

## Analysis of points raised by Natural England's Letter

### Transcript: Page 42-43

At the very – I think that summarises the responses from the pink letter from LAA. **At the very last minute today at four o'clock Natural England made a response to the issues that had been raised by the applicant.** I'll summarise these very briefly. The key issue is the boundary of the Ramsar site **(POINT 3 OF NATURAL ENGLAND'S LETTER)** which when presented on the map was wrong.

The Ramsar site should in fact follow the boundary of the existing SAC and the proposed SPA so it's an amalgam of the two protected sites effectively. It doesn't follow the complete boundary of the SSSI which extended to the north and the west of the airport but if there's questions about that later on then we can look at the map again and hopefully make it a little more clear exactly where those boundaries lie.

Effectively it doesn't change Natural England's position on the effects on the Ramsar site because the proximity of the site is not changed. **END OF POINT 3**

**(START OF POINT 1 OF NATURAL ENGLAND'S LETTER).**

So really Natural England expressed some disappointment that further representations were being made very late in procedures, 24<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> February, in terms of letters from Nigel [Deakin 0:33:48] and Professor Thomas but also stand by their previous conclusions that no further material information has been provided in

support of the applications and therefore the previous conclusions of Natural England stand.

Very, very briefly they've confirmed that they've consulted with regional and national specialists including Alan Druitt of the birds unit from Natural England who has considerable experience with assessments of effects of avian developments on birds. They state the bird control programme does not limit the bird control measures that may have to be used. Noise and visual disturbance is an issue, particularly it's been an issue in the past in relation to another airfield, Elvington Airfield, which was refused consent on the grounds of effects on an SPA more than a kilometre away from the site.

But also in saying that they also draw comparisons with the other airports that have been mentioned and say that each airport should be assessed on its merits and as it's not necessarily appropriate to discuss Elvington Airport, which was refused, it's also possibly not appropriate to discuss other inland or other coastal airports which will have a very different set of circumstances to the site at Dungeness **(END OF POINT 1)**.

**START of POINT 2** I suppose in terms of the SAC Natural England don't agree with the conclusions of Bureau Veritas in that they think that there would be a significant effect upon the habitats within the SAC and think that the precautionary approach should be adopted **(END OF POINT 2)** . But otherwise that's summarises very, very briefly – and excuse the slightly incoherent nature, it was four o'clock when we received the response from Natural England today so... thank you.

Chairman:

Thank you Mr Webb. Mr Lewis, does that conclude the presentation?