

Manston Airport deadline 8 submission from Broadstairs resident Alan Welcome. Registration ID (20013166)

General response to DCO process to date. I am deeply unimpressed by the poor quality of RSP's initial documentation and its apparent inability to provide worthwhile answers to the important questions posed by the examiners. The inconsistencies and contradictions apparent throughout the DCO process persuade me that RSP's aim is to acquire as much land as possible, as cheaply as possible and to secure as much flexibility as possible in how it subsequently makes use of its valuable acquisition; all this with as little risk as possible of any serious comeback if it fails to deliver on its stated aims.

As an example of an inconsistency, RSP demands a large quota count while stating that it does not require night flights.

And for a massive contradiction - the applicant suggests that it will spread flights evenly throughout the day – but at the same time it justifies its demand for an unfeasibly large number of stands by claiming they are needed to deal with the concentration and bunching of flights! A pretty transparent attempt at cake and eating it.

I am concerned at RSP's tawdry attempts to downplay the likely impact of its proposals on the local environment and on the health and wellbeing of people living under the flightpaths, and those further afield who will also have their quality of life diminished. RSP's view on this does not chime with reality. In common with many others I can say this with some authority because I have experienced the effects of cargo operations at Manston. I feel very confident that the CAA noise contours commissioned by NNF will bear me out.

Response to draft DCO It seems barely credible that a DCO has to be (or indeed can be) written when so much remains unresolved and opaque. I feel sure that a situation like this was never envisaged by those designing the process.

In consequence, if a DCO has to be generated I would like to see it written in such a way as to ensure that RSP cannot avoid its proper responsibilities to the local population and to the current lawful owners of the land.

This could include a complete ban on night flights other than humanitarian flights and emergencies. This would, I think, mean that there would be no need for a Quota count. There could be seriously punitive fines for any failure to conform to these requirements – punitive to the extent that the airport would lose a significant amount of money for every transgression. An endlessly rising tariff may well ensure compliance.

RSP could be required to significantly extend the noise mitigation measures (probably in line with NNF's CAA-produced noise contours).

The land involved could be strictly limited to that required for the core NSIP activity and no more.

Full, non-negotiable protection should be provided for the current lawful owners of the land. This is not so much prompted by any desire to assist SHP, but rather in the spirit of fairness and the desire to ensure that RSP should not profit in any way from this process other than by delivering the core NSIP while having proper respect and consideration for the residents of Thanet and Herne Bay.

Funding Funding remains an important, unresolved issue, despite having been raised by PINS way back when the DCO application was accepted. If the SOS ultimately decides to approve the DCO, I think the strength or otherwise of the DCO document will be revealed by whether or not money

comes flooding in. If it does - the DCO will have proved weak, persuading investors that RSP can do more or less what it likes with regard to aviation activity – or that it can with impunity abandon its stated plans and do something more obviously lucrative.

Thank you.