handling agent and most of the desks can be used to check in any airline. The remaining desks are operated by British Airways for their flights and code share partners, with a common check in arrangement. The peaks for each bank of desks tend to coincide. Common user facilities become a necessity should a further handling agent be introduced, by the airlines, to the</p>

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				airport. See also the response to comment C17.
NSC 44	Para 50	Passenger terminal and apron	Need to look at impact of hotel, mscp, admin building etc...clearer AMP. Hotel not to be considered in isolation.	The statement about the Terminal Building being central to the plan for delivering growth was made to emphasise that this is the current significant capacity constraint and other facilities are in effect ancillary to this building. The Environmental Impact Assessment will consider all the impacts of the full development and a co-ordinated approach to design is proposed.
NSC 45	Para 51	Passenger terminal and apron	How will improved accessibility for all user groups be achieved? Drop off areas, signage, taxi and bus waiting areas.	The drop off and public transport arrangements will be clarified in the final Master Plan. Detailed proposals will be illustrated in the planning application design drawings.
NSC 46	Para 52	Passenger terminal and apron	Design objectives supported. Different forms of construction options not considered. Need for crime prevention and security should be given recognition.	The Master Plan sets out a high level strategy for these matters. The detailed design will consider the different forms of construction.
NSC 47	Para 53	Car parking	Dedicated airport public transport services should be judged by contribution to sustainability of the whole airport operation. Similar comments re mscp's.	The Master Plan does not qualify viability by reference to commercial criteria. However a certain level of patronage is required in order to achieve environmental benefits by running public transport services. This will be explored further in the Transport Assessment.
NSC 48	Para 54	Car parking	Concerns about cost implications of multi storey or u/ground car parks accepted.	Noted.
NSC 49	Para 55	Car parking	Holistic assessment of car parking (required) to include cost of land, and impact on GB. Two storey decked structures?	See response to comment C19.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
NSC 50	Para 56	Car parking	Multi-storey stcp appears sensible.	Noted.
NSC 51	Para 57	Car parking	Pricing mechanisms not considered between different products.	The Transport Assessment will take these matters into account.
NSC 52	Para 58	Car parking	Further consideration of strategic park and ride warranted. Lulsgate Quarry. Worle Parkway. Not credible to argue BIA's preferred solution is best unless such options are fully and fairly assessed.	These options will be considered in the Transport Assessment/car park appraisal referred to above.
NSC 53	Para 59	Car parking	Difficult to draw meaningful distinction between extended airport boundary car park and unauthorised off-airport sites.	The differences will be considered in the car park appraisal. These matters have been considered in some detail in the enforcement appeal inquiries relating to unauthorised off airport car parks. The differences relate to access, efficiency of use, trip generation, visibility and concentrating development to minimise impact on the Green Belt.
NSC 53	Para 60	Car parking	Not evident that surface extension is preferable on grounds other than cost. Further analysis to show surface car parking is the most sustainable option.	To be considered in the car park appraisal.
NSC 54	Para 60	Car parking	Planning issues to be comprehensively addressed. Parking management strategy and comparative landscape impact assessment required.	To be considered in the car park appraisal.
NSC 55	Para 60	Car parking	Any proposal for a mscp must be accompanied by context elevations (sections) and analysis of appearance from close to middle distance views.	The detailed analysis will be provided with the planning application.
NSC 56	Para 61	Car parking	Statements made in connection to off-airport car parking not tested or	These statements are generally as presented by the Council and BIA at public inquiries

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
			quantified.	considering unauthorised off airport car parks. There have been nine such appeal decisions to date and the inspectors' conclusions have been overwhelmingly against the satellite car parks.
NSC 57	Para 62/63	Fuel farm	Proposal sound. Consider if location would constrain westward expansion of car park.	We have no proposals to extend the car park to the west and in any case the location of the fuel farm would not cause a constraint.
NSC 58	Para 64	Fire station	Location OK but should not compromise apron and taxiway required in the longer term.	We believe the location safeguards any apron and taxiway expansion that might be required in the future.
NSC 59	Para 65	Administration building	No indication of expected size.	The size is indicated in paragraph 7.82 and the building is shown on the accompanying drawings.
NSC 60	Para 66	Administration building	Has consideration been given to including some or all of office accommodation in upper floors of terminal?	As both buildings are of more than one storey displacing accommodation from one to the other has no effect on land take unless the requirement for the administration building can be eliminated. For crew and office accommodation it is more efficient and cost effective to locate the facilities in a separate purpose built facility, avoiding interfaces with passengers. In the interests of minimising visual impact it is important that the height of the buildings do not exceed the height of the existing terminal building.
NSC 61	Para 67	Runway	Slightly fuller explanation of runway capacity issues would be useful.	This will be provided.
NSC 62	Para 68	Taxiways	Do BIA intend to introduce other taxiway improvements?	The Master Plan includes our proposals in this respect. We do not believe that rapid exit taxiways will be of value with the current runway length.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
NSC 63	Para 69	Air routes	Further information required.	The air routes are being adjusted in a separate joint exercise with Cardiff Airport. This is concerned with extending the managed airspace operated by the two airports, introducing new noise preferential routes, and standard instrument departure and arrival routes. This has been the subject of a wide consultation, including the Council and no further changes during the life of the Master Plan are expected.
NSC 64	Para 70	General aviation	Which type of GA is being lost?	See response to NSC 17.
NSC 65	Para 71	General aviation	Assurances that GA facilities and land will be available.	This will be addressed in the final Master Plan.
NSC 66	Para 72	Mail and freight	Proposal to relocate Royal Mail is sound.	Noted.
NSC 67	Para 72	Mail and freight	More detail required on potential market for flown freight.	See response to NSC 19.
NSC 68	Para 73	Air quality	Lack of clarity as to where on site standards will be exceeded.	This is made clear in the accompanying air quality report.
NSC 69	Para 73	Air quality	Lack of information regarding impact of road vehicles. Have road impacts relating to airport traffic been considered?	Road impacts relating to airport traffic have been considered.
NSC 70	Para 75	Air quality	General background air quality in surrounding area needs consideration.	The Environmental Impact Assessment will address this more fully.
NSC 71	Para 76	Community	Scant consideration of how BIA will consider the effects on communities or potential for mitigation.	See NSC 35.
NSC 72	Para 77	Community	Indicate considerations such as Health Impact Assessments that may be produced in connection with planning applications.	The planning application will include a Health Study.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
NSC 73	Para 78	Landscape and visual	Visuals from detailed study would help illustrate key issues and ways in which AMP intends to mitigate the impact.	Visuals will be added.
NSC 74	Para 78	Landscape and visual	All new and relocating development needs to be identified. South side development will need to be carefully examined.	Comment not understood. All development is shown. A more detailed plan will be available for the final Master Plan to provide additional clarification.
NSC 75	Para 79	Noise	AMP description is appropriate. Indicate implication for flight arrival and departure routes.	Measures to increase runway capacity are not expected to affect flight arrival and departure routes.
NSC 76	Para 80	Noise	Equipment to monitor and enforce controlled routings, dealing with divergences.	See response to comment C34.
NSC 77	Para 81	Noise	Impact on educational establishments within the area.	It may difficult to identify the school on the noise maps included with the Master Plan. However they indicate that the noise climate will improve and in the future the school is predicted to fall outside the 63dBA Leq contour. BIA have provided noise insulation to the school through conditions to previous planning approvals.
NSC 78	Para 81	Noise	Objections if relocation of the school cannot be advanced in the short term. Impact on safe walking initiatives.	See above. It is understood that the primary reasons for relocating the school relate to the state of the buildings and the A38. The Transport Assessment will consider the impact on safe walking initiatives. The Environmental Impact Assessment will identify the school as a receptor for impacts as relocation is not certain.
NSC 79	Para 82	Noise	Goblin Combe Environment Centre and campsite buildings should be considered as noise sensitive buildings.	The requirements for noise sensitive buildings are as set out in the ATWP. The Environment Centre lies outside the 57dBA Leq contour both

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				now and in the future. The campsite buildings fall outside the 63 dBA Leq contour, and we do not believe that the use of the campsite would classify the accommodation block as a noise sensitive building.
NSC 80	Para 83	Noise	Night flying proposal seems reasonable.	Noted.
NSC 81	Para 84	Noise	Does BIA intend to introduce FGP on any of its stands?	See response to comment C35.
NSC 82	Para 85	Noise	Landscape impact of noise barrier not described.	The noise barrier will be considered in detail in the EIA and its landscape assessment. At this stage we believe that the landscape impact can be mitigated through careful design and planting schemes.
NSC 83	Para 87	Surface Access Strategy	Bus links or road strategies in the rest of the (ie. outside Bristol) sub region.	See response to comments C50 and C51.
NSC 84	Para 87	Surface Access Strategy	Commitment to regularly monitor demand for additional services and provide them when reasonably practical to do so.	The surface access strategy will include such a commitment.
NSC 85	Para 88	Surface Access Strategy	Surface access issues and strategy for the period to 2030? Targets for public transport seem to be quite modest. Lack of real wider thrust towards public transport use. Issues and needs in the longer term – stated intention to serve more of the demand from the whole South West.	See above.
NSC 86	Para 89	Highways and traffic	Growth not possible without substantial and direct impacts on the surrounding road network.	The transport assessment will fully assess these impacts and identify the mitigation measures needed.
NSC 87	Para 90	Highways and traffic	Formal transport assessment should be	The formal transport assessment will be

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
			included in the AMP.	published in conjunction with the final Master Plan.
NSC 88	Para 91	Highways and traffic	Council does not share the view that short term growth is unlikely to have an undue effect on the road network. This view is contrary to ATWP.	As noted above the formal transport assessment will be provided to the Council in conjunction with the Master Plan.
NSC 89	Para 92/93	Highways and traffic	More emphasis on effects on villages such as Barrow Gurney and Chew Magna. No proposals to mitigate adverse impacts of growth through Barrow Gurney.	The Transport Assessment will address these issues.
NSC 90	Para 94	Highways and traffic	Airport growth without full resolution of implications for surface access not satisfactory.	The Transport Assessment will provide the information required.
NSC 91	Para 95	Travel to work	Projections for staff car parking and use of initiatives to reduce dependency on car.	A Staff Travel Plan has been prepared and the key measures and targets will be incorporated into the Master Plan.
NSC 92	Para 96	Travel to work	Public transport provision for North Somerset and WSM?	The Surface Access Strategy will be amended to include specific proposals for North Somerset.
NSC 93	Para 97	Climate change	Unless BIA can develop more robust and realistic measures to address its impact on climate change it could be argued that air travel and airport expansion should be limited until solutions are in place.	See response to comment C57.
NSC 94	Para 99	Climate change	Good reason to seek additional controls to offset the effect of aircraft emissions in the short term.	See response to comment C57.
NSC 95	Para 102 et seq	Climate change	Estimates of requirements for offset tree planting. BIA to refine estimates and bring forward proposals that address	We do not believe that the Council's tree planting estimates provide a credible solution for climate change. There are differences of

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
			public concern over climate change implications of increasing air travel.	scientific opinion over the use tree planting as a carbon sink, and the impacts on the landscape of tree planting on the scale suggested would be substantial. We agree that offsetting has a role to play in raising awareness of climate change issues and its use to facilitate investment in high quality projects is recognised. The current trend is to encourage the public and business to consider offsetting their carbon use. We understand that North Somerset Council may be contemplating such a scheme and we would be pleased to work as a partner for its delivery. The Sustainable Aviation Strategy includes offsetting.
NSC 96	Para 106	Sustainability appraisal	Final AMP needs to demonstrate greater integration of actions required and mitigation measures proposed within a structure framework.	The Sustainability Appraisal will be updated and developed for the forthcoming planning application.
NSC 97	Para 107	Sustainability appraisal	Does BIA intend to assess the AMP in line with the latest National Framework?	The AMP has been assessed in accordance with the latest framework.
NSC 98	Para 109	Development 2016 to 2030	Council's key concern with AMP is with respect to period 2016 to 2030.	The Inspector's report on the North Somerset Local Plan has now recommended that preparation of the BIA AAP, the key tool for long term planning, be postponed until after the approval of the replacement SWRSS and the replacement Core Strategy for North Somerset and when a review of the Master Plan has provided firmer indications of what may be required beyond the currently intended works to lift capacity to 9 mppa. The issues related to

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
				the period 2016 to 2030 would be comprehensively addressed then.
NSC 99	Para 110	Development 2016 to 2030	AMP does not set out a cogent land use plan for 2030. Safeguard land for long term and provide planning certainty.	The AMP does not set out to provide a complete land use plan or to safeguard land for expansion at this stage. The final Plan will however address the issues raised in the NSC report.
NSC 100	Para 111	Development 2016 to 2030	Inadequate information or justification to satisfy the Council that the full economic and social potential of BIA is being safeguarded within a sustainable framework. Inadequate land safeguarded.	See above.
NSC 101	Para 112	Development 2016 to 2030	Concern about implications for an AAP.	See above.
NSC 102	Para 113	Development 2016 to 2030	Issues regarding sustainability appraisal beyond 2015. Assumptions on business travel and oil prices.	See above.
NSC 103	Para 114/115	Development 2016 to 2030	Issues relating to ATWP.	See above.
NSC 104	Para 116	Runway extension	Essential to clarify link between pax forecasts, aircraft types, and need for runway extension.	See response to comment C20.
NSC 105	Para 117	Runway extension	Caution about assumptions regarding B787.	See response to comment C20.
NSC 106	Para 118	Runway extension	Runway extension should be safeguarded (or possibly safeguarded). More work needed to establish whether there is merit in safeguarding a longer extension. Protect long term benefit to North Somerset.	We are surprised at the Council's enthusiasm for a runway extension. We have set out our position in this respect and we do not propose to include proposals for a runway extension in the Master Plan.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
NSC 107	Para 119 et seq	Second terminal	May be possible to accommodate more than 9mppa on north side. Or transfer passengers to aircraft on south side from north side terminal.	We agree that this may be possible and the Master Plan will be amended to include this as an option. Nevertheless, we believe it would be prudent to safeguard the delivery of the second terminal, for the same reasons that have been advanced by the Council for the runway extension. The potential for further expansion north side, if it exists at all, is limited, and there are concerns about the taxiway capacity. These matters will be resolved as part of future reviews of the Master Plan and it would not be appropriate to adopt a final solution now or rule out any options.
NSC 108	Para 123	Land use plan	Full optimum land requirements may not have been identified.	The 2030 plans are indicative at this stage and BIA does not intend to bring forward firm proposals yet.
NSC 109	Para 124	Land use plan	Greater clarity to be expected regarding overall scale of facilities.	See comments above.
NSC 110	Para 125	Land use plan	Question need for south side taxiway. Runway crossing proposed. Prudent to safeguard full parallel.	The land use plan will include the full south side taxiway.
NSC 111	Para 126	Land use plan	AMP should state intention to safeguard other land or any need to acquire property.	See comments above.
NSC 112	Para 127	Land use plan	31 hectares additional land not shown. Cannot plan for post 2015 development in statutory terms.	See comments above.
NSC 113	Para 128	Remainder of Chapter 12	Issues about the way impacts are covered.	The issues need to be separated into two time zones until such time as definitive proposals for long term development are prepared.

## Bristol International Airport – Draft Master Plan – Consultation – Comments from BCC, B&amp;NES, South Gloucestershire

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
<b>Bath and North East Somerset Council</b>				
General			Support for York Aviation report and general concerns of NSC	These concerns have been addressed in the BIA response to the North Somerset Council comments.
B&NES1	Letter dated 16 December 2005	Flight paths	Concern about impact on UNESCO World Heritage site and Cotswolds AONB.	See response to comment C22.
B&NES2		Flight paths	Hope that flights under BIA ATC will be directed to avoid Bath and Keynsham.	See response to comment C22.
B&NES3		Surface Access	Demand for bus services to be carefully monitored. Provide services to locations other Bristol City Centre and Clifton.	The surface access strategy will include a commitment to this effect.
B&NES4		Surface Access	Review public transport target – not challenging enough.	See response to comment C50.
B&NES5		Surface Access	Inadequate capacity on A38. Unacceptable pressure on villages in Chew Valley from increased traffic.	The impacts and mitigation requirements will be fully assessed in the formal Transport Assessment which will be provided with the Master Plan.
B&NES6		Surface Access	Airport should strongly support early development of a South Bristol Ring Road with an extension to the airport.	BIA does support the early development of a South Bristol Ring Road.
B&NES7		Car parking	Consider multi-storey or underground car parking on north side.	See response to comment C19.
B&NES8		Noise	Make every effort to mitigate noise impact on local community.	BIA is committed to achieving this.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
<b>Bristol City Council</b>				
BCC1	Letter dated 30/11/05	Forecasts	Predictions in ATWP are forecasts not growth targets.	The AMP does not use the term targets in this context.
BCC2		Green Belt	Text setting out BIA's case for removal of airport from Green Belt inappropriate for inclusion in the AMP	This part of the AMP will be deleted.
BCC3		Economic and Social Considerations	Link between economic and airport growth supported.	Noted.
		Economic and Social Considerations	Further assessment required to determine fit between airport expansion and Bristol's sustainable development objectives.	We have asked Bristol City Council to clarify what their sustainable development objectives are. We understand that there are no specific objectives as such but our attention has been drawn to the Community Strategy for Bristol 2006 which declares five shared visions for the future of Bristol (2006-2026). The AMP fit with these objectives will be assessed.
BCC4		Economic and Social Considerations	Clarification of how BIA intends to monitor economic, environmental and social performance.	The final AMP will include a commitment for BIA to prepare an annual sustainability report setting out our performance in these areas.
BCC5		Employment/access	Will BIA act as co-ordinator to support employment opportunities? (see para 6.32)	BIA will take on the role of co-ordination between businesses at the airport to secure staff travel improvements.
BCC6		Employment/education	Council welcomes assurances that links with City of Bristol College will continue.	Noted.
BCC7		Local community	Community fund action supported and continuation encouraged.	Noted.
BCC8		Night flying	No binding commitment on night flying. Clarification sought whether changes may	See response to comment C45.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
			be sought once expansion secured.	
BCC9		Night flying	Benefit from using quieter aircraft should not be eroded by increase in number of night flights. Should be addressed in EIA.	The night quota system is designed to ensure that this does not happen.
BCC10		Noise	Master Plan should include a commitment that all aircraft should comply with Chapter 4 standard as soon as practicably possible.	See response to comment C36.
BCC11		Noise	EIA should consider what BIA's responsibilities are likely to be in respect of noise mapping required by the European Noise Directive.	BIA will need to meet its obligations under the European Noise Directive, and the mapping prepared for the Master Plan demonstrates how this will be achieved. The mapping information is used in the EIA but there is no other direct connection with the Directive.
BCC12		Sustainable construction	Consider achievement of a BREEAM score of very good or above and preparation of a sustainable drainage strategy.	The EIA will include commitments in this respect.
BCC13		Environmental management	Adopt an eco-management and auditing scheme, covering energy use, waste and recycling.	BIA's environmental management programme covers these matters.
BCC14		Environmental management	Address wider impacts of transport requirements of passengers and impacts on Bristol Air Quality Management Area in EIA.	The EIA will include a full assessment of air quality impacts.
BCC15		Car parking	Where possible meet demand within the existing airport boundary – underground or multi-storey car parking.	See response to comment C19.
BCC16		Short stay car parking	Consider low rise (<4 storeys) to minimise visual impact.	The AMP does include proposals for low rise multi-storey short stay car parking.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
BCC17		Car parking	Do not consider remote off-site car parks. WSM and Avonmouth may become viable in the future.	Noted.
BCC18		Car parking	Are the 1000 short stay spaces included in the 14000 additional spaces?	No.
BCC19		Staff travel	Allocation of parking for sharers in the most convenient areas welcomed and should be expanded.	Noted.
BCC20		Climate change	Consider preparation of an assessment of projected impact on climate change to include impact of increased flights and increased traffic.	See response to comment C57.
BCC21		Surface access strategy	Public transport proposals broadly accepted. Accept Bath route not feasible. Possibility of bus-based rapid transit.	We are unsure whether bus-based rapid transit is appropriate for out of town transportation of air passengers. However we will monitor developments in this area.
BCC22		Surface access strategy	Signage review and information provision proposals welcomed.	Noted.
<b>South Gloucestershire Council</b>				
SGC1	Letter dated 15/12/05	Economic development	Proposed expansion welcomed.	Noted.
SGC2		Staff car parking	Concern about staff car parking. Should be greater emphasis on developing the Travel Plan.	A Travel Plan has been prepared and the targets and proposals will be included in the final AMP.
SGC3		Road access	Concern about promotion of M4 Link.	Concern noted and the AMP will be amended accordingly.
<b>Government Office for the South West</b>				
GOSW1	Letter dated 12/12/05	General	Indicate how national and regional policy has been taken into account in developing options.	The application of policy in the option selection process will be reviewed and highlighted where applicable.

No	Reference	Subject	Comment	BIA Response
GOSW1			How will emerging policies such as GBSTS and RSS review continue to inform the process?	The impact of emerging policies will be monitored and the AMP will be amended, if necessary, as part of future reviews. We expect the AMP to be an important consideration in the RSS review.
			Provide timetable showing how AMP will align with planning applications and NSC AAP.	This will be clarified in the light of developments following the publication of the Inspector's report on the NSC Replacement Local Plan.
			Not all options for development to 2015 have been set out in the text. Explanation of option selection would be beneficial.	The options will be adjusted as necessary to correct this oversight.
			Provide more clarity on strategy for beyond 2015. Similar approach to runway suggested for second terminal, car parking and surface access.	The chapter will be adjusted to provide this clarity.

## Bristol International Airport – responses from Parish Councils

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
<b>Backwell</b>				
Response generally as Cleeve/Congresbury/Timsbury. Specific new comments listed below.				
BA1	Letter 8/12/05 and report	Traffic/transport/infrastructure	More account to be taken of severe adverse environmental effects occurring and continued growth of airport traffic.	The environmental appraisal takes account of these effects. Further detailed assessment in the EIA.
			Concerns that back roads of Backwell are used as rat runs e.g. Church Lane, Church Town, Dark Lane, Backwell Hill Road, Hyatts Wood Road, Downside Road. Encourage use of Brockley Combe.	The Transport Assessment will cover the Backwell roads and the use of Brockley Combe will be considered.
			More use of public transport. Avonmouth and Bath?	See public transport strategy.
			A38/A370 link road to be pursued before development. Proportional costs met by BIA.	The early delivery of the A38/A370 link road is a priority for BIA, with the implementation of other traffic management measures pending its delivery.
			Airport expansion to be capped until infrastructure sorted out.	See response to comment C55.
		Environment	Urgent and effective steps to be taken to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by the aviation industry.	See the Climate Change Study Technical Note.
			Detailed EIA essential before planning permission is given.	This is a requirement of the planning system.
		Noise	More noise generated for residents living near the airport by concentrating on North Side.	This is a consideration in the car park appraisal.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			Concern about ground noise near North Terminal, making it difficult for residents living near the airport.	Mitigation measures are proposed (acoustic wall) to address this.
		New development	We are concerned that the (proposed new car park) will be an eyesore for residents.	The design will seek to avoid this.
			We are concerned that the hotel will be an eyesore for residents.	The design will seek to avoid this.
			Great concern at additional noise (from hotel).	We think these fears are unfounded.
		General	Recommend that BIA compensate residents who live near the airport that will be affected by airport expansion.	BIA operates a community fund for the benefit of nearby communities. Statutory provisions for compensation apply.
			All mitigation to be put in place before any new developments, i.e. acoustic barrier and landscaping.	See response to comment C58.
<b>Barrow Gurney</b>				
BG1	Email dated 16/12/05	Surface access/traffic	Severe community severance.	BIA is aware of the concerns of Barrow Gurney and these are a key consideration in the Transport Assessment.
BG2		Surface access/traffic	Highway capacity assessment of airport traffic seriously flawed. Further work to be carried out to determine true picture.	Formal Transport Assessment is in hand.
BG3			Without mitigation community cannot survive in current form. Programme of mitigation must be developed and agreed with the community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New airport access road before extension of terminal</li> </ul>	The formal Transport Assessment will assess the mitigation requirements.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village centre mitigation measures</li> <li>• A370/A38 signage and junction adjustments</li> <li>• Remove BG from internet routings.</li> <li>• Measures for residents on A38</li> </ul>	
BG4		Community relations	Adopt good neighbour policy	BIA is committed to being a good neighbour.
BG5		Car parking/green belt	Keep land take to a minimum, deck over some areas. Limited multi-storey. Explore off airport car parking.	See response to comment C19.
BG6		Night flying	Oppose increase in night quote (sic). Reduce impact of night flights from current levels. Cap at present level (voluntary planning condition).	See response to comments C45 and C47.
BG7		Flight paths	Ensure adherence to flight paths (at night).	See response to comment C34.
BG8		Land use	Develop existing site to full. Avoid development of open areas. Locate non-essential services off site. Hotel not desirable.	The Master Plan seeks to develop the existing site to the full. We believe there are benefits to locating services on site and there are very few that can be successfully located off site. There is strong demand for a hotel and there are traffic benefits with locating it on site.
BG8		Mitigation	Surface access traffic mitigation inadequate.	See above.
BG9	Appendix A	Environmental impact	Master Plan to be subject to full EIA. Mitigation measures to be developed and agreed with the communities.	See response to comment C1.
BG10		Growth	Cap of 8mppa up to 2015.	BIA does not think such a cap would be

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
				beneficial to the region.
BG11		Green Belt	Current protection to be maintained.	See response to comment C3.
BG12		Ground operations	Mitigation measures to be included to mitigate effects of ground operations.	See response to comment C35.
BG13		Voluntary house purchase	Publish scheme to include properties affected by airport surface traffic.	We do not believe BIA has any such responsibilities.
BG14	Appendix B	Highway study	Paper with criticism of report.	Formal transport assessment in hand.
<b>Blagdon</b>				
BL1	Letter dated 14/11/05	Car parking	Not all private parking facilities should close. Competition beneficial.	All car parks must operate in a manner consistent with the Airport Surface Access Strategy and contribute to the delivery of objectives to increase the proportion of passengers using public transport. This matter has been considered at appeal inquiries and all such enforcement notices have been upheld.
		Green belt/car parking	Hypocritical to prevent car parking on green belt outside the airport whilst permitting development of green belt for car parking inside the airport.	Concentrating airport development at BIA reduces the overall impact of car parking.
		Car parking/development	Achieve a better balance between north and south side development.	See response to comment C19.
		Community benefit	Impose, say, £2.50 charge per passenger on social passengers. Use money to benefit local villages, bus services.	See response to comment C30.
		Buildings	No future buildings should be higher than existing buildings. Impact on	There are no proposals for buildings higher than those existing.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			Mendip skyline.	
<b>Brockley</b>				
BP1	Letter 11/12/05	Forecasts	Growth in low cost sector undesirable.	See response to comment C5.
		Economic benefit	Tourism deficit.	See response to comment C14.
		Development	Concern about surface car park extensions. Multi-storey car parks less obtrusive. Avoid intrusion into open area to south of runway. Not in favour of extending outside the perimeter of the site.	See response to comment C19.
		Day time noise	Use 50dB contour. Withdraw noisiest and dirtiest aircraft. Use economic incentives to encourage noise/emissions reductions. Differential landing charges. Control over flight paths. Noise barriers to limit ground noise.	See response to comments C34 to C44.
		Night noise	Reduce noise quota. Limit on night movements. Publish 60dB LAmax and 45 dB LAeq contours.	See response to comments C45 to C49.
		Transport and surface access	Concern about traffic congestion, noise and pollution.	Comments noted. Impacts addressed in environmental appraisal and forthcoming EIA.
			Use strict planning control of car parking to increase proportion of pax using public transport.	See response to comment C50 on public transport. Must meet demand for car parking, or there will be undesirable consequences.
			Encourage greater use of local bus services, Flyer type coaches/mini-buses.	See response to comment C50.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			BIA/airlines to subsidise where not economic.	
			Discourage heavy freight from using Brockley Combe Road.	Agreed.
			Airport expansion to be restricted until infrastructure problems solved.	See response to comment C55.
		Climate change	Urgent and effective steps to be taken to reduce emissions of greenhouse gas emissions by aviation.	See response to comment C57.
<b>Burrington</b>				
Bur1	Letter 7/12/05	Traffic	Traffic level at saturation point. No new infrastructure built. Public transport not used sufficiently. Congestion and pollution increasing.	See response to comment C50 to C56.
		Green belt	Green belt must be protected. BIA should not acquire further land for car parking.	See response to comment C3.
		Noise	Noise increased since changes in use of airspace in 2005. Daytime noise levels unacceptable in summer.	There have been no changes in use of airspace. Proposed airspace changes should improve noise climate.
		General	Present level of activity significant detrimental impact on quality life. Further expansion would destroy environment irrevocably for local villages.	See response to comment C26.
<b>Butcombe</b>				
	Letter 9/12/05	General	Does not support any further expansion. Major and detrimental effect on residents in environs and adverse effect on world	See response to comment C2.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			environment.	
		Responsible development	Seeking to achieve expansion at minimum cost? Impose planning conditions to force development in the most acceptable and sustainable manner.	BIA is committed to achieving sustainable development.
		Projected growth	Aggressive marketing might bring forward growth or tax might constrain growth.	The Master Plan will be regularly reviewed to assess any such changes.
		Carbon emissions	Taxation or carbon trading might render projections unrealistic.	See response to comment to C6.
		Green belt	Expansion south side obtrusive and visible from AONB. Resist and enforce more acceptable alternatives.	See responses to comments C19 and C32.
		Infrastructure	Current road infrastructure inadequate. BIA to pay for improvements. Traffic congestion major issue.	See response to comment C52.
		Car parking	Underground and offsite car parks to be pursued.	See response to comment C19.
		Light pollution	Serious problem from apron lighting.	Comments noted for design.
		Noise	Continuing problem, especially at night.	No change in night flying proposed.
		Hotel	Queried as effective use of the site.	We believe there are significant benefits to be gained through an on-site hotel.
<b>Chew Magna</b>				
CM1	Letter 8/12/05	Traffic	Traffic impact unacceptable. Passenger numbers should not grow from current levels until and unless surface access improved.	Formal transport assessment in hand. See also response to comment C55.
		Noise	Oppose increase in noise levels (North Wick impact). Actual noise	North Wick is expected to remain outside the 54dBA Leq contour.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			measurements to be undertaken in areas around BIA.	Arrangements will be made for on site noise measurements.
		Flooding	Against any measure that would increase flooding risk to Chew Magna.	Flood risk assessments being carried out as part of the forthcoming EIA. No adverse effect on Chew Magna expected.
		Economic benefit	Economic argument not made. Jobs, outward investment, tourism imbalance.	See response to comments C8 to C16.
		General	Opposed to expansion unless infrastructure improved, controls over noise, no risk of flooding at Chew Magna	Commitments to improve the infrastructure are being made following the GBSTS. Noise impact assessed in the Master Plan. Flood risk assessment forms part of the EIA.
<b>Chew Stoke</b>				
	Letter 10/12/05	General	Wide range of views. Some welcome new routes, economic benefits. Some prefer no growth or no airport.	Noted.
		Surface access	Work with local authorities and government to improve road access. Commission traffic survey to establish airport traffic levels using B3114 and B3130.	Agreed. Traffic surveys have been undertaken on the B3130. See formal transport assessment.
		Noise	Concern about potential increase in noise levels. Be more explicit about type of aircraft, coping with wide bodied aircraft, impact on noise levels.	Details are provided in the Master Plan. No increase in noise levels is predicted.
<b>Churchill</b>				
CH1	Letter 13 September 2005	Traffic	New road from Bristol to WSM will bring more traffic to Churchill and Langford.	We await the outcome of the GBSTS in this respect.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
		Noise	Noise and emissions will reduce quality of life in villages.	No significant increase in noise and emissions is predicted.
		Hotel/car parking	Will bring more traffic.	See formal transport assessment.
<b>Cleeve</b>				
CL1	Letter dated 25/11/05	General	Object most strongly.	
CL2	Para 1	Environmental impact	No environmental report or EIA to back up expansion plans.	See response to comment C1.
	Para 2	Green belt	Plans do not merit building on further green belt land or change to existing green belt designation.	See response to comment C3.
	Para 3	Noise	Publish 50dBA Leq contours alongside 57dBA Leq contours.	See response to comment C39.
	Para 4	Noise	Daytime noise often annoying, especially at peak times. Expansion 12 mppa will cause severe annoyance.	The Master Plan does not include firm proposals for expansion to 12mppa at this stage.
	Para 5	Noise	Favour economic incentives to encourage noise and emissions reductions. Differential landing charges according to noise.	See response to comment C44.
	Para 6	Noise	Withdraw noisiest and dirtiest aircraft.	The B737-200 of Ryanair has now been withdrawn.
	Para 7	Noise	Publish 60dB:LAm <sub>ax</sub> and 45 dB LA <sub>eq</sub> night noise contours.	See response to comment C49.
	Para 8	Night flying	Expansion to 12mppa will cause unacceptable sleep deprivation.	We have no firm plans for expansion to 12mppa.
	Para 9	Night flying	Introduce night limit on aircraft movements. Quota system to run 11pm to 7am.	The quota system is as used at Heathrow, Stansted and Gatwick. The Government review of these restrictions

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
				has concluded that the hours of operation should remain the same. The system has an inherent limit given that the vast majority of aircraft are currently quota count 1 or 0.5, and this is unlikely to change.
	Para 10	Night flying	Favour policy leading to zero night flights.	See response to comment C47.
	Para 11	Car parking	Strict planning controls on car park spaces to increase use of public transport. No further car parks until major proportion of passengers and staff using public transport.	See responses elsewhere.
	Para 11	Car parking/green belt	No further green belt to be used for car parking.	See response to comment C3.
	Para 12	Surface access	Airport to pay proportion of transport infrastructure. Current GBSTS proposals inadequate.	See response to comment C54.
	Para 13	General	Cap airport at 6mppa until problem of infrastructure solved.	See response to comments C4 and C55.
	Para 14	Economic benefits	Believe arguments flawed. Do not support growth.	See responses to comment C8 to C16.
	Para 15	Climate change	Urgent and effective steps to reduce greenhouse emissions by the aviation industry required.	See response to comment C57.
<b>Clevedon Town Council</b>				
	Email 12/12/05	Surface access	Would like to see more emphasis on improved links to public transport including a spur link from/to the nearest rail service – rather than even larger	See responses to comments C50 to C56.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			areas of land made over to car parking.	
<b>Compton Bishop</b>				
CB1	Letter 8/12/05	Aircraft movements	Increase in low flying aircraft. Additional noise and pollution. Parts include AONB.	Low flying aircraft at Compton Bishop are unlikely to be from BIA. Noise and pollution impact from BIA should be minimal. Could be aircraft from Cardiff or military?
CB2		Traffic	A38 accounts for 25% of traffic to BIA. Concern about impact on road safety.	Transport assessment to address.
<b>Compton Martin</b>				
CM1	Letter dated 25/12/05	Night flying	Reassurances or complete ban.	Reassurances provided in the Master Plan.
		Types of aircraft	Restrictions on types of aircraft to limit noise.	Aircraft operated are the quietest available and such a restriction is not necessary.
		Road infrastructure	High improvement at junctions on A38.	Transport assessment to address.
<b>Congresbury</b>				
Response as Cleeve Parish Council – noise impact north of River Yeo.				
<b>Dundry</b>				
D1	Email 12/12/05 and draft 21/11/05	General	Master plan does not pay sufficient regard to the balanced approach.	We believe that this is not so.
D2		Reasons for expansion – economic benefits	Main demand tourist related. Account for tourist deficit in claims for benefits of expansion.	See response to comment C14.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
D3		Economic benefits	Higher outflow of investment funds from UK than funds coming into country.	See response to comment C15.
D4		Economic benefits	What additional routes needed for business. Why is current use low?	Current use is not low in comparison to other airports. Additional routes are to European cities and long haul.
D5		Economic benefits	Question whether sufficient workforce to meet demand. No account of future reductions in jobs.	We disagree. See response to comment C12.
D6		Noise	Show 50 dBA contour. Recognise topography (effect of?).	See response to comment C39. The topography around the airport will not have any material effect on the noise experienced on the ground at Dundry.
D7		Noise	Illustration of what increase in aircraft movements means at 9mppa and 12 mppa. Recognise that all aircraft movements cause disturbance.	The Master Plan provides an illustration for 9mppa. No meaningful comparison for 12 mppa is possible at this stage – the Master Plan does not include firm proposals for this further expansion.
D8		Night flights	Reduce, cut out or cap at existing movement level. Change the night period to 11pm to 7am.	See response to comment C47.
D9		Noise	Do more to encourage modern, less noisy and less polluting aircraft. Differential landing charges.	See response to comment C44.
D10		Flight paths	Put in place proper means of recording routes and use penalties.	See response to comment C34.
D11		Surface access	Cap until solution agreed. Housing south of Bristol will make situation worse.	Solutions emerging from GBSTS to the sub region's transport problems. See response to comment C55.
D12		Car parking	Concern about car parking to south of the airport. Other options not explored adequately.	See response to comment C19.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
D13		Terminal Building	Take account of improving technology. Concern about requests for change of use not airport related.	See response to comment C17. There are no plans for non-airport related change of use.
D14		Climate change	State more clearly environmental impact. Government to take more steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from aviation.	See response to comment C57.
<b>Dunkerton</b>				
D1	Letter dated 20/12/05	Surface access/public transport	No plan or strategy to improve access by public transport. No direct public transport to Bath or environs.	See response to comment C50.
D2		Surface access/road infrastructure	No plans for improvements to existing roads network.	See response to comment C51.
D3		Car parking	Needs and desirability for further car parking to be urgently addressed.	See response to comment C19.
<b>Englishcombe</b> (comments contained in other responses not repeated)				
	Letter 7/12/05	General	White Paper neither authorises nor precludes any development.	Any development will still be subject to the planning system.
		Economic issues	Economic case may depend on very doubtful assumptions about future of low cost air travel. Not viable with climate change concerns. Taxation position may change.	See response to comment C6.
			There is a case that BIA generates a net economic loss through outbound tourism.	See response to comment C14.
			Costs of infrastructure development required to support expansion should be charged to BIA and reflected in business	BIA will contribute to infrastructure according to its impacts.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			case.	
		Surface access	Expansion plans must not be implemented without being accompanied by adequate infrastructure development.	See response to comment C53.
			Expansion plans must not be implemented without implementation of public transport improvements. Doubt effectiveness of just Flyer.	See response to comment C50.
		Car parking	Achieve substantial increase in public transport before further car parking is permitted.	See response to comment C50.
		Green Belt	Do not consider BIA plans warrant development on Green Belt.	See response to comment C3.
		Noise	Noise levels sometimes disturbing. Concern at impact on night time noise of major expansion. Stabilise night time flights at present level. Noise reduction, noisiest aircraft should be removed from service. Publish additional noise contours.	See response to comments C45 to C48.
		Climate change	Urgent and effective steps to reduce emissions... Economic incentives.	See response to comment C57.
<b>Farnborough</b>				
F1	Letter dated 6/12/05	Need	Parishioners do use airport – convenient access to continent and US.	Noted.
		Surface access/traffic	Routes through Chew Magna and A39 through village likely to become busier.	See response to comment C52.
		Public transport	Low target.	See response to comment C50.
		Infrastructure	Substantial contribution from BIA to pay	BIA will pay for mitigation proportionate to

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			for improvements.	the increase in impact from development.
		Car parking/green belt	No justification for using green belt for car parking. More imaginative approach required for accommodating private transport.	See response to comment C3.
		Aircraft noise	Lower limits, penalise operators of old noisy aircraft.	See response to comment C44.
		Night flights	No increase in the future.	No change in flying restrictions proposed.
		Economic benefit	Not persuaded by arguments. Outbound tourism effect.	See response to comment C8 to C16.
		Climate change	Concern. Use quieter, cleaner and more efficient aircraft.	See response to comment C57.
		General	Issues to be addressed in more substantive way before expansion proceeds.	See response to comment C1.
<b>Kingston Seymour</b>				
KS1	Letter dated 19/12/05	General	Some councillors oppose expansion, some view it favourably. Particular reservations post 2015. Some benefits to the community and local economy. Adverse impacts considerable.	Noted.
KS2		Noise	Some residents some distance from airport are disturbed by noise. Ensure quietest aircraft possible are used.	See response to comment C44.
KS3		Night flying	Reduce and eventually eliminate night flying.	See response to comment C49.
KS4		Surface access	Concern about unacceptable traffic congestion eg on A370 and A38. Targets for public transport are modest. Welcome intention to use the Flyer as a	See response to comments C50 to C56.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			community resource. Commitment to contribute to A38/A370 link road welcomed. Progress against targets to be closely monitored and made available annually.	
<b>Long Ashton</b>				
	Email/letter 12/12/05	General	Noise level during day at present usage is acceptable. Greatest effect would be pressure on the road systems. Accept that some expansion is inevitable.	Noted.
	Para 4.24	Surface Access	BIA needs to be taking a more positive approach to its own surface access problems.	See response to comment C50 to C56.
		Employment	Concerned about inaccessibility of airport to potential employees without cars, from South Bristol.	See response to comment C56.
			Many of employees from local villages but likely to those on lower salaries and shift work.	Employees enjoy a range of salaries and this concern is unfounded.
		Tourism impact	Outbound tourism is a net drain on the South West.	See response to comment C14.
		Night noise	Pleased that night quota to be maintained at current levels.	Noted
			Wish to be reassured no increase in air traffic movements during shoulder hours of night quota system.	See response to comment C48.
			Agree with option 2 on night quota (maintain as existing)	Noted.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
		Transport and surface access	Active consideration must be given to LRT, guided bus and heavy rail.	See response to comment C53.
			Demand management only viable if alternatives to private car in place.	Agreed. See public transport strategy.
			Improved accessibility to BIA must not be based solely on road transport. Segregated LRT or guided bus route, through S Bristol and North Somerset would improve surface access and assist in regeneration of S Bristol.	See response to comments C50 to C56.
			Disappointingly low proportion on public transport.	See response to comment C50.
			Increase in traffic on B3130 totally unacceptable.	See response to comment C52.
			Orange route for A38/A370 link road favoured. New road will create new traffic.	Noted.
		Development 2016 to 2030	Challenge statement that heavy or light-rail transport will not be viable. Wish to see feasibility studies. Vital to safeguard routes. Has car parking revenue influenced approach?	See response to comment C53.
			Bus as only means of public transport unacceptable. Car usage will increase and more loss of green belt.	See response to comment C53.
<b>Marksbury</b>				
M1	Letter dated 6/12/05	Noise	Work to lower limits that 57dBA. Withdraw noisy/dirty aircraft.	See response to comments C39 and C44.
		Night flying	Give undertaking not to increase night	See response to comment C46.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			flights.	
		Traffic	Concern about traffic in Marksbury and environs. Defer plans until new infrastructure in place.	The highway capacity study has considered the effects of east bound cross country traffic in the context of Chew Magna. Airport traffic is a relatively small component in the traffic flow.
		Green Belt	No justification for use of green belt for airport development.	See response to comment C3.
		Climate change	Insist on quieter, cleaner, and more efficient aircraft.	See response to comment C44.
		Economic impact	High tech effect on employment. Reciprocity of business travel. Tourist imbalance.	See response to comment C8 to C16.
		General	Too high a price to local environment.	See response to comment C2.
<b>Newton–Saint–Loe</b>				
NSL1	Letter dated 15/11/05	Surface access	Better public transport could be provided from the Bath area.	See response to comment C50.
<b>Norton Radstock</b>				
NR1	Letter 2/12/05	General	BIA important economic driver and should be encouraged.	Noted.
		Transport infrastructure	Benefits greater if better transport infrastructure.	Noted.
		Economic benefit	Concern that poor road access to NR will prevent economic spin off to NR area.	Noted.
		Car parking	No public transport to NR therefore need to use car. Road access and car parking provision essential. Concern	Direct public transport to Norton Radstock is unlikely to be a realistic prospect.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			about closure of off site car parks.	
		Noise	No known complaints from NR.	Noted.
<b>Portishead and North Weston</b>				
P1	Letter 9/12/05	Concerns	Impact of air pollution	See response to comment C25.
			Loss of green belt to car parking	See responses to comments C3 and C19.
		Growth	Growth in air traffic would be reduced if aviation fuel were taxed.	See response to comment C6.
			Major investment in improving direct road access from M4/M5 and Bristol and improved public transport would cut down on number of car park spaces needed.	See response to comments C50 to C56.
		Benefits	Reduction in journeys by travellers to the south east.	Noted.
			Benefits to business and tourist economy of regular scheduled flights.	Noted.
<b>Saltford</b>				
S1	Letter 8/12/05	Affect of airport on Saltford	Noise from aircraft landing but this does not cause excessive disturbance.	Noted
			Traffic on A4. Additional vehicles unwelcome. South Bristol Ring Road may make things worse.	See response to comments C50 to C56.
			Convenience of flights welcomed by travellers.	Noted
			Increase in flights would be tolerable if new aircraft used.	Aircraft generally are new, particularly those of easyJet and Ryanair.
			Road traffic and parking main concerns.	See general responses.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			Airport badly sited.	
			Place greater emphasis on major improvement in public transport. No expansion into green belt to accommodate car parks. Expensive car parks OK.	See response to comment C50 and C19.
			Positive impacts – a few more destinations.	
			Plan driven by financial case for BIA rather than quality of life issues for the region. BIA contribution to GBSTS implementation.	The plan sets out the benefits and impacts.
			Not evident that the Plan sets out the best route for long term development.	
<b>Stowey-Sutton</b>				
SS1	Letter dated 4/11/05	Surface access	Concern about increase in traffic. Opposed to further expansion of airport unless road infrastructure in place including dual carriageway links to motorway and ring road to reduce impact of through traffic on Chew Valley.	The GBSTS proposals for the South Bristol Ring Road are aimed at alleviating some of the traffic problems to the south of Bristol.
<b>Timsbury</b>				
Response as Cleve Parish Council				
<b>Ubley</b>				
	Letter 13/12/05	Surface access	Comments about lack of infrastructure.	See response to comments C50 to C56.
		Light pollution	Concern	See response to comment C31.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
<b>Whitchurch</b>				
WH1	Email 18/11/05	Surface access	No objection but concern about road infrastructure. Traffic problems on A37 and support roads.	See general comments.
		Night flying	Would object to increase in night flights now or in future.	See response to comment C46.
<b>Winford</b>				
	Letter 6/12/05	Green Belt	Opposition to proposals to 'take over' Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances, against peoples wishes, negate purpose of Green Belt, dangerous precedent. Unacceptable.	See response to comment C3.
		Car parks and surface access	Support multi-storey car parks on north side. Strong argument for underground to lessen impact on Downside Road. Need to be screened.	See response to comment C19.
		Surface access	South Bristol Ring Road and A370/A38 link road should be in place to cope with additional traffic.	We strongly support the construction of both roads.
			Extensions to Flyer welcomed. Support the idea of outlying car parking facilities. Park and Ride at Long Ashton? A37?	See response to comment C19.
		Hotel	Site away from airport rather than take up valuable car parking space.	We believe the benefits of an on site hotel outweigh the very small impact that it will have on car parking.
			Set charges for Flyer and remote car parks to entice more passengers to use them.	Price mechanisms form part of our strategy – but prices of car parking needs to be realistic to avoid perverse behaviour.
		Light pollution	Strong disapproval of further light	See response to comment C31.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			pollution. Switch off scheme?	
		Noise	Welcome intent but prefer more detailed proposals. Fine aircraft exceeding noise limits.	A lot of detail has already been provided. See also response to comments C34 and C44.
			Proposal for noise barrier welcomed. Spare no expense to ensure right size and thickness – no more wooden fence.	Noted. A number of designs are under consideration.
			CDA approaches welcomed.	Noted.
			Welcome intention to operate within existing night quota limit. Limitation on flight movements?	See response to comment C46.
		Runway extension	Pleased with no extension.	Noted.
			Greater clarity with land at east end of runway. This is not operational land?	This land is operational – it includes the approach lighting and the runway end safety area. However no development is proposed here.
		General	Be as visionary as possible.	Agreed.
<b>Wrington</b>				
WR1	Letter 11/12/05	General	Activity currently at capacity. Detrimental impact from increase. Cap airport numbers at 6mppa.	See response to comment C4.
		Terminal Building	Add-ons resembling 'tin sheds' should be avoided.	See response to comment C18.
		Traffic	A38 has satisfactory capacity for traffic from south west.	Noted.
			Severe detrimental effect from traffic on Downside Road. Changes necessary – should include weight limit and relocation of freight entrance to A38.	Transport assessment will consider.
		Night flights	Cap maximum number of movements at	See response to comments C46 and C47.

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			present level. Reduce night quota as quieter planes introduced.	
		Ground noise	Issue needs to be addressed. Change to off aircraft power unit and noise barrier.	See response to comment C35.
		Car parking	To be tackled more imaginatively. Parking should be multi-storey to north of terminal. Prioritise car parking over hotel. Development southside opposed on environmental grounds and visual impact. Airport development would be more visible from AONB.	See response to comment C19.
		Staff travel	More robust staff travel scheme necessary to reduce car parking.	See response to comment C56.
		Public transport	Need to be more ambitious than 13%. Extend Flyer to Parkway and other locations.	See response to comment C50.
		Pollution	Monitoring of air, noise and light pollution essential. BIA to cover cost but unitary authority should carry out independently. Results to be reported to Wrington regularly.	Noise and air quality monitoring is undertaken now and results are reported to Wrington. We would be willing to consider alternative arrangements for monitoring with North Somerset Council.
		Economy	15 out of 770 responses to parish plan survey worked at airport.	Noted, but it is unclear how this relates to the total working population of Wrington (1463 according to the 2001 Census).
<b>Yatton</b>				
Y1	Letter 13/12/05	General	Council objects to any expansion of BIA.	
Y2		Negative impact	Noise, air pollution, visual impact on	

No	Ref	Subject	Comment	Response
			AONB, loss of green belt.	
		Benefits	Marginal for local people.	
		Traffic	Increase in traffic even with increase public transport use.	

## Bristol International Airport – Master Plan Consultation – other stakeholder responses

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
<b>Airport Consultative Committee</b>			
Letter 7/12/05	General	Pleased that consultation is working well. No merit in revisiting suitability of location or limiting expansion – recognises White Paper conclusions and expansion inevitable. Expansion does bring considerable economic benefit. Agree with conclusions on runway capacity. Should aim to confine as much development to north of site as possible.	Noted. The Plan has been reviewed to take into account views regarding north side development.
	Passenger Terminal	Agree expansion of existing facilities is most sensible option. Make design as environmentally friendly as possible.	Noted and agreed.
	Aircraft parking	Support expansion to east of existing terminal, relocation of administrative buildings and proposed additional acoustic barrier.	Noted.
	Car parking	Oppose wholesale expansion of parking areas on south side of airport. Majority favour multi-storey parking on north side. Minimise impact on Downside Road properties with shielding vegetation and effective acoustic barrier. Light pollution should be reduced. Seek to optimise land use as far as possible. If expand into green belt then controlling off site parking more difficult.	The car park proposals are under review to take account of comments from consultees. See also response to comment C19.
	Surface access	Airport traffic is but an element of traffic flows to the south of Bristol and Bath. Every endeavour should be made to enhance public transport links to serve the Airport and	See response to comment C50.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		encourage passengers to use such transport.	
		Doubts about traffic arrangements at Lulsgate Bottom. A38/Downside Road/Felton Road to have traffic control with pedestrian crossing facility? Airport bound traffic to use commercial vehicle entrance?	The formal Transport Assessment will consider these points.
	Mitigation	The Draft Plan addresses noise issues on the basis of absolute loudness levels. Government sponsored scheme for compensation for noise disturbance proposed. Refer to London Stansted scheme.	The noise impact appears not to have been properly understood. The noise mapping does take into account the frequency of noise events by assessing the noise impact on the basis of dBA Leq. BAA Stansted have launched two schemes, a Home Owner Support Scheme (HOSS) related to properties within the 66dBA Leq contour predicted for the <u>proposed second runway</u> and a Special Cases Scheme (SCS) for those people living just outside the HOSS boundary with severe medical conditions which require them to move at the earliest opportunity. Conditions for such schemes relating to noise impact are set out in the ATWP. These conditions have not been met at BIA and are not predicted to be met before 2015. BIA will regularly monitor this situation.
<b>Business West</b>			
Letter 22/12/05	Economic impact	BIA is a vital contributor to sustained economic growth in the West of England. It is crucially important for social and economic well-being for the entire South West. Imperative that the airport develops as White Paper – support vision for	Noted.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		growth for sub region proposed by West of England.	
	Consultation	Level of consultation impressive.	Noted.
	Green Belt	Business West supports removal of airport from Green Belt.	Noted.
	Environmental impact	Plans for growth must recognise that environmental impacts must be minimised. Airport to take lead in the challenges of environmental management of the site – improved travel planning, reducing energy and waste. Advice, support and guidance available through dCarb-West.	Agreed and noted.
	Surface access	Need for better surface access, but this should not prevent BIA from meeting requirements set out in White Paper. Clear need for major transport infrastructure improvements outside the control of BIA – addressed though JLTP and GBSTS. Need for South Bristol Ring Road, A370/A38 link road and improvements to A38.	Agreed and noted.
	Public transport	Emphasis should be on coach/shuttle and rail/shuttle.	Agreed.
	Development	Plans are attractive and can see limited negative visual aspects.	Noted.
<b>Campaign to Protect Rural England</b>			
Letter and submission dated 5/12/05	General	Growth rate and proposed maximum size unacceptable. Reject as 'premature' any development plans that will allow passenger growth to exceed 6mppa until improvements in public transport and surface-access measures are in place.	The views of CPRE are noted but these opinions are not reflected in the ATWP. The transport assessment will consider the impacts on the highways in detail and develop the mitigation measures required. Arbitrary limits cannot be adopted.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
	Surface access	Ref para 4.24. Unsatisfactory. (BIA to advise) what it will require in terms of permission to develop and joint funding (road, rail or other transport networks).	The surface access needs of the airport cannot be considered in isolation of the transport needs of the rest of the region. Proposals have to be taken forward with statutory partners following adoption of the proposals in the GBSTS. See also response to comments C50 and C51.
		A rail link may be essential, light rapid transit. CPRE expect BIA to undertake studies to examine and cost as sustainable and attractive with the support and encouragement of GOSW.	See response to comment C53.
	Forecasts	2004 ATM data not classified into aircraft types. Exact details of type of movements in the various MP data to be clearly stated. Query Table 3 discrepancy.	Data will be provided. Table 5 only identifies ATM's carrying passengers. Table 3 includes all ATM's including cargo, mail and air taxis.
	Economy	CPRE considers that conflicting claims for this region must be resolved by an independent body (GOSW?), which examines the methodologies used but not necessarily the data used.	See responses to comments C8 to C16. Government have already examined these issues in the preparation of the ATWP.
	Air quality	Include CO <sub>2</sub> as a pollutant. Explain reduction between 2004 and 2020 for some pollutants.	CO <sub>2</sub> estimates will be included in the Climate Change chapter. The reduction in pollutants is a result of improvements to vehicle emissions under the EU improvement programmes.
	Air quality	Air quality estimations to include contribution to total pollution of vortex wake effects.	The documents quoted by CPRE identify this as a subject for future research. Vortex wake effects do need to be considered in air quality assessments. However they are only likely to affect ground level concentrations of pollutants whilst the aircraft is below 200m above the ground. Even then the contribution

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
			is thought to be small and only a consideration for departing aircraft, when the emissions are at their greatest. In BIA's case a departing aircraft will be over 200m by the time any residential properties are reached. Vortex wake effects will not have a material effect on air quality in these locations and therefore this factor can be discounted in the context of the Master Plan air quality assessment. It should be noted that the Master Plan air quality assessment was undertaken by the source quoted by CPRE (CATE).
	Noise	State clearly extent to which current fleet mix meets Chapter 4 standard. Confirm all year 2006 fleet will meet Chapter 4.	See response to comment C36.
		Query 65/35 modal split.	See response to comment C40.
		Inclusion of Ryanair 737-200 in 2004 data will distort appreciation of the contours. Rerun with 737-200 replaced by 737-800.	See response to comment C37.
		Details of 757-200 and 767-300 included in predicted contours. Provide clear indication of average use assumed and assumed routes.	The analysis includes 23 757-200 movements by charter flights to European and Mediterranean destination, 14 scheduled flights by 757-200 aircraft to the USA and 22 scheduled flights to the USA by 767-300 aircraft. All flight data quoted here is per week.
		Publish data regarding aircraft types and distribution by route.	See response to comment C38.
		Provide information on calibration of noise model, or use ANCON2 to give comparisons with figure	See response to comment C42.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		B1.	
		Provide definition of decibel.	Definition will be provided.
		Provide future contours for Lden, Lnight and LAeq 8 average summer night. Also assumptions for future situations.	See response to comment C49.
		Display 50dBA Leq contour as service to residents to show what difference it would make. CPRE believe 50dBA Leq is the onset of annoyance in quiet rural area.	See response to comment C39.
		Provide info on areas of each contour band, population and number of households, and method used for determining.	See response to comment C43.
		Are there limit values for Lden and Lnight to assist in appreciating figures B2 and B3?	It is the Government's responsibility to set limit values as part of the process of transposing the European Noise Directive (END) into UK law. We do not believe formal limit values have been set yet. For further information see the DEFRA consultation on the END.
	Night quota	Assessment of longer term needs of night quota requested (para 8.50)	The assessment is in the section on night noise starting on page 92.
		Provide information on movements in shoulder periods 23:00 to 23:30 and 06:00 to 07:00.	See response to comment C48.
	Transport and surface access	Approach ignores intentions of para 4.55 and 4.56 of ATWP. Objective is 'to increase number of passengers who get to airports by public transport'. Rail link may be essential, light rail ideal.	The BIA approach is consistent with the ATWP. CPRE have misquoted para 4.56. The ATWP sets an objective to increase the <i>proportion</i> of passengers who get to airports by public transport. See response to comment C53 in respect of rail.
<b>CBI South West</b>			

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
Letter 14/12/05	Economy	South West economy must compete with other parts of the UK and dynamic emerging economies throughout the world if it is to succeed.	Noted and agreed.
		Regional Economic Strategy aspires to growth of 3.2% per annum. Thriving growing airport essential for economic development.	Noted and agreed.
		South West cannot hope to compete with emerging low cost economies. High skill, high value added companies must be attracted to and retained in the region to deliver growth in competitiveness, employment and quality of life. These companies have high travel requirements. Successful international airport will be a factor in decisions to locate and remain in the region.	Noted and agreed.
		Peripherality is a constraint on economic growth in the South West.	Noted and agreed.
		Fast travel to major centres across the world gives business access to new markets, suppliers, knowledge and competitive pressure. Increase export opportunities, innovation and productivity.	Noted and agreed.
		South Bristol and Weston-super-Mare will benefit from increased employment.	Noted and agreed.
		Commitment to Sustainable Aviation Strategy welcomed. Reduction in car journeys to other airports, reduced business travel time increases productivity.	This effect has now been quantified in terms of journey time savings – see response to North Somerset comments.
		Improved surface access much needed. Increase public transport, new road linking M4 to M5 with spurs to South Bristol, airport and Weston-super-Mare.	Agreed and noted.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
<b>Chew Valley Chamber of Commerce</b>			
Letter 15/11/05	General	Keen to be involved in providing useful services. Some anxiety in relation to traffic. Pleased to be reassured that there will be no increase in noise levels or night flights.	Noted.
<b>English Nature</b>			
Letter 15/12/05	General	No comment on plan. Await ES.	Noted.
<b>Environment Agency</b>			
Letter 13/12/05	Flood risk	Concerns that development may increase rate of surface water run-off. No increase in rate of run off overland or to any watercourse will be permitted. SUDS to be used throughout. Taxiways, aircraft stands and parking may require collection of run off and multistage treatment train before filtration to ground. Impacts on hydrology and water regime to be fully considered in EIA and Flood Risk Assessment.	The detailed effects of surface water run-off will be addressed in the EIA and detailed design of new facilities.
	Surface and ground water protection	Potential impacts to controlled waters should be fully considered. Consider fuel storage and safeguarding SPZ from pollutants. Underground may not be best option. Consult Bristol Water.	See above. We believe that underground storage provides the opportunity for better protection of controlled waters.
	Transport	Master Plan must look at encouraging and providing alternative means of access to the airport other than the car.	The Master Plan seeks to achieve this.
	Car parking	Principle of providing adequate car parking for airport users on site welcomed. EA will work with	Noted. Underground parking is not proposed.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		BIA in establishing principle of underground parking.	
<b>Friends of the Earth</b>			
Letter 5/12/05	Climate change and growth	Plan liable to double emissions by 2015 and triple by 2030. Rate of growth in passenger miles should be limited to deployed technology efficiency improvements – 1% per annum.	The Master Plan is consistent with the ATWP projections for the growth of air traffic.
	Economic impact	Tourist revenue imbalance – affects SW tourism industry. Dispute inward investment claims and employment benefits. Low paid, seasonal, anti-social shifts, poor access. Unlikely to benefit S Bristol and WSM.	See response to comments C8 to C16.
	Surface Access	Strategy heavily flawed. Volumes of traffic underestimated. Road infrastructure cannot cope; roads will need to be widened. BIA will not pay for this work.	The traffic figures will be restated in the Master Plan based on a refined calculation for the formal transport assessment.
	Car parking and land	Should not extend site; double deck existing car park; reduce number of people using cars; at 1% growth rate no extra car parking required. No extra car parking south side – uses Green Belt and more visible.	See response to comment C19.
	Hotel	Not warranted. Servisair say flight crew will not stay there. Increases airport revenues at expense of local businesses.	FoE has misunderstood Servisair. We disagree with FoE conclusions.
	Terminal Building	Extra terminal not warranted. On line or ATM style check in will mean existing facility can accommodate extra passengers.	See response to comment C17.
	Airport as a business	Low-margin, high volume business – not sustainable. Relies on cheap aviation fuel and	We fundamentally disagree with the FoE assertions.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		lack of tax. Increase landing charges. – enable greater public transport and pay employees more.	
<b>Goblin Combe Environment Centre</b>			
Letter 6/12/05	Environmental impact	Loss of tranquillity, likely to result in loss of income and reduction in enjoyment.	See response to comment C26.
		Concern about degrading of natural environment from increasing air pollution.	These effects will be fully explored in the EIA.
		Goblin Combe contains a SSSI. Concern about degradation, denying people ready access to a countryside, resulting in longer journeys to visit the countryside.	To be considered in the Rural Character Study. See response to comment C26.
<b>Highways Agency</b>			
Letter 6/12/05	Surface access	A38 is not a trunk road but connects to the motorway network. HA would be interested to learn of road improvements that could impact safety and efficiency of the trunk road network. Pleased to see GBSTS proposals for public transport reflected in the plan.	HA will be consulted as part of the formal Transport Assessment.
	General	Look forward to working to deliver transport strategy for the South West. Keep Agency informed of progress with Plan.	See above.
<b>Independent Airport Park and Ride Association (IAPRA)</b>			
Letter 12/12/05	Surface access/car parking	Share objective of increasing proportion of journeys to airport by public transport but do not believe this achieved simply by closing down unauthorised car parks.	IAPRA views are noted and the use of strategic park and ride sites forms key part of the car park review undertaken following the consultation.
		Do not share the view that it is necessary to	See above.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		concentrate car parking largely on site or that off site car parking needs to be controlled by airport.	
		Demand for off-airport car parking will be sustained even if unauthorised operations are shut down.	See above.
		Barriers to use of public transport – rural catchment area, transport at night, cost for families or large groups. Therefore continued reliance on car.	See above.
		Do not agree that extra spaces should be located solely on site. Proper provision should be made for further car parking at park and ride sites located away from the airport. There is other available land outside the existing airport boundary that could be used to provide some of extra car parking needed (location not specified). Ensure equitable split between on-airport and off-airport provision. Would help ease congestion and pollution levels.	See above.
		Do not accept view that off airport car parks should be under BIA control – anti competitive position. Choice and competition is in the public interest. Keeping cost of car parking competitive would contribute to reducing taxis, kiss and fly, unauthorised car parking and street side parking.	All car parks must operate in a manner consistent with the Airport Surface Access Strategy and contribute to the delivery of objectives to increase the proportion of passengers using public transport.
<b>Parish Councils Airports Association</b>			
Email 12/12/05 (from 4	General	Does not set out who the PCAA represents. BIA not in an appropriate location. Do not accept growth is necessary or desirable,	We disagree with the PCAA's general conclusions which are contrary to the Government's conclusions in the ATWP.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
Pump Court Chambers)		inevitable or justified by economic benefit.	
	Green Belt	Airport overlooked by AONB; Airport development alien to location; Adverse impact on green belt; Screening will not hide development; People enjoy green belt for open landscapes and tranquillity.	The PCAA appear to misunderstand the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. These comments relate to impact on the landscape. We believe that the PCAA are overstating this impact. There is considerable scope for reducing the impact through careful design and landscaping. Much of the airport site is already well concealed from the surrounding area. See also response to comments C31 to C33.
	Surface access	Growth at the airport should be capped unless or until it can be shown that the surface access problems have been resolved.	The formal transport assessment will investigate the traffic impact fully and develop mitigation measures designed to address the traffic impacts from airport development.
	Car parking	66 acres of green fields in green belt for car parking not environmentally acceptable solution. Should airport expand if it cannot accommodate development without environmentally unacceptable solutions? Comparison with Stansted. Tightest possible constraints required.	The car park review and transport assessment will fully investigate all options for car parking.
	Noise	57dB measure does not reflect experience of local residents. Tranquil rural areas. Increase in flights will result in significant annoyance to more than 1000 people.	See response to comment C39.
	Economic case	Economic case is debatable, possibly wrong and not a justification for growth.	See response to comment C8 to C16.
	Surface access/transport	Do not accept traffic figures or conclusions in Chapter 9. Traffic modelling fails to deal	See formal transport assessment.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		adequately with traffic congestion – 1 hour peak considered, insufficient detail by section or link. Cannot assess report – data from BIA. Registration plate survey 12 hours, 1 day, outbound, only. Other comments as Barrow Gurney response.	
	Economic considerations	Reference to Whitelegg Report. Key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business can easily be handled within present capacity limits.</li> <li>• Tourist deficit</li> <li>• Flawed job creation methodology</li> <li>• High outflow of investment funds</li> <li>• Annual job loss from deficit</li> <li>• Aviation industry tax exemptions</li> <li>• Aviation industry does not pay for its environmental damage</li> </ul> Request airport to take more measured stance on economic implications in future publications.	See response to comment C8 to C16.
	Climate change	Airport to take vigorous steps to achieve a large increase in the proportion of passengers using public transport, measures adopted should include the removal of any restraints on access to terminal of bus and taxi operators.	See response to comment C50. There are no restraints on access to terminal of bus and taxi operators.
	Climate change	EU Emissions Trading Scheme will only be effective if emission permits are set at a price which will significantly restrict activities of major polluters.	We await conclusions from the EU on the levels of permits.
	Noise	Airport to confirm proportion of the current fleet that meets Chapter 4 requirements.	See response to comment C36.
		Strong case for seeking information on night noise impact.	Since no change in the night flying regime is proposed and the night flying restrictions

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
			relate to the noise of aircraft there will be no change in the night noise impact.
		Confirm actual modal split in 2004; Confirm whether all Laeq contours based on 65/35 modal split; Basis for using 65/35 split.	See response to comment C40.
		Include information on: Fleet mix assumptions for 6 and 9 mppa; No contours for 2030; Information on aircraft types used in modelling; Distribution of aircraft types by route in modelling; Calibration work carried out on modelling.	See responses to comments C38 and C42.
		Information requested on Lden and Lnight for future situations and Laeq 8 for average summer night for 2004.	See response to comment C49.
		Include 50dB:LAeq contours in day maps and 45dB:LAeq and 60 dB:Lmax on nocturnal maps.	See responses to comments C39 and C49.
		Information requested on: Area of each contour bands by scenario modelled; Information on households and population; Method used for determining number of households and the population.	See response to comment C43.
		Re-run contours for 2004 replacing B737-200 with 737-800.	See response to comment C37.
	Runway length	What constraints does the current runway length mean in terms of aircraft types used?	The wide bodied jets in Table 6 can use the current runway.
	Night noise	Include diurnal hourly information on movement numbers for the current and future situations in the shoulder periods, 23:00 to 23:30, 06:00 to 07:00.	See response to comment C48.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		Confirm that Option 2 means that BIA has no intention of seeking any change to the current night quota level before 2015.	See response to comment C45.
	Development generally	Avoid south side development to minimise impact on local area.	Comments noted. Southside development is inevitable. Need for further expansion to be considered in the context of the car park/transport assessment review.
<b>Somerset County Council</b>			
Letter 12/12/05	Ecology	There are links between the colonies of lesser and greater horseshoe bats near BIA and those in Somerset and Mendip. Contact provided.	Somerset County Council will be consulted in the course of the EIA.
	Transport	Concern about implications of 2019 projected flows on A38 within Somerset. Would like to be kept closely involved with development of the formal traffic assessment. Contact provided.	Somerset County Council will be consulted in the course of the Transport Assessment.
	Strategic planning policy	No comment, but ask to be consulted on further developments related to flight paths and noise issues and potential adverse impacts on Quantocks AONB and Exmoor National Park.	Noted but no further developments in this respect are anticipated.
<b>South West Regional Development Agency</b>			
Letter 15/1/06	General	Supports the preferred option for expansion to 2015 – this will enable BIA to contribute towards implementation of the Government's Airport White Paper and Regional Economic Strategy.	Noted.
	Economic impact	Keen to continue to work with BIA to ensure that airport develops the right air services to support growing South West economy. Work with SWRDA and local partners in the regeneration of South Bristol and Weston-super-Mare.	Noted.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		Continued commitment to local recruitment and skills initiatives welcomed.	
	Surface access	Continue to work with partners to ensure that the airport is fully integrated into the local and regional transport network and help deliver necessary transport improvements to support airport's growth.	Agreed.
	Sustainability appraisal	Pleased to see undertaken. Welcome discussing further and where possible assisting with implementation of recommendations.	Noted.
<b>South West Tourism</b>			
Email 12/12/05	Tourism	SWT recognises BIA as a key part of the region's tourism infrastructure. Brings visitors. SWT would welcome greater recognition of inbound traffic. Increased long haul may increase local overnight stays.	Comments noted and greater clarification on inbound traffic will be provided.
	Aircraft movements	Expansion of air movements may be detrimental to rural qualities (tranquillity) which tourism relies on. Effect on rural character. Airport is significant entry point to region and country for overseas visitors. Strategic importance to tourism industry. Routes beneficial to tourism from Holland, Belgium, Germany and Central Europe.	See response to comment C26.
	Inbound/outbound tourism	Impact on tourism mixed – BIA provides opportunities for outbound tourism. Cannot assume expansion exclusively positive for the region.	See response to comment C14.
	Benefits	Use of local facilities by passengers entering or leaving BIA.	See response to comment C16.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
	SWT Corporate Plan long term objectives; Transport	Master Plan can assist with SWT objectives – public transport, green travel plans. Link employment growth to public transport provision; ease pressure on road network.	Noted. The revised public transport strategy will reflect these points.
	Conclusion	Welcome potential proposals offer. Address/recognise negative effects of expansion on the tourism product.	Noted.
<b>Sustainability South West</b>			
Letter 9/12/05	General	Plans to expand BIA could have a beneficial effect on the regional economy – some job creation. Ensure employment and training opportunities support the needs of local workforces. Recognise efforts of BIA to reduce environmental impact. SA is a positive development (no record of being asked to comment).	Noted.
	Climate change	Concern that projected expansion not in line with governing principles and priorities in new SD strategy (living within environmental limits and establishing immediate action to tackle climate change).	The projected expansion is in line with the ATWP which sits as Government policy alongside the Sustainable Development Strategy.
		Review rate of expansion with regional low carbon approach and CO2 reduction targets in UK Energy White Paper.	The ATWP forms a part of the UK Energy White Paper – see above.
		Take proactive approach to drive forward Sustainable Aviation Strategy. Ring fence money from expansion to fund work.	BIA is committed to driving forward the Sustainable Aviation Strategy.
		Undertake work to inform passenger understanding of climate impacts of air travel.	Many airlines already do this and it forms part of the Sustainable Aviation Strategy.

Reference	Subject	Comment	Response
		Passengers to be encouraged to calculate carbon footprint.	
	Terminal extension	Should adopt exemplary and ambitious approach to integrating sustainable construction. See Future Foundations.	The terminal design will seek to include sustainable construction solutions where possible.
	Tourism/surface access	See Future Footprints initiative – sustainable tourism project.	We would be pleased to discuss this further.
	Public transport	Priority to increase public transport. High-speed link to Bristol and other bus services options for investment.	The public transport strategy embraces these objectives.
	Health impact	Take active measures to help prevent mental and physical poor health and stress from increased flights. Establish effective consultative arrangements.	A Health Study has been commissioned as part of the EIA for the forthcoming planning application.
	Sustainability	Sustainable procurement policy – local goods and services.	This approach is consistent with the BIA environmental policy.
	Sustainability Appraisal	Issue a document that sets out how the recommendations have been incorporated into the plan.	The Sustainability Appraisal will be updated as part of the planning application.