

**APPLICATION BY RIVEROAK STRATEGIC PARTNERS LTD (“THE APPLICANT”)
FOR AN ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE UPGRADE AND
REOPENING ON MANSTON AIRPORT**

PINS Reference Number: TR020002

STONE HILL PARK LTD’S COMMENTS ON THE APPLICANT’S WRITTEN SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS PUT AT THE HRA, BIODIVERSITY AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES HEARING HELD ON 5 JUNE 2019

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Habitats Regulations Assessment, Biodiversity and other Environmental Issues Hearing (the "Hearing") was held at 02:00pm on 5 June 2019 at Discovery Park, Sandwich, CT13 9FF.
- 1.2 The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions (“Applicant’s Written Summary”) was published on 18 June 2019 [REP8-015].
- 1.3 SHP has submitted its own Written Summary of Oral Representations [REP8-032] (“SHP’s Written Summary”). The purpose of this note is not to repeat those submissions, but to highlight to the ExA further omissions, anomalies and discrepancies relating to the information submitted by the Applicant.

2. AGENDA ITEM 4: EIA MATTERS

2.1 4(a) Air Quality:

- 2.1.1 As SHP noted at the Hearing and in paragraphs 2.1 – 2.7 of its Written Summary [REP8-032], there is a fundamental error in the Azimuth Report [APP-085] and the asserted fleet mix that infects the environmental effects assessed in the application. In summary, c.25% of all cargo ATMs are assumed to be the very small ATR-72 aircraft, for which there would be no apparent use under the Applicant’s business model.
- 2.1.2 It is revealing that the Applicant’s Written Summary [REP8-015] does not comment on the fleet mix that was used to assess the likely significant effects in the ES.
- 2.1.3 During the Hearing Mr Hilton for the Applicant suggested that there could be *“some variability in the fleet mix”* but *“did not believe they would be significant in any way”*. This entirely subjective comment was made without evidence and without any sensitivity testing having been carried - Mr Hilton noted that only the fleet mix provided by the Applicant had been assessed and that Wood were unable to answer questions on it. It is not clear whether Wood have any expertise in this area.

2.1.4 As explained in SHP's Written Summary (including its Appendix 1), the effect of replacing small ATR-72 aircraft (that would not form part of the Applicant's asserted e-commerce integrator model) with larger aircraft is likely to be material. These effects have not been assessed.

2.2 **4(b)(i) Biodiversity:**

2.2.1 The Applicant has not addressed its failure to undertake the many outstanding ecology surveys that it had committed to that were required "to confirm the worst case ecological impact assessment" [REP1-001].

2.2.2 A summary of the issues was set out in paragraphs 2.8-2.12 of SHP's Written Summary.

2.3 **4(c) Climate Change:**

2.3.1 In the course of the Hearing the Applicant asserted that a benefit of the Applicant's business model is that transporting freight by air rather than trucking was more environmentally sustainable. However, this assertion (or any evidence to support it) was not included within the Applicant's Written Summary.

2.3.1 As demonstrated in paragraphs 2.13-2.15 and Appendix 2 of SHP's Written Summary, UK Government data shows that CO2 emissions of Airfreight are between 5.8 and 27.4 times higher than for trucked freight. If the additional impacts of Radiative Forcing - the influence of other climate change effects of aviation (such as water vapour and nitrogen oxides) – the UK Government recommends using a multiplier of 1.9 to these figures to ensure a holistic view of the additional environmental impacts of airfreight are recorded.

2.4 **4(d) Noise:**

2.5 In its written submission, the Applicant attempts to justify why the daytime SOAEL should not be lower than 60dBAeq, 16hr.

2.6 In doing so, the Applicant has not been accurate, is highly selective in its quotes and fails to acknowledge the degree to which some existing airports already have noise insulation schemes starting at 57dBAeq, 16hr.

2.7 In paragraph 2.28, the Applicant asserts that the Aviation 2050 consultation paper only considers whether mitigation at 60dB is appropriate. In actuality, paragraph 3.122 the paper explicitly states that government proposes to extend noise insulation policy threshold to 60dB and for "airspace changes which lead to significantly increased overflight, to set a new minimum threshold of an increase of 3dB LAeq, which leaves a household in the 54dB LAeq 16hr contour or above as a new eligibility

criterion for assistance with noise insulation.” It is logical that this second test would apply to Manston, as there is no current airport.

- 2.8 In paragraph 2.29, the Applicant appears to gloss over its attempts during the Hearing to tell the ExA that the ICCAN representation did not state what it actually does. The Applicant appears to be attempting to rewrite history by asserting the point being made by the ExA was in relation to noise caps, rather than just accepting that ICCAN stated in its submission [REP7a-033] that the imposition of an SOAEL of 60dBLAeq, 16hr “*would be entirely in line with the Government’s thinking on this issue.*”
- 2.9 The recent submission of comprehensive noise contour information prepared by the ERCD on behalf of Five10Twelve Ltd and No Night Flights suggest that the costs associated with applying mitigation at 63dB and 60dB would be materially higher than estimated by the Applicant in paragraph 2.30.
- 2.10 In paragraph 2.31 of the Applicant’s Written Summary, the Applicant refers to the technical note submitted as Appendix ISH6-21. **SHP submitted a detailed note to the ExA on 20 June 2019 [AS-207], highlighting the material errors and omissions in the information submitted by the Applicant regarding the trigger levels for noise mitigation measures at other airports.**
- 2.11 **4(d)(iii) Noise DCO Requirements:**
- 2.12 In paragraph 2.38 the Applicant asserts that “*few airports have multiple types of limits as is currently being discussed.*” SHP would refer the ExA to its note [AS-207] which demonstrated that no confidence can be taken from the Applicant’s assertions on noise mitigation controls / measures at other UK airports.
- 2.13 SHP would refer the ExA to its comments in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.16 of SHP’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions put at the dDCO Hearing held on 7 June 2019 [REP8-033], which explains the sorts of controls that would also need to be reflected in the DCO to ensure the environmental effects were not worse than assessed.