

Ros McIntyre - Interested Party 20014158

Written summary of oral submission to the ISH on Environmental Issues – 5th June 2019

No Night Flights has said from the start of this process that RSP's noise contours do not reflect the full impact of the noise nuisance that its proposed new cargo airport would cause. We know that RSP's noise contours don't give an accurate picture because we have lived through 15 years of a smaller commercial airport – now closed for a number of years – operating on that site.

RSP has steadfastly refused to acknowledge or deal with the representations by NNF and by individual residents as to our past experience of what the noise of real airport operations was actually like in various locations. Our experience – it must be remembered – was of a smaller airport than RSP is proposing. Yet RSP claims we will experience a fraction of the noise nuisance that we previously experienced and that in many locations the noise impact of a 24/7 cargo airport would be negligible or zero.

The only information available to the ExA on noise impact is RSP's noise contours. The ExA invited ICCAN to comment, but ICCAN is too new a body to be able to offer expert help.

Given the importance of an accurate calculation of noise impact for the assessment of the proposed harm caused to quality of life, to health and to our economy and environment, NNF commissioned the Civil Aviation Authority to produce noise contours for us. Those contours are different to the contours commissioned by FiveTenTwelve, but they tell a similar story. We asked the CAA because it is a recognised body with no vested interest in presenting a rosy picture. Also, the CAA is using the most appropriate methodology, which RSP has not. Finally, the CAA could offer us a consultancy team experienced in using the most up-to-date approaches. RSP's noise modeller was honest enough to say in the March hearing that he had very little experience of doing this work.

NNF has just received the final report from the CAA. An initial quick study of the report confirms our own experience of the noise impact of airport operations. The report shows that RSP's noise contours do not accurately reflect the full scale of the noise nuisance that its new airport would inflict on local people and on the local environment.

This means that RSP's ES does not capture the worst case. It also means that RSP's estimate of noise mitigation costs is inadequate.

We're aiming for the CAA report to be with you next week. It goes directly to any assessment of whether there is any net public benefit in RSP's proposal. We are clear that there is none. The report is therefore a material consideration in any

assessment as to whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition of this land.

Finally, it is telling that residents have had to raise funds to produce this expert evidence ourselves.