

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Manston Airport Submission  
**Date:** 08 July 2021 22:24:59  
**Attachments:** [Matt.Feekings-Long term exposure to aircraft emissions.pdf](#)  
[Matt.Feekings-The Munich Airport Noise Study.pdf](#)

---

For the attention of the Manston Airport Case Team.

### **Is there a “need” since Covid & what has changed?**

I have looked at previous submissions of mine and revisited this question on the “Need” and “what’s changed since Covid” and I can say that there has been a significant change. However, nothing seems to have changed in terms of the elements considered by PINs when advising the SOS to reject the application.

I am encouraged by the SOS requesting further information to identify any change, as it shows they feel it’s now time to provide their response as to why they did not reject the application by following the independent advice coming from the incredibly in-depth consultation/investigation carried out by the Planning Inspectorate, but instead misguidedly supported it, only for it to be overturned by the JR. So this seems the next logical step to empower the SOS to finally reject this application, having received such overwhelming evidence and research by its concerned voters.

**Health:** Carbon targets have been introduced since this questionable project was conceived and if we must accept that carbon neutral transport is genuinely on the table to form part of this strategy, then it must also be accepted that PINs advise Govt there is not ‘need’ for this to be given the green light. This is of course on top of the fact that the airfreight industry currently has zero fully operational examples of reduced carbon, high efficiency aircraft yet and there are none even being tested. In addition, Thanet District Council have announced a climate emergency due to the high levels of pollution, which must draw attention to the thousands of additional HGV movements proposed to shift the 24/7 levels of freight already being flown in by (not new/efficient/quite) aircraft.

In terms of the Impact Assessments – not only are they still lacking in their honesty, but also, ‘nothing has changed’ RSP still conclude it will have a significant impact on those in the direct local flight path. The evidence of health in both adults and children is still very clear (previous submissions have linked to this and I have attached them once more. WHY you may ask?

Because THIS POSITION HAS NOT CHANGED!

- Attachment 1 - *EU Commission report from 16th July 2015, “Long term exposure to aircraft emissions”*.
- Attachment 2 – The Munich Airport Noise Study.

**Employment:** This has never fully been addressed by RSP or challenged by Thanet District Council. The original number listed as 23,000 are proof, if any were needed, that the way in which these reports are collated do not demonstrate transparent facts, based on detailed analysis of existing airfreight operations.

**Passengers:** The catchment area remains the same, which has proven to be insufficient on the numerous attempts to make a venture successfully operate out of the ex-Manston airfield site. A detailed review of this fact can be seen by looking at the finances of those attempts and failures.

**Freight:** Again, unless Covid is to be responsible for the UK to set targets for cleaner/safer air quality but totally ignore this, the position now for this 24/7 freight hub has even less of a place, environmentally, economically or ethically than it did before Covid. At the time of the previous consultation (that our village was excluded from – as confirmed by our Parish Council), there was

spare national freight capacity. The only change is that even further capacity has been exposed.

Regards,  
Matt Feekings

[REDACTED]



# Science for Environment Policy

## Long-term exposure to aircraft emissions causes premature death

**As well as contributing to the greenhouse effect**, aircraft emissions have an important impact on air quality and human health. This study, which quantified the effect of civil aviation emissions across the globe, suggests they could be responsible for 16 000 premature deaths every year, at an annual cost of over €18 billion. The air quality costs of aviation were similar to its climate costs, and over 10 times larger than accident and noise costs.

**16 July 2015**  
**Issue 421**

**[Subscribe](#) to free  
weekly News Alert**

**Source:** Yim, S., Lee, G., Lee, I., Allroggen, F., Ashok, A., Caiazzo, F., Eastham, S., Malina, R. & Barrett, S. (2015). Global, regional and local health impacts of civil aviation emissions. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 10(3), p.034001. DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/10/3/034001. This study is freely available at: <http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/10/3/034001>.

**Contact:** [sbarrett@mit.edu](mailto:sbarrett@mit.edu)

### **Read more about:**

[Air pollution](#),  
[Chemicals](#),  
[Environment and health](#), [Environmental economics](#), [Risk assessment](#)

The contents and views included in Science for Environment Policy are based on independent, peer-reviewed research and do not necessarily reflect the position of the European Commission.

To cite this article/service: "Science for Environment Policy": European Commission DG Environment News Alert Service, edited by SCU, The University of the West of England, Bristol.

**Aviation is becoming an increasingly popular method of transport.** According to the [International Civil Aviation Organization](#) (ICAO), the number of air passengers is set to more than double in the coming 20 years. This vast increase is expected to have a similarly drastic effect on air quality, and therefore on the environment and human health. Alongside greenhouse gases, aviation emissions contain fine particular matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and precursors of ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). PM<sub>2.5</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> have both been linked to an increased risk of premature death.

This study is the first to analyse emissions at local (~1 km), near-airport (~10 km), regional (~1000 km) and global (~10 000 km) scales. Aviation emissions were based on 2006 levels provided by the [Aviation Environment Design Tool](#), which models aircraft performance to produce fuel burn, emissions and noise data. The impact on air quality was simulated by two widely used chemical transport models ([GEOS-Chem](#) and [CMAQ](#)), which simulate atmospheric chemistry.

The number of premature deaths caused by the emissions was calculated by overlaying air pollution simulations onto population density data, thus determining the pollution exposure of populations in different world regions. The researchers then used [World Health Organization](#) recommended concentration-response functions to quantify the risk of premature death, specifically from lung cancer and cardiopulmonary disease.

The results showed that exposure to PM<sub>2.5</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> from aviation emissions could be responsible for approximately 16 000 premature deaths every year. Of these, the vast majority (87%) could be linked to PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

To assign a monetary value to these premature deaths, the researchers determined country-specific values of statistical life, i.e. how much people would be willing to pay for reductions in their risks of dying due to air pollution. For the US, they were based on estimates from the [Environmental Protection Agency](#), while estimates for other countries were modified based on national income per capita.

The researchers estimate that premature death due to long-term exposure to aviation emissions could cost around \$21 billion every year, equivalent to almost €18.5 billion. Europe alone accounts for around €9 billion of these costs — the highest of all regions.

In order to gauge the relative importance of aviation emissions, the researchers compared the health costs of aviation to the costs associated with accidents, climate change and noise. They found that the air quality costs of aviation were in the same order of magnitude as climate costs (which include losses caused by increases in global surface temperature, such as higher flooding risk), and over 10 times larger than accidents (the economic costs of injuries and mortalities) and noise costs (losses in property values — health related costs were not considered).

*Continued on next page.*

# Science for Environment Policy

## Long-term exposure to aircraft emissions causes premature death (continued)

16 July 2015  
Issue 421

**Subscribe to free  
weekly News Alert**

**Source:** Yim, S., Lee, G., Lee, I., Allroggen, F., Ashok, A., Caiazzo, F., Eastham, S., Malina, R. & Barrett, S. (2015). Global, regional and local health impacts of civil aviation emissions. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 10(3), p.034001. DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/10/3/034001. This study is freely available at: <http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/10/3/034001>.

**Contact:** [sbarrett@mit.edu](mailto:sbarrett@mit.edu)

**Read more about:**

[Air pollution](#),  
[Chemicals](#),  
[Environment and health](#), [Environmental economics](#), [Risk assessment](#)

The contents and views included in Science for Environment Policy are based on independent, peer-reviewed research and do not necessarily reflect the position of the European Commission.

To cite this article/service: "Science for Environment Policy": European Commission DG Environment News Alert Service, edited by SCU, The University of the West of England, Bristol.

These findings suggest that reducing fuel burning in aviation could provide air quality cost benefits on a scale comparable to climate change mitigation.

Recognising the impact of aircraft pollutants, the European Commission is working hard to reduce aviation emissions. Its [Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport](#) is cooperating with international organisations, amongst which is the ICAO, to address potentially harmful emissions from aircraft, including particulate matter.

