

**Samara Jones- Hall**

**Matter 5**

**Issue 2 – Question 10 and Issue 7 - Question 14**

**STRATEGIC SITES**

***STATEMENT REGARDING CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND IMPARTIALITY***

*For the avoidance of any doubt and in the interests of full transparency, I hereby confirm that I do not have any interests, either financial or otherwise, in the Manston site or any other rival development beyond those of a local business and local resident with strong concerns regarding the devastating impacts of the proposed development on the local area, economy, environment and population. I have not accepted any payments or any other form of compensation or inducements for presenting this or any of our other submissions or representations to the Inspectors. Any offers or suggestions of such from any party will be refused and immediately reported to the Inspectors.*

-----

My comments below are specific to the proposed development of an airport by Riveroak Strategic Partners Limited on the site known as the Manston site and the questions raised by the Inspectors:

**Matter 5, Issue 2, Question 10**

1. The environmental, social and socio-economic impact has not been identified of the revised proposal by the airport developer of circa 127,000 ATMs<sup>1</sup> rather than the originally proposed 17,000 ATMs plus night flights (Quota Count 3028 this could be up to an additional 9,000

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant Response to Question by the Examining Authority at OP1.11 “The physical capability of Work No. 9, the 19 cargo stands, is as mentioned in the application, calculated **as 83,220 ATMs a year**. The physical capability of Work No. 10, the three recycling stands is calculated as **36 ATMs a year** (each stand receiving one aircraft which takes a month to dismantle). The physical capability of Work No. 11, the four passenger stands, is calculated as **43,800 ATMs a year**. This is based on each stand managing 15 incoming and outgoing flights between 0700 and 2300 with an hour’s dwell time and 10 minutes between a flight leaving and the next one arriving”. Please see <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-003366-RiverOak%20Strategic%20Partners%20-%20Response%20to%20the%20Examining%20Authority's%20Written%20Questions.pdf>

**Samara Jones-Hall**

**Matter 5**

**Issue 2 – Question 10**

**Strategic Sites**

ATMs) and an additional training flights of 36,000 ATMs a year – an increase of 792% ATMs on houses located at this site which have been identified to be developed on new strategic housing sites very near the proposed airport.

2. The impact of not only noise, vibrations of planes been taken into account but also freight loading and unloading and also all the extras HGVs and fuel tankers and workers etc has not been taken into account for this revised proposal of at least an increase of 792% ATMs since the submitted Environmental Statement by Riveroak Strategic Partners Limited.
3. The noise modeling has been challenged by a large number of representations at the DCO hearings. Particularly that Riveroak Strategic Partners Limited has used incorrect noise data rather than an accurate noise baseline data, factual historic noise data, historic runway usage and historic data of the type of freight planes that actually want to use this site. This means that the noise data available now not only has not been scaled up by at least 792% in line with the revised number of ATMs proposed by the airport developer but has been shown and evidenced during the DCO hearings to be significantly inaccurate.
4. The two regulatory public safety zone requirements have not been factored into the environmental, social and socio-economic impact<sup>2</sup>. One of these would be on the site known as Manston Green.

---

<sup>2</sup> 5 March 2010 Department of Transport *Control of Development in Airport Public Safety Zones*

**Samara Jones-Hall**

**Matter 5**

**Issue 7 – Question 14**

**STRATEGIC SITES**

***STATEMENT REGARDING CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND IMPARTIALITY***

*For the avoidance of any doubt and in the interests of full transparency, I hereby confirm that I do not have any interests, either financial or otherwise, in the Manston site or any other rival development beyond those of a local business and local resident with strong concerns regarding the devastating impacts of the proposed development on the local area, economy, environment and population. I have not accepted any payments or any other form of compensation or inducements for presenting this or any of our other submissions or representations to the Inspectors. Any offers or suggestions of such from any party will be refused and immediately reported to the Inspectors.*

-----

My comments below are specific to the proposed development of an airport by Riveroak Strategic Partners Limited on the site known as the Manston site and the questions raised by the Inspectors.

**Matter 5, Issue 7, Question 14**

1. The environmental, social and socio-economic impact has not been identified of the revised proposal by the airport developer of circa 127,000 ATMs<sup>1</sup> rather than the originally proposed 17,000 ATMs plus night flights (Quota Count 3028 this could be up to an additional 9,000

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant Response to Question by the Examining Authority at OP1.11 “The physical capability of Work No. 9, the 19 cargo stands, is as mentioned in the application, calculated **as 83,220 ATMs a year**. The physical capability of Work No. 10, the three recycling stands is calculated **as 36 ATMs a year** (each stand receiving one aircraft which takes a month to dismantle). The physical capability of Work No. 11, the four passenger stands, is calculated **as 43,800 ATMs a year**. This is based on each stand managing 15 incoming and outgoing flights between 0700 and 2300 with an hour’s dwell time and 10 minutes between a flight leaving and the next one arriving”. Please see <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-003366-RiverOak%20Strategic%20Partners%20-%20Response%20to%20the%20Examining%20Authority's%20Written%20Questions.pdf>

**Samara Jones-Hall**

**Matter 5**

**Issue 7 – Question 14**

**Strategic Sites**

ATMs) and an additional training flights of 36,000 ATMs a year – an increase of 792% ATMs on houses located at this location which have been identified to be developed on new strategic housing sites very near the proposed airport.

2. The impact of not only noise, vibrations of planes been taken into account but also freight loading and unloading and also all the extras HGVs and fuel tankers and workers etc has not been taken into account for this revised proposal of at least an increase of 792% ATMs since the submitted Environmental Statement by Riveroak Strategic Partners Limited.
  
3. The noise modeling has been challenged by a large number of representations at the DCO hearings. Particularly that Riveroak Strategic Partners Limited has used incorrect noise data rather than an accurate noise baseline data, factual historic noise data, historic runway usage and historic data of the type of freight planes that actually want to use this site. This means that the noise data available now not only has not been scaled up by at least 792% in line with the revised number of ATMs proposed by the airport developer but has been shown and evidenced during the DCO hearings to be significantly inaccurate.