

From: [REDACTED]
To: ManstonAirport@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: Manston Airport DCO
Date: 14 June 2019 22:52:45
Attachments: [Laura Marks.14 June 2019 .docx](#)

Dear PINS

Please find attached my comments as requested ahead of the deadline.

With best wishes

Laura Marks
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Environmental damage, health damage, wellbeing damage, tourism damage. All this for some freeze-dried fish and racehorses?

General Reflections

Having moved to Ramsgate Central four years ago, with my parents following not long after (to Nethercourt) I remain horrified, insulted and anxious that this vexatious DCO application has progressed this far.

I would like to thank the Examiners for their persistent accuracy and line of enquiry as we residents, who face the real lived experience, rely on you solely to come to the right decision. As your questions keep coming, the arrogance of this application increases. RSP think they can miss every deadline, tell the Examiners how to do their job and purport to know more about the DCO process than anyone else.

We remain voiceless, with the MP for Thanet North wearing his RSP badge 'with pride' and our MP for Thanet South forgetting to declare he has an airline (MAMA). We have Bob Bayford quite happy to ride roughshod over due local process. There is no local democracy and yet the supposed mandate trumpeted by Roger Gale was smashed to pieces in the recent local elections as Thanet voted emphatically to be represented by those who oppose the airport by a significant majority. Roger has no mandate, neither does Craig.

In all of these months of uncertainty and anxiety we have remained unable to explore accurately via evidence, that the noise impact and disturbance to our area would be catastrophic. Despite RSP appearing to make up their own noise contours they have failed to produce accurate data. How is it acceptable that over 40,000 people remain unaware of the proper impact of noise on their lives when we are approaching the end of the assessment?

This is a breach of our basic human rights and our entitlement to fairness and natural justice.

It has taken the residents personal fundraising to generate the evidence which we must now reflect on as a horrific prospect. The independent assessments commissioned by No Night Flights¹ and by 5 Ten 12 Limited²

From even a cursory read, we can see what we already knew, and which the locals had to go and find out ourselves. How is it that a one-page pie in the sky business case by RSP can be submitted, alongside a report whose author admits it does not contain evidence of viability, be enough to put this large population through so much?

Why has this been allowed to happen?

What has gone wrong with our planning legislation?

¹ <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004224-AS%20-%20No%20Night%20Flights%20-%20NNF18%20-%202014%20June%202019.pdf>

² [https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004163-AS%20-%20Five10Twelve%20-%20CAA%20\(ERCD\)%20NOISE%20CONTOURS_Redacted%20Final.pdf](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004163-AS%20-%20Five10Twelve%20-%20CAA%20(ERCD)%20NOISE%20CONTOURS_Redacted%20Final.pdf)

We won't have many more opportunities to comment so I want you to know I am sick of this divisive and incoherent incompetent application, this obfuscation and conceit we have to listen to as these distant invisible funders consider the ruination of our lives as a price worth paying. For what we do not know.

As KCC and others confirm time and again, Manston simply doesn't work commercially and it is time to put an end to this and time to stop putting the residents through this and get on with what really counts, and that isn't a cargo flight of emergency fruit and vegetables.

I am tired of listening to airport supporters and their popularity surveys. This is not a sentiment competition. I am sick of being accused of being a NIMBY or a DFL. I am sick of supporters using the Manston DCO as a barely veiled cover for anti-housing sentiment. Housing we desperately need.

Based on need, viability and national significance I ask the Examiners to consider whether they've seen even a shred of evidence to support these key criteria because I cannot. Where is this evidence? It is simply not there.

Comments on responses to the ExA's Third Written Questions received at Deadline 7a

- 1) I respectfully request the Examiners add a further request to RSP in the spirit of fairness, the most basic of all human principles. My request is this

Applicant to provide a detailed assessment on the impact of noise on the whole of Ramsgate and Herne Bay and a list of every street in every noise contour and the extent of the noise impact. Applicant to provide details of sound insulation and compensatory steps to mitigate for certain loss of quality of life. Applicant to outline justification of this impact against cost of healthcare decline, climate change impact and environmental damage.

I ask the Examiners why this forensic noise detail is asked of Smugglers Leap, and of Manston Green, but not for our town? Not for our Royal Harbour or Heritage Action Zone where the planes will be low in descent, rumbling towards Nethercourt at such a low and dangerous height. Yes, noise has been discussed, but we residents, we simply don't know the facts. Because RSP has not put any credible data in the application. This isn't simply a risk; it is cavalier for a DCO to go one step further when the impact on this sizeable group of residents is simply not clearly stated by the applicant. I have to ask myself why? I ask myself this question every single day. Why would anyone think a cargo hub at Manston is a genuinely good idea? There are many other ways to regenerate a local economy and to mitigate against social deprivation and poor health and employment outcomes.

- 2) Save Manston Airport Association

https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004128-Dr%20Beau%20Webber%20-%20Answers%20from%20Save%20Manston%20Airport%20association%20to%20Examination%20Questions%20Final_Redacted.pdf

ExA : Provide evidence that smaller airports with short walking distances attract older or less mobile passengers.

My observation - no demographic data is supplied in this response. There is no evidence which has been provided by SMA.

ExA: Provide evidence that older or less mobile passengers may travel greater distances than the average specifically to use smaller airports.

My observation - no evidence is provided. Only sentiment and opinion is provided by SMA.

The submission is in essence, some people saying they'd prefer a local airport. This is not NSIP relevant.

3) RSP Answers

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004084-Third%20Written%20Questions%20Answers.pdf>

ExA: ii. Respond to NE's comments regarding the impact on the SPA and Pegwell Bay and confirm when you intend to submit a revised Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment (RIAA). It is recommended that the updated text is supported by noise contour maps overlain with designated site boundaries and key bird locations; and by WeBS data.

RSP: In terms of noise disturbance, the Applicant's surveys revealed that noise events at a similar level to those that would be experienced as a result of overflying aircraft already occur at a much higher frequency within the Bay than will occur from operation of the airport. The existing noise levels are driven by the close proximity of a well-used road to the coastline.

My observation: is this a joke? Existing noise levels will be the same as from the current road noise? The Examiner should strike this answer out on the grounds it is nonsense.

RSP: Overall, operation of the airport will result in a relatively small number of additional noise events of a similar magnitude to those already occurring in the Bay.

My observation: the applicant should be stopped from making any further absurd comments to suggest that ATMs of this volume will generate a relatively small number of additional noise events.

4) Misleading advertising on the Isle of Thanet News and misleading web content on the SMA website. Content extract below:

<http://www.savemanstonairport.org.uk/wordpress/dco-stages/>

i.e. PINS accept Manston is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, and that RiverOak have the necessary money to pay for it.

My observation: this is factually incorrect.

5) From NNF

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004224-AS%20-%20No%20Night%20Flights%20-%20NNF18%20-%2014%20June%202019.pdf>

106. RSP's contours mask the reality that its proposals for a new airport at Manston represent material harm for tens of thousands of people. RSP significantly underestimates the population numbers affected and ignores the fact that this is a vulnerable population in UK health terms, and one that is not currently exposed to noise from aviation operations.

107. RSP's measurements of the current ambient noise levels are suspect. RSP placed noise monitors in the gardens of airport supporters and chose locations for other measurements that are not representative of the ambient noise in that location. This means that the proposed change in the level of noise that people will experience as a result of RSP's proposal has been understated at both ends – RSP's measurements of the current noise level are tainted by uncertainty and its measurements of the possible future noise level and the number of people affected is demonstrably understated.

RSP seem to be manipulating ATMs in their DCO application to suit their own agenda, keeping them high to justify an NSIP but then later keeping them low to avoid having to produce an accurate environmental report based on the true capacity of their plans for Manston, avoiding creation of public safety zones and having to pay blight and compensation claims

My observation: this recent document changes everything and this DCO should be halted immediately. I read this report with alarm and fear. The impact is simply too great. The need is simply not there. The harm is simply unjustified.

Conclusion

Based on the evidence (or lack of) this DCO application remains unproven, unviable and unnecessary. Please stop this constant application blight for Thanet. Stop us being bullied by some invisible investors, a one-page business plan and a history of past commercial failure. Stop the fake news on jobs, the fake news on investment and the nonsensical belief that waving at the pilot and the pilot waving back is something our town should want to do every ten minutes as we wipe fuel droplets from our faces or that modern cargo planes 'glide' in and we'd barely notice.

If RSP remain desperate to fly in some freeze-dried fish perhaps they would like to buy Prestwick Airport, also up for sale and also sieving cash.