

5th July 2021

For the attention of the Manston Airport Case Team

Re: Determination of the Application by RiverOak Strategic Partners Limited for an Order granting Development Consent for the reopening and development of Manston Airport in Kent

This is in response to the Statement of Matters:

I would like to voice my opposition to the above proposal for the reasons below:

Changes since July 2019

1. In June 2019, the government passed a law to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 78% by 2035* and to net zero by 2050* (*<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-enshrines-new-target-in-law-to-slash-emissions-by-78-by-2035>), therefore building an additional air freight hub at Manston goes against these targets. Flying goods in by air is highly damaging to the environment and is likely to be phased out over time in favour of shipping or rail if these targets are to be achieved. The position of Manston means that there would be increased HGV movements along the routes to the rest of the country to transport the goods arriving by air, thus adding more CO2 to the atmosphere. Indeed, our own local Thanet District Council declared the area to be a Climate Emergency on 11th July 2019 (<https://www.thanet.gov.uk/info-pages/climate-emergency/>) and pledged to make the Thanet area carbon neutral by 2030.
2. The whole world has been going through a COVID:19 Pandemic and this country has seen seismic changes to the airline industry. Much of travel for business and especially leisure has been banned until recently and it is likely that many people will be wary of foreign travel for some time. Many UK airports have been severely affected by this and this had led to many redundancies in the airline travel industry. There is now a lot of extra capacity at many airports that will be able to handle any freight movements needed now and in the near future. As Manston is not going to be fully functional until 2023, any freight movements coming into the UK will be adequately handled by one of our many airports such as Gatwick, Heathrow and East Midlands (which are better placed strategically anyway).
3. Since last June, many prime farmland fields around the Manston area have been used for building residential properties, several fields in Cliffsend, Monkton and a 1,600 home-development site is being opposed for nearby Birchington by local residents. Even the local MP, Sir Roger Gale, is against such huge areas of farmland being lost irreversibly to housing and has voiced his concerns repeatedly. The brownfield site of the airport should, I and many believe, be used for such large areas of housing and other mixed usage to preserve our greenfield sites to grow crops locally and again, save extra greenhouse emissions in importing similar crops from abroad.

In addition to the above, I would add that my previous concerns about the airport are still as relevant today as they were when I submitted it to PINS, that is the effect on local schools with the constant noise and air pollution. The schools likely to be affected have, in total, around 9,900* attendees (*figures taken from OFSTED 2019) are:

Pre-Schools Affected:

Monkton Under Fives CT12 4JQ
Minster Day Nursery School CT12 4PS
Manston School House Nursery School CT12 5BA
Growing Together Nursery School CT12 6HX
Little Scarecrows Nursery School CT12 5BA

The Elms Nursery School CT11 9QP
Fledglings Day Nursery School CT11 OBS
The Grange Montessori Nursery School CT11 9LJ
Bright Start Nursery School CT11 9RT
The Children's Nest Nursery School CT11 8QX
Mother Goose Nursery School CT11 8LB
Hand in Hand Nursery School CT11 7AJ

Primary Schools Affected:

Monkton Primary School CT12 4JQ
Minster Primary School CT12 4PS
Newington Primary School CT12 6HX
St Laurence College Primary School CT11 7AF
St Laurence Junior School CT11 0QX
Chilton Lane Primary School CT11 0LQ
Priory Infant School CT11 9XT
Christ Church Junior CT11 0ZZ
Ellington Infant School CT11 0QH
Newlands Primary CT11 7AJ

Secondary Schools Affected:

The Royal Harbour Academy CT12 6RH
Laleham Gap School CT12 6FH
Great Oaks Small School CT12 5FH
Foreland Fields School CT12 6RH
Small Haven School CT12 6PT
Chatham and Clarendon Grammar School CT11 9BB (Upper)
Chatham and Clarendon Grammar School CT11 7PS (Lower)
St Laurence College CT11 7AE

(The above do not include schools in the Herne Bay area that are just as likely to be affected)

RSP have admitted that people living near the runway will be adversely affected but I do not feel that they have properly thought about the impact on our local children's education. Children who have disrupted sleep and disrupted lessons throughout the day will not perform well. Surely it is unacceptable to blight hundreds of our young people's futures in this way?

The sum of money proposed by the applicant may help with providing some noise-reducing glazing etc but as the money is proposed over a 20-year period, many of the schools will not receive any assistance in the short term. Some may have to wait until the full period is almost up before receiving any help – small comfort for those generations of children whose education will be severely affected by the daily disruption to their lessons.

The proposed sum of money does not address the noise experienced during outside lessons such as Sports, Forest School and other outdoor pursuits. Summer Sports Days will be ruined by the deafening sound throughout the day. Children are encouraged to enjoy breaktimes by running around outside and socialise but how will they want to do so with these planes constantly flying overhead and conversation stifled? The increased air pollution is also a very real concern for the children, and indeed for anyone living in close proximity along the flight path.

And what of sleep deprivation? Many of the children (and staff) live close by their designated school and will be certainly affected during their bedtimes. The applicant states that their daytime flying hours will be from 6:00-23:00. The NHS** recommend that children should get the following hours of uninterrupted sleep:

- 3 years 11-12 hours
- 4 years 11.5 hours
- 5 years 11 hours

- 6 years 10.75 hours
- 7 years 10.5 hours
- 8 years 10.25 hours
- 9 years 10 hours
- 10 years 9.75 hours
- 11 years 9.5 hours
- 12 years 9.25 hours
- 13 years 9.25 hours
- 14 years 9 hours
- 15 years 9 hours
- 16 years 9 hours

** (Data taken from <https://www.nhs.uk/live-well/sleep-and-tiredness/how-much-sleep-do-kids-need/>)

As these results show, the 7 hour 'quiet window' does not allow enough time for the children affected to recharge for full health benefits.

This potential development has already undergone a lengthy scrutiny by the Planning Inspectorate, where after much deliberation the application was rejected. It is beyond belief why their recommendation was subsequently ignored and overturned by the SoS for Transport with no convincing reason given. I ask you to look at all the arguments carefully and to waste no more time in rejecting this application for good.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Lizbeth Langston

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Mrs Lizbeth Langston.