

**Emails between Dr Underhill-Day and Dr Armstrong (April and May 2011)**

**From:** John Day  
**Sent:** 05 May 2011 12:18  
**To:** 'Armstrong, Roy'  
**Cc:** Sutherland, Rosie  
**Subject:** RE:

Dear Roy,

Thank you for your e-mail. I too have been on holiday over Easter.

However, I am not sure that you have understood my proof entirely, as the basis for my rebuttal is that I do not agree your approach.

I can certainly agree that some birds breed, roost and feed near airports, but disagree that this suggests that there is no impact.

The scientific literature is certainly not comprehensive but it does show that there can be serious effects on bird species and I do not agree that the vast majority of published scientific papers are too simplistic scientifically. I do not believe that your approach on disturbance by aircraft is appropriate, or that it is possible to presume no adverse effect from just the presence of birds around airports without further scientific investigation.

The combined effects of aircraft noise and vision with off-airfield disturbance have not, in my opinion, been addressed and are still of concern, with any disturbance likely to affect non-target species as well as bird strike risk species.

Whilst I agree that the current situation with regard to gulls and terns is that there are very few birds on the SPA near to the airport, I do not agree that this means there is no possibility of an effect, as these birds are known to shift their breeding grounds particularly if disturbed or predated, and they could easily seek to return to the eastern end of the SPA in the future and could then be subject to disturbance from aircraft.

If you would like to phone to discuss before Monday I will be in most of today and tomorrow.

Regards,

John

**From:** Armstrong, Roy [<mailto:Roy.Armstrong@Cumbria.ac.uk>]

**Sent:** 21 April 2011 15:28

**To:** John Day

**Cc:** 'Nigel Deacon'

**Subject:**

Hello John

I've had a good look at your proof and wondered if now would be a good time to discuss us agreeing areas that we want to agree and disagree on. As you know, the Inspector has asked that we communicate and try to agree which areas we need to look at on May 9th. Perhaps I could start by listing the areas that, from your latest document, still appear to be contentious.

You remain to be convinced on reedbed species, so could we agree that Purple Heron, Bittern, Marsh Harrier and Cetti's Warbler are species that we need to look at further?

You mention concerns over off-airfield disturbance. As this is only likely to involve species presenting a birdstrike risk this would appear to be limited to White-fronted Goose, Bewick's Swan, Greylag Goose, Lapwing and Golden plover. Does that sound correct to you?

I don't believe that the terns/gulls are an issue as they have an alternative area at Rye, do not nest at Dungeness in significant numbers and the location of the potential breeding islands is sufficiently distant from flightpaths for there to be no expected impact. Is this a group that we could agree on or do you still have reservations?

Are there any other species that you feel we still need to address in detail. Or, are there any species that you are now happy for us to agree will not suffer a negative impact?

I look forward to hearing from you in due course,

All the best

Roy

Dr Roy Armstrong  
Senior Lecturer  
Centre for Wildlife Conservation  
University of Cumbria

Tel: 016973 52222

Mob: 07899932422

University of Cumbria is a Company Limited by Guarantee, Registered in England & Wales No. 06033238  
Registered Office: University of Cumbria, Fusehill Street, Carlisle, CA1 2HH. Telephone 01228 616234.

**Confidentiality:** This email and its attachments are intended for the above named only and may be confidential. If they have come to you in error you must take no action based on them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone; please reply to this email and highlight the error.

**Security Warning:** Please note that this email has been created in the knowledge that Internet email is not a 100% secure communications medium. We advise that you understand and observe this lack of security when emailing us.

**Viruses:** Although we have taken steps to ensure that this email and attachments are free from any virus, we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free.