

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: TR020002 Submission of written form of oral submission by interested party, Deb Shotton
Date: 05 June 2019 20:42:53
Attachments: [Hearing 3 submission.pdf](#)

Good evening, Richard

I am pleased to submit for the Examining Authority a written version of my oral submission to ExA at the ISH today regarding environmental impact and noise.

It is very slightly longer than the oral submission, due to time constraints at the hearings.

If you have any queries or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

With kind regards, Deb Shotton

I wish to make a submission about the environmental impacts of this proposal.

My name is Deb Shotton. I am a resident of Ramsgate, our home sits under the proposed flight path for this new airport.

We bought our house in 2014. At this point the airport was closed, and the flight path did not exist.

It has been recognised at these hearings that the airport closed at the point that the airport was sold to Ms Gloag.

For the purposes of clarity, can I please ask that it is a matter of record that this is the case. That the former Manston Airport is a closed airport.

Thus this application is for a new airport and not for extension or redevelopment of an existing airport.

I understand that Mr Humphries appeared to be keen to establish, at Monday's hearing, that the airport was extant.

This is not the case. Its closure was reported on the BBC in May 2014 and it is listed in Wikipedia as the former Manston Airport, now closed.

The importance of this point cannot be overstated, because it must affect the manner in which the nuisance and annoyance to those affected is assessed and interpreted.

We in Thanet are moving from a situation of suffering no aircraft noise from large aircraft flying low overhead, to being subject to the effects of a fully operational cargo hub which is not in a position to state that there will be no night flights. On the contrary, their projected quotas pretty much guarantee that there will be night flights.

One inflammatory word cropped up yesterday, namely "Consequences". Following on from Mr Humphries' assertion during the hearing yesterday that there would be no consequences should the development not proceed following the grant of a DCO, I would answer that there might not be for him. For us, however, and many like us, there are huge consequences.

We live in fear of having the remainder of lives, for which we have planned carefully, being blighted by noise and pollution which will adversely affect our health.

Our business plans have been put on hold, in anticipation of the fact that a noisy and dirty cargo hub will diminish significantly Ramsgate's flourishing tourist and day visitor trade.

Mr Humphries further asserted towards the end of yesterday's hearing that the consequences for Climate Change had already been taken into account by the Secretary of State when this DCO application was permitted to proceed to examination.

I am sure Mr Humphries and I are not the only people here aware that, since that decision by Mr Grayling, a Climate Change Emergency has been declared by this government, which must impact the decision as to proportionality and need.

This will be of significant interest to the Secretary of State given the ECHR decision in *Hatton & Others v UK*, that when national authorities had failed to comply with some aspect of domestic law, environmental issues have given rise to violations of Article 8 of the Human Rights Convention. Namely as it provides:

a right to respect for one's "private and family life, his home and his correspondence", subject to certain restrictions that are "in accordance with law" and "necessary in a democratic society".

It will also bring focus to bear on the potential damage to the very special and vulnerable coastal areas over which the aircraft would fly at low level, were this DCO to be granted, one of which, the Goodwin Sands, is a newly designated Marine Conservation Zone.