

For the attention of the Manston Airport Case Team:

Response to the four points listed in the Statement of Matters issued by the Secretary of State:

I am a Ramsgate resident who has lived here through Manston's many changes from RAF airfield to Lorry Park. I have seen, heard and felt the effects of flights on the town, including but not limited to the following:

- Trying to work in a primary school that had to stop teaching every time a plane went over.
- Being woken late at night and early in the morning by flights
- Family days on the main sands disturbed by low incoming flights.

This may not be the most scientific or data filled response you will get, but it is generated from eyewitness evidence - I know exactly how loud and how low the planes are over the town, and this fact has not always been dealt with entirely honestly.

1. The extent to which current national or local policies (including any changes since 9 July 2020 such as, but not limited to, the re-instatement of the ANPS) inform the level of need for the services that the Development would provide and the benefits that would be achieved from the Development;

Change one – Government Zones

An extremely negative policy that removes the say of local people in what happens in their area. But just saying a seaside town with a burgeoning creative and tourism industry is a successful industrial zone doesn't make it true. This policy does not inform a level of need, merely removes any benefits that might come from actually consulting with local people. **Less Benefit**

Change two - Air Pollution Ruling

Another change is the inclusion of air pollution on a death certificate for the first time. Air Traffic causes air pollution on a huge scale and this runway is close to a large town with several schools under the flight path, which will be affected by low level planes all day if this plan goes ahead. Now that it is legally accepted that air pollution can kill, how can any government find it ok to run planes low over Ramsgate schools? **Less Benefit**

Change three - Re-instatement of the ANPS

The Airports National Policy Statement sets out:

- *why government believes that need is best met by a north-west runway at Heathrow Airport*
- *the specific requirements that the applicant for a new north-west runway will need to meet to gain development consent*

If the government is pushing for this, why is Manston necessary? **Less need**

2. *Whether the quantitative need for the Development has been affected by any changes since 9 July 2019, and if so, a description of any such changes and the impacts on the level of need from those changes (such as, but not limited to, changes in demand for air freight, changes of capacity at other airports, locational requirements for air freight and the effects of Brexit and/or Covid);*

Change one - we left the EU

Okay, so Brexit might well have meant we needed to fly in more freight (not a good thing for the environment) but I've not seen vast swathes of empty supermarket shelves or massive inflation on food and goods since we left, so perhaps the change to observe is the fact that we now realise the need for vast extra airfreight simply isn't there. **Less need**

Change two – Covid

We've managed to import enough even without the freight that comes in on passenger flights, and now that travel is starting up again the passenger flight option will be available again, so surely proof that the need is not there for a freight hub at Manston. **Less Need**

Change three – Local plan and more housing in the area.

Since construction industries went back to work, Ramsgate has seen several new developments completed, many of them aimed at people wanting to move to the coast and work from home, as Covid has affected working patterns. The Local plan has meant much building on Green Field sites because Manston couldn't be used, for example the go-ahead has been given for a large housing developments at Minster. So potentially an even higher population will be adversely affected by the airport. Many Ramsgate developments are 'luxury', aimed at bringing people into the area with spending power, home workers popping out for a break at a local café etc. This would support local businesses and drive regeneration. I can't see those people coming/staying/working here if the airport happens, so try offsetting empty developments and local businesses closing down against jobs created by the airport. **Less Benefit**

3. *The extent to which the Secretary of State should, in his re-determination of the application, have regard to the sixth carbon budget (covering the years between 2033 – 2037) which will include emissions from international aviation;*

The extent to which the Secretary of State should have regard to the sixth carbon budget simply cannot be overstated. We should be looking at ways to reduce aviation and reduce air miles on food. The proposed airport negatively affects carbon emissions, has aided in the destruction of green/farming land and demonstrates a clear lack of sincerity on the Governments part to address the climate change agenda.

4. Any other matters arising since 9 July 2019 which Interested Parties consider are material for the Secretary of State to take into account in his re-determination of the application.

In summing up I think it is important to point out what hasn't changed:

This proposed airport is dangerously close to a highly populated area.

Noise and pollution will affect shops, businesses and tourism.

Air pollution will affect health.

Noise will impact on the learning of children in several schools.

The fact that night flights are not discounted and the decibel level is set higher than at other airports will impact on mental health in an area that is already battling social issues caused by deprivation.

The reserving of this large brown field site has pushed housing onto green field sites, thus eroding farming, quality of life and contributing to climate change by the erosion of green spaces. ***Denotes a lack of serious consideration of the sixth carbon budget***

The pollution caused by the airport and related transport will affect a large area of SSSI including salt marshes which are important for carbon capture. ***Denotes a lack of serious consideration of the sixth carbon budget***

The possible jobs generated by a freight airport are not enough to offset the jobs lost in the industries destroyed by the airport and the future jobs lost in the industries the airport will prevent from coming to the area. (we could have had the hugely successful film studios if it hadn't been for the Airport plan)

The geography has not changed - this site is still on the tip of a large county which already has issues with weight of traffic.

The airport has been proved unviable on previous attempts and it is no more viable now. Money, time and effort is still being poured into a costly failure that is preventing more positive change from happening in the area.

Dani Flowerdew 