

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#); [grant.shapps@dft.gov.uk](mailto:grant.shapps@dft.gov.uk); [info@andymcdonaldmp.org](mailto:info@andymcdonaldmp.org)  
**Subject:** Manston DCO  
**Date:** 31 January 2020 13:19:01

---

Response to request for comments and further information from interested parties. 17.01.2020

Ref.20013777 I will not burden you with my previous submissions here.

**I would like to express my wholehearted support for all of the points made in the late submissions by Five10Twelve in both of their October submissions and their January submission to the Planning Inspectorate.**

### **No Proven need**

‘The Applicant has NOT demonstrated that Manston is/will be cost-efficient, sustainable and deliverable’ Five10Twelve

RSP has not proven a case for the need to reopen Manston. They, (RSP) have stated that business would be taken from existing operators/airports, not from new business, so surely there **is no need**, as there is already capacity at other airports. Rather than creating new jobs or capacity, that business would simply be shifted from elsewhere, jobs would be lost there to create here. Something I am sure those businesses already operating at those other airports would fiercely defend.

This does **not** meet the requirement for an NSIP.

### **Climate change and pollution**

The Conservatives, in their manifesto, stated it would be committed to bring forward new laws to pledge the UK to net zero emissions by 2050, also to amend the climate change act 2008 and pledged the UK to be the “first major economy to commit to ending its contribution to global warming”

Passing the DCO for a cargo hub at Manston would certainly fly in the face of this commitment. It would make no sense to allow the opening of a new airport, whilst being committed to the above.

Each aircraft movement at Manston would distribute PM2.5 and under, plus many more pollutants to contaminate us, our children and grandchildren's young lungs, especially whilst they are outside at play.

## Reputational risk

There would be a huge reputational risk for the SOS, to give the go ahead to a start up business with no credentials, no sound business plan and no track record in running an airport, apart from involvement of Mr Freudmann, who has never managed one successfully, especially at Manston, nor proof of the funds to cover it.

Indeed, it sounds very akin to the 'Seaborne freight' debacle of a year ago, also here in Ramsgate. The then SOS didn't come out of that very well.

## Noise

RSP cannot have based their application on a 'Worst case scenario'

The amount of ATM's applied for has changed upwards several times during the PINS examination, it is now substantially different to the information in their Public Consultation, or the DCO application at the beginning of the process. (A 'front loaded' application process)

They also did not change the fleet mix (used in their NMP forecast 2018) even though it had changed, requiring updating their NMP. The way in which they have chosen to portray how we, as residents will perceive each ATM is flawed as it 'averages out' an average of the impact of each movement over a long period, rather than how it will actually be experienced. This makes their application inaccurate and incomplete.

The children, almost 10,000 of them, in several schools, identified in RSP's application, ( ) certainly won't experience the 'averaged out' noise of an aircraft going overhead disturbing their lessons. Each movement will disturb their learning. Each movement at night will disturb their sleep. The money RSP say is available for those schools for noise mitigation is also woefully inadequate, limited and eeked out every year. These funds should be available so that schools will be protected from the day operations are commenced, not in 20 years. 99.5% (?) of Residents will not be entitled to any compensation according to their noise contours it seems.

The W.H.O. talks about individual noise events causing harm at 45DB

Many times aircraft have flown at approx 400 feet above my house at SEL90db at night, waking me every time. Yet, RSP say that 18 movements a night at 80db will not disturb sleep?

RSP now appear to be applying for unlimited "late" arrivals between 2300-0600 including the most noisy aircraft in operation.

Unlimited arrivals AND departures between 0600-0700 of up to QC2, The only constraint on these being an enormously generous annual QC budget of 2000 QC points. That is extremely worrying. Are we to suffer a huge amount of these movements squeezed in to a one hour slot?

Five10Twelve had to privately commission noise contour maps as the ones RSP produced in their application were wildly misleading, excising 70db and 85db contours altogether. These were supported by the NNF commissioned maps also

from the CAA. Both show that RSP map contours are inaccurate. This does not present a 'Worst case scenario' rather, it appears an attempt to disguise it.

### **PSZ**

RSP have refused, it seems, to acknowledge the requirement for, or to make provision for a PSZ at the outset of their operation, stating it will not be needed for several years, this is wrong. PSZs are based on forecasts looking years ahead. This would be extremely detrimental to Ramsgate, a town of 40000 people. It would cover a huge swathe of the town bringing a planning blight with it.

Barbara Warner.