

To Ms Anderson and the Manston Airport Case Team

Response to The Secretary of State regarding any comments they have on two late representations from Five10Twelve Limited dated 17 October 2019 and 27 October 2019, which it states are an evidenced Rebuttal to the Applicant's Overall Need Case [REP11-013].

I wholeheartedly support these late submissions from Five10Twelve Limited, I have many concerns regarding Public Safety Zones ("PSZs"), having previously seen the contour map that the applicant provided is not anywhere near the same as was one that was commissioned by NNF and Five10Twelve. The applicant should in reality have much larger PSZ's – they are proposing flying over a very densely populated area but in reality their PSZ shows that a house on one side of road will not be included but the other side of the road would be – I might add I am talking about a minor road not a major road.

DfT confirms PSZs are required. RSP assume PSZ only needs to be put in place when number of ATMs reaches a certain number but they need to be put in place well in advance of these numbers surely.

As a matter of policy, the Department for Transport applies Public Safety Zones at aerodromes that have more than 1,500 movements a month and which are likely in due course to exceed 2,500 movements.

RSP should have considered whether Manston Airport needs a PSZ because they state that the potential number of ATM's is 83220 by capacity and they also state they do not want limits or a cap on the number of flights.

Riveroak's Major Accidents and Disaster Assessment and Mitigation Plan fails to address the following risk factors adequately –

- (i) the proximity of Ramsgate (population 40,000) to the runway
- (ii) the number of schools under the flight path
- (iii) the height of the aircraft over Ramsgate
- (iv) the safety record of cargo aircraft at Manston Airport
- (v) the lack of capacity at local A&E for dealing with a major incident

Ramsgate is not 4km from the runway as Riveroak contends. (para 6.6, Statement of Reasons TR20002/App/3.1) The built-up area currently begins 1.3km from the runway and directly under the flight path. It is 4.5km across Ramsgate from the outer edge of the Marina to the runway. The planes line up over the Grade 2 star listed Clock Tower and descend across the town. There are 4 schools directly under the flight path.

A proper risk analysis would conclude that Manston should not be given planning permission as an airport let alone accorded a DCO.

The Examining Inspectors visited a property on the Nethercourt Estate where a resident had lost her roof previously from aircraft flying over, that just emphasizes the problems that can and probably would occur.

The Government has made a legally binding commitment to make the UK carbon neutral by 2050, obviously airport expansions would totally contradict such a message. Even the DfT has recently said that the new runway at Heathrow will only be built if it complies with our carbon reduction targets, so I fail to see how this DCO would fit with the Governments guidelines of Carbon Neutral.

It appears to me the applicant has done its very best to show best case scenarios on each and every case. I have lived under the flight path for over 30 years and am more than aware of the effects of planes flying very low overhead. Night flights happening when there were supposedly none – complaints from residents ignored, pollution, noise, not being able to be heard, cannot hear a conversation or telephone calls to name a few.

It is my firm belief that RSP have not shown anywhere near enough evidence that a DCO is actually needed or indeed granted.

Rita Burns

Registration No 20012450