

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport: Richard Price](#)  
**Subject:** Manston, Rsp DCO. Deadline 8 Submission  
**Date:** 13 June 2019 20:13:09

---

In light of the recent EXa meetings and representations at Discovery park, I am once again writing to the Examining Authority.

In my last submissions I mentioned Db levels and noise. I note that Five10Twelve has independently paid for and submitted noise contours produced by the CAA. Astonishingly, that given they have used the same fleet mix as RSP, these new noise contours have produced different results. How is this possible? Why was the CAA not used by RSP to produce their (insufficient) noise contours? I feel it is an attempt to mislead residents and indeed the EXa of the true extent of the noise and suffering we will be exposed to. I also note that some of the fleet mix used cannot be used as a Cargo plane surely, they are rather small. Does this further suppress the true extent of the noise we will be exposed to?

I would like to point out that my house falls in the 60dbLeq contour, but, by RSP criteria I am not entitled to any kind of compensation for noise mitigation measures. Why is compensation only payable at 63dbLeq when it is paid at 57dbLeq at London City airport and 60dbLeq elsewhere. Although I mention compensation, it will not help me in any case. I do not experience the aircraft going over my house as an average 60dbLeq, rather, several incidents at **95db**. How can this be tolerable.

I care for two people, through Kent county council Shared lives scheme, with a LD. One who is extremely sensitive to noise. This situation would be utterly devastating for them and they would have to move, FAST. However, the worst thing about this is, if this DCO were to be granted, I will lose a person, possibly two, who has/have become part of my family. I will also lose my income and possibly my home, as I will have no means to pay my mortgage. I will, most probably, be unable to sell my (by then, reduced in value) house to move elsewhere. I do not envisage anyone wishing to buy a home enduring 95db levels of noise several times an hour. An extremely bleak future to look forward to for all of us. Again I mention that Shared lives families live all over Ramsgate, so it is possible we will all experience the same fate. The Local Authority save a minimum of £26,000 PER PERSON, PER YEAR, by placing them with families. It will place a large financial burden on Kent county council if all of these people had to be taken back in to LA care. £2.6 Million pounds, minimum, PER YEAR per 100 placements. Not an insignificant amount to be added to their budget every year for social care.

**I am still to be convinced that this is an NSIP and I trust you are too, as there appears still to be no evidence of it.**

Please note, I have not attached RSP noise contours, or Five10Twelve's as I am aware you already have these.

Barbara Warner

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport: Richard Price](#)  
**Subject:** Manston DCO deadline 8  
**Date:** 13 June 2019 23:28:14

---

20013777

It appears to me that the documentation presented to the Exa by RSP does not present a worst case scenario, which I understood the decision, granting a DCO would be based on, if it is not, how can the Exa and all other interested parties reach, or indeed already have reached, an informed decision that is valid?

For instance, I have just yesterday, submitted a representation regarding noise contours. RSP have used a noise contour map that has been previously accepted as being correct by all interested parties, including myself. However, there is now available a noise contour map produced by the CAA, based on RSP's information and undertaken by local residents Five10Twelve. How ludicrous that members of the public have to pay for and do this!. The results are different, (although they are based on the exact same information) vastly detrimental to residents and our environment. Why didn't RSP engage the CAA to do them in the first place? Why should we, as Ramsgate residents (the people most affected) not have had full and accurate information provided by RSP in their Consultation documents, which were, by the way difficult enough to access. If the noise contours have been proven to be incorrect, can we rely on other assertions in their documentation to be factual?

I would like to ask the EXa, has the question of a Personal Safety Zone now been properly addressed by RSP?. It must surely be deemed to require one, but I can see no evidence of it. In my first submission I was sceptical they were stating 17,100 flights, just under the requirement for a PSZ. But, as they have increased that number significantly, up to 83,000? it must be required in the DCO at the outset.

A PSZ will have a huge impact on Ramsgate, its residents and the emerging local plan. It should be added as soon as possible so that all parties can plan accordingly.

Myself and my family have been very concerned about the continual missed deadlines by RSP to questions from the EXa. Particularly regarding finances etc. Is this acceptable? What happens if we reach the end of the process and they have still not responded? By continually delaying giving any answers, will they get a 'free pass' as it were? Is this a deliberate act to try and circumvent the system?.

Barbara Warner