

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: Re: clarification about the dispersion
Date: 25 February 2019 17:33:39
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image001.png](#)

Hi Manston Airport case Team

The information that the examination process is inquisitorial is new to me and any information about how to use this aspect in a timely fashion (i.e. to complete a dialogue about an important aspect of any dialog before the enquiry is over - where the applicants answer may raise further questions) would be immensely helpful.

As I have said previously, the majority of the time I have available to devote to this and other issues, that I broadly consider as part of my civic duty, is greatly reduced because of my old school, [REDACTED], being central to the [REDACTED]. Being [REDACTED]

The most useful thing to me would be some way finding the questions already put to the applicant and the answers the applicant has given.

I note for example the applicant has informed the media that the applicant has spent various amounts in excess of £10m on the application so far, whereas the accounts the applicant has filed with Companies House shows no monies passing through the applicant's account.

The other very serious question that I and others have raised relates to noise pollution and the viability of sound insulation in Ramsgate's conservation area.

Further questions I have raised relate to how any compensation scheme would work, there have been no answers to these that I can find.

But yes please add my my email for consideration by the ExA.

Best regards Michael

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2019 11:28
To: ManstonAirport@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: Re: clarification about the dispersion

Hi Manston Case team at pins

I still haven't had any response to my questions about particulate dispersion distances made both to pins and RiverOak rsp on numerous occasions, including a deadline 1 submission.

I have tried to search the post application documents, but like the application itself it doesn't have a dedicated and reliable search facility or comprehensive index. Because the pins application isn't published as a normal website in html but as a series of pdf documents this makes it almost invisible to search engines like Google. This means the word particulate only brings up 3 matches, my own submission no appearing at all. The application as published on the pins website brings up no matches for the word particulate.

To be absolutely clear with this pm10s disperse (fall to the ground) within about 1km of the burn that generated them and pm2.5s travel much further as airborne matter and certainly further than the Thanet coastline.

RiverOaks various environmental documents all appear to have made the fundamental error of using the same dispersion distance for pm 2.5s they used for the much larger pm10s i.e. about 1km and basically not much further than the proposed airport perimeter.

Using this wrong figure has resulted in a figure of only 1 death in Thanet from particulate matter whereas using the correct dispersion distance for pm2.5s would suggest a considerable increase.

Broadly RiverOak documentation appears to agree with current information about pm2.5s, which indicates an increase of 10 µg/m³ equates to premature death or the early onset dementia around in 20%. Of the population.

20% of the Thanet population would be. around 30,000 people.

Here in Thanet the problem with and airfreight hub with more than 10,000 movements per year, which would burn more than 30,000 tonnes of kerosene on or near the ground at Manston, would be exacerbated by the onshore sea breezes holding the air pollution in the main concentrations of population.

Obviously if both the applicant and pins don't check to ensure that they are using the right dispersion distance for pm2.5s and make any necessary modification to the application then in the light of my continued and publicly documented observations could bring what was probably an error into the area of negligence. This could open the way for litigation from both victims of the diseases and the deceased dependent relatives.

I also feel that it is unreasonable to receive no explanatory response about the 2.5pm dispersion distance from the applicant, despite asking on numerous occasions over a considerable period of time, as this wastes my time, particularly in checking over multiple documents and I should like to claim compensation for this wasted time.

Effectively from my point of view, I have had no answer but am left with the possibility that I may have been answered somewhere in around 500 complex and unindexed documents.

In terms of not being able to make an oral representation, telephone pins or the applicant, due to my disability related accessibility issues, I don't think this should put at a disadvantage to the point of just being ignored.

Best regards Michael

