

## Deadline 8 - Manston Airport Application

Dear Sirs

As a registered interested party and resident of Ramsgate, I would like to submit the following comments and questions regarding the proposed DCO to create a new cargo airport at the disused Manston Airport site. I have closely followed the whole process, particularly the last round of Issue Specific Hearings. I feel that many of the applicant's responses have only added to the fog, rather than dispelled it.

1. My understanding is that a DCO only pertains used for a nationally significant infrastructure project. This is one where the public benefit (jobs, financial, need) dramatically outweighs the harm (pollution, loss of amenity, loss of value) caused by the project. Throughout the course of this hearing I have read nothing from the applicant in support of the public benefit that has not been accurately dissected and destroyed. There is no need (as evidenced by lack of ANY government mention of Manston as a supported airport), claims of jobs are spurious (and include jobs of farmers in exporter countries such as Peru) and no evidence that the project would be profitable, even for the hidden investors let alone anyone in Thanet or the wider UK. In contrast, the harm is very clear (despite strenuous efforts on the part of the applicant to rubbish the data). Most of Ramsgate and Herne Bay will suffer devastating noise and atmospheric pollution, sites of Special Scientific Interest will suffer, large numbers of historic buildings will suffer, residents will lose the enjoyment of their outside spaces, the burgeoning tourist trade will be strangled, and those who have invested heavily in the improvement of Thanet will lose out massively. As just one small example, Natural England accept the applicant's suggestion that the negative effects on Pegwell Bay wildlife can be sufficiently ameliorated by restricting public access to this wonderful site. So a brand new cargo hub with no benefit justification is allowed to trump the centuries-old public right to enjoy their natural environment. This leaves me absolutely speechless with rage.
2. I also understand that to employ a Compulsory Purchase Order to deprive the lawful owner of unfettered use of his land, all consensual options should have been explored prior to the granting of a CPO. SHP have offered to lease the site on a 125 year lease, subject to certain conditions that do not hamper the applicant's plans. This offer was rejected. On what basis then is a CPO allowed to proceed?
3. The applicant appears to be deliberately avoiding his responsibilities in compensating those who will be affected. The noise contours bear no resemblance to those published when Manston was an operational airfield (with a much lower level activity than planned) and differ from those produced by the CAA in recent engagements. This appears to be a direct attempt to minimise the number of properties that are eligible for compensation. The applicant's assessment of the compensation for compulsory purchase is ridiculously undervalued. There are no public safety zones

established. Remember this is NOT an application to extend an existing facility. It is an attempt to create a NEW, massively busy airport cargo hub on the site of a small airport that has been closed and disused for many years.

4. There is very strong public opposition, which the airport supporters have repeatedly denied. However the local election results show that parties with a strong anti-airport message trounced the candidates that were pro-airport, and the number of residents associations formed to fight this terrible proposal vastly outnumber the few that support it.
5. The applicant claims that there will be no 'timetabled' night flights (whatever timetabled means). We know from when the airport was operational in the past that even with a similar claim there were multiple 'late arrivals' occurring throughout the night. The applicant has not changed quota count or ATMs despite agreeing to the night flight curtailment. In addition the applicant does not use the standard definition of night time (11pm-7am) and instead considers that flights between 6am and 7am are not night flights. I beg to differ, this is most definitely night time. It would appear from statements made at the hearings that there will be a considerable number of take-offs in this 1-hour period. The DCO must explicitly prevent night flights, and penalties for ATMs within this period should be sufficient to curb the activity.

There are other issues with this application that many have raised including the lack of clarity over financing which the Examining Authority has noted as a significant risk to the proposal - more than a year ago.

In summary, this proposal to create a new airport has not demonstrated need, benefit, or even viability. It is NOT a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. The applicant has not fulfilled the prerequisites to allow the application of a Compulsory Purchase Order against the lawful owners of the land, and has been unable to demonstrate any ability to finance even the initial stages of purchase and compensation. The disbenefit to large numbers of Thanet residents is fully evidenced and severe. The application should be rejected.

Yours faithfully

Dr P Shotton

Registered Interested Party and concerned Ramsgate resident.