

- NNF00** (this document) the guide to the NNF submissions
- NNF01** summarises our concerns under these headings:
- A. No National Need
 - B. The Polluter’s Forecasts Are Not “Worst Case” (1 - operational assumptions)
 - B. The Polluter’s Forecasts Are Not “Worst Case” (2 – night flights)
 - B. The Polluter’s Forecasts Are Not “Worst Case” (3 - disasters and PSZs)
 - B. The Polluter’s Forecasts Are Not “Worst Case” (4 - job creation)
 - C. The Polluter’s Noise Assessments Are Flawed and Misleading
 - D. The Polluter Isn’t Paying for Damage to Our Health
 - E. The Polluter Isn’t Paying for Damage to The Habitats of Other Species
 - F. The Polluter Would Make A Bad Situation Worse for Our Roads
 - G. Can the Polluter pay for acquisition, development and mitigation?
 - H. The Land Would Be Better Used for Employment and Housing Needs
 - I. The Public Have Been Misinformed About the Application and Support Is Less Than Claimed
- NNF02** **“No Room for Late Arrivals”** – a study of the UK air cargo market
- NNF03** Analysis of the **Falcon** report on the viability of an airport at Manston
- NNF04** Analysis of the **KCC** Position Statement on Manston Airport
- NNF05** Analysis of the **Avia** report on the viability of an airport at Manston
- NNF06** Critique of **Volume I** of Azimuth Associates’ report
- NNF07** Critique of **Volume II** of Azimuth Associates’ report
- NNF08** Critique of **Volume III** of Azimuth Associates’ report
- NNF09** Review of issues relating to **noise, night flights, and impact**
- NNF10** Review of issues relating to the effectiveness of the **s.106 Agreement**
- NNF11** Critique of **Volume IV** of Azimuth Associates’ report
- NNF12** “Getting it wrong locally: **misrepresentation** of the applicant’s proposals”