

Dear Mr Price & examiners

I am writing on behalf of Nethercourt Action Group Ref 20013745, Hilary Scott Ref 20014097 & myself Ian Scott Ref 20013013.

We have found it impossible to read, digest and be able to comment on the last two deadlines due to the very small window allowed for submissions. We would like to place on record our anger and dismay that we are expected to take on board hundreds of pages of often very technical issues and, in both cases of the last two deadlines, respond within two days. We have had no opportunity whatsoever to get or take advice. Due to ridiculously tight deadlines we have been unable to engage fully with the examination during this stage. Because of this we would like to place on record our support for the submissions made by No Night Flights, Five10Twelve, Barry James & Susan Kennedy as they represent the objections we all have to this DCO application.

We have, however, been able to note a couple of points. One is RSP's attempt to discredit the noise contours done by No Night Flights (NNF) and Five10Twelve by calling them "crude". These were created by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) from information provided by NNF of real life experience. The ones produced by RSP were created by someone who had never produced them before on software they hadn't used before using notional aircraft mix, flight paths and number of ATMs which has since changed. The CAA is the go to agency for matters related to aviation. They would be the ones RSP would have to apply to for flight paths and are in charge of general aviation safety so it seems to us their noise contours would be the ones to trust and we would hope the examiners would to.

We are also very worried about RSP noise mitigation plan or rather lack of. The proposed night ban isn't a ban at all. As it stands there will be no protection for residents from unlimited late arrivals at any time of the night from any aircraft whatever the quota count. There is no legal definition of what constitutes a "late" flight in the DCO and the operators of the airport could use any excuse knowing full well there will be no consequences. The NMP as is leaves residents no protection whatsoever at night. This has never been consulted on or examined. Added to this there seems no provision for monitoring noise or noise monitors apart from 6.5km from the start of take off. As this would put them in the sea at Ramsgate what use would they be?

We understand SHP are saying they will withdraw their objection and submissions following completion of the sale of Manston to RSP. This is written & oral factual evidence given to the enquiry and we would hope that it is still taken into consideration by the examiners especially at the date of completion is two days after the examination period finishes. The sale of Manston by SHP does not remove its relevance to the enquiry. It would be a travesty to not consider it at this very late stage when it is impossible for anyone else to submit it.

There also seems to be no resolution to the question of the Pegwell outfall. We are worried that the runoff from any airport would contaminate the SSSI

We have read the MOD's last letter and it sums up admirably the way RSP have behaved all the way through this examination period. In our opinion they have lied, misled & misrepresented. They have also done their very best to hide the full impact of their proposal on Ramsgate from the word go and we hope the examiners make sure they are not rewarded by recommending refusal.

Yours Sincerely

Nethercourt Residents Group, Ian & Hilary Scott