

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport; manstonairport@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:manstonairport@pins.gsi.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** Applicant's Fourth Written Questions in Application dated 20/6/2019  
**Date:** 08 July 2019 08:32:52

---

Jane Hetherington



Dear ExA,

Once again we are required to respond to these endless corrections and responses to the original application aware that the whole situation has radically changed in view of last week's news about the sale of the land by SHP to RSP. This had apparently been in negotiation for some time and of course that leads one to question the transparency and accountability of the whole process and the continued obfuscation practised by the Applicant.

I am in full time work and a councillor for Ramsgate, yet in addition to this already extremely busy timetable, I am expected to read and respond to 298 pages of detailed questions and responses. This in the infinitesimal amount of time I have before the deadline ....and it is impossible. This highlights the flaws in the process and the Applicant has taken full advantage of this with endless rewrites and a raft of unanswered questions. Many individuals have worked hard to examine and respond to the issues the Applicant fails to address and I hope the ExA will explore these further?

Subsequently in such a short time I can only concentrate on a few issues.

G4.3 ICCAN Corporate Strategy 2019-21 Consultation

There is a lack of interest or regard displayed by the Applicant in relation to aviation noise and it's impact quote,

Aviation noise "can have a detrimental effect on the quality of life and health which are difficult to quantify using graphs, metrics, maps or other data"

The information in relation to the detrimental impact of noise is in the public domain and the research has been submitted by many Thanet residents relating to the adverse impact of noise pollution on learning, sleep, child development and mental health. Residents have additionally given personal evidence of the appalling impact of noise during the existence of the previous airport's operations. I myself was frequently woken by the late arrival of EU jets operations living as I do in CT11 and daytime operations also impinged on my work.

The Applicant quote,

"The Applicant recognises that individuals experiencing adverse noise impacts will not necessarily feel the bigger picture benefits to the economy compensate them as individuals for noise disturbance. However, it will be for the Secretary of State to determine where the balance lies and whether benefits of this nationally significant infrastructure outweigh the limited harm to a very small percentage of the population"

ICAN is clear on this point that economic benefits do not and cannot compensate. The economic benefits to this area and it's population are far from evident and appear to be based on Dr Sally Dixon's lack lustre and inadequate report. There is nothing to evidence a national interest and the number impacted is not as the noise contours submitted by NNF a "very small percentage of the population".

Yours Sincerely,  
Jane Hetherington

Sent from my iPad