

I am furious that once again RSP is dismissive of the local population and is trying it on by not dealing with all night landing and the QC and with no time to go through the questions, within the time limit its here that I am using NNF input I am also having to once again repeat what I have already submitted as I can still find no response to that submission.

Any aircraft which has a quota count of 4 or more cannot take-off or land at the airport between the hours of 0600 and 0700.

Meaning – they can land unscheduled and “late” at any time between 2300 and 0600. A 747-400 cargo plane is only QC4 on departure, so we can have "late" planes louder than a cargo 747-400 that coming in all night with no limit on numbers.

The airport will be subject to an annual quota between the hours of 0600 and 0700 of 2000 [quota points, they mean]. Each landing and take-off at the airport during that time period is to count towards this annual quota. An aircraft is deemed to have taken off or landed during the time period if the time recorded by the appropriate ATC control unit as ‘airborne’ or ‘landed’ respectively falls within it;

Meaning – there is NO QC limit between 2300 and 0600. So, the airport can use 2000 QC points over the year for the hour 0600 to 0700. Any “late” arrival between 2300 and 0600 doesn’t count towards that QC quota. This is extraordinary and means that RSP can have as many night arrivals as it likes, all through the night, of anything up to and including QC4, as long as they stop by 0600. It can then have an enormous number of flights of up to and inc QC2 for that hour, then back to any QC they like for 0700 to 2300. this is much, much worse than anything we have lived through before. Proportionally, it is worse than is allowed in the London airports.

The forecasts for the area enclosed by the 50dB(A) Leq16hr (0700-2300) contour shall not exceed 35.8 sq km, and the area enclosed by the 40dB(A) Leq8hr (23.00-07.00) contour shall not exceed 47.4 sq km. Future calculation, monitoring and reporting of the application and any breaches to the contour is discussed in Section 7 below

Meaning – this pretend noise cap is not shown anywhere; will not be shown anywhere; is entirely notional; and leaves none of us knowing what it would mean in practice. It won’t be measured by actual noise monitors because there will be just 4 of them 6.5Km from start of roll on the departure paths only. No noise monitors for arrivals, funnily enough. And none in residential areas. The noise cap is a hypothetical construct and has no meaning in terms of limiting noise. Anyone who can hear a plane going over them will still be able to hear it

Noise mitigation is still well below what the London airports are offering

RSP is not planning to report, at all, on ACTUAL noise levels generated every year. So, no noise monitoring apart from those 4 monitors 6.5km away. Everything will be based on hypothetical noise models

This is an appalling idea with little regard for the Residents who live on the approach/flight paths. This would give RSP no limits and no penalties! In the past we had a sec106 tied to the land which caused us issues when it operated something that RSP would be very aware of.

We had shoulder periods for the late arrivals that gave us little protection and the local authority (TDC) significance failed to deal with. Going through the documents I am frankly

amazed that (as yet) TDC has not addressed the genuine public concerns via the DCO application, is it because the leader of TDC gave comfort to RSP in his letter of support?

I am deeply concerned that the ExA is failing to understand/grasp the night flights scenario?

On the matter of TDC it is more than important that the ExA asks these questions of TDC:-

1. Has TDC indicated to the ExA the sec 106 noise monitoring failures?
2. The need to have more than one mobile noise monitor and its cost met by the applicants with the relevant train costs and annual maintenance fees?
3. The shoulder period failures?
4. The failure to collect fines?

The above are material facts that TDC should have addressed at the start of the DCO process and TDC would have that evidence.

On the subject of the DCO funding and the inadequacies within the submission, I am very concerned that the costing of the staffing of the Border Inspection Post (BIP) and training of TDC staff to man it to check goods, let alone the costs of building one to make the airport the UK's biggest freight centre? So has the following taken place?

1. Has TDC informed RSP what costs they want for staffing a BIP as RSP would have to fund and pay TDC for that staffing?
2. Has the HMRC been approached for what they need?
3. The HMRC has specific needs.

I am concerned that we continually get more questions than answers at each stage of this DCO and those of us that lead more than a complex life are somewhat disadvantaged something I am not happy about.

Finally I have been informed that I need to formally request that the ExA answers the two questions as the FOI team at PINS cannot do so?

1. If this application is successful will it affect the ability of PINS and Public Bodies to enable public bodies to remain in public ownership?

2. Has PINS considered this in its pre-consultation process or taken legal advice on the effect of a DCO acceptance outcome?

affects

Regards

MK