Additional Written Submission by Dr. R. John Pritchard

On the Effects of passing Aircraft Noise upon Listed Buildings,

Refuting Hysterical and Ill-founded Claims by Anti-Airport/Anti-Aviation Campaigners

Quite a lot has been submitted to the Examining Authority claiming that re-opening Manston Airport will have a devastating effect upon our built environment and especially upon our local listed buildings. Following the announcement of Manston Airport's purchase by RiverOak from Stone Hill Park, anti-aviation, anti-airport social media sites have intensified their claims that this will have a calamitous effect upon them and their historically significant residences. I had not intended to write to you again, but in the circumstances I feel I must, not least because this is another matter on which I believe I can speak with a measure of authority from personal research and first-hand experience.

Ramsgate has some 22,000 homes including 5 List Entry Numbers for Grade I, 12 Grade II* Listed Buildings, and 453 for Grade II Listed Buildings, 1 Scheduled Monument and 2 Scheduled Parks & Gardens, according to the website of Historic England.[1] Only a small percentage of those are located directly under the most likely flightpath over Ramsgate into Manston Airport, and it is there that buildings potentially affected by noise will be most exposed to it. I have downloaded a map that establishes the identity and positions of each of those listed buildings. There are just 31 listings of residential buildings (a total of 74 homes) among the 65 listings by Historic England that are within a 100 metre radius (thus a 200 metre corridor) following the centre-line of the glidepath of aircraft coming in to land at Manston Airport on a direct approach from the English Channel following a minimum drag, minimum power approach as recommended.

I fully appreciate that the glidepath is not the glideslope, but No Night Flights and Five10Twelve Ltd as well as a number of other IPs and PIL have based their submissions on assertions or presumptions that receptors are just a few hundred feed (100m?) above them, apparently without any significant appreciation of vertical deviation from the higher ground of the airport runway. They also seem to be silent on the fact that the dB contours they more recently obtained from the CAA are freefield measurements that make no allowance for the obvious point that night-time noise they have calculated will affect people far less when in bed or watching tv at night inside their brick-built listed buildings and that most of the effects on them during daytime periods will also occur while they happen to be indoors, not outdoors,.

I would make the point that only people outdoors (or the outside of the buildings) will be affected by freefield levels. To suggest otherwise is tantamount to ignoring that anyone inside an aircraft is not subjected to the same level of noise that would be experienced by, say, a ground handler who is outside the aircraft with its engines on while standing on the tarmac. All that a ground handler has to protect himself is a pair of headphones: how much better or worse will those headphones attenuate noise than a listed brick building with appropriate loft insulation exposed to noise for a far shorter time at a far greater distance from the aircraft?

These buildings survived in a town that was subjected to very heavy bombing during both world wars. They have been exposed to coastal damp and decay and been repaired, sometimes sensitively, sometimes not. They have been subjected to exceedingly high levels of noise from British and

1 https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/map-search?clearresults=true

American fast jets, both bombers and interceptors, and they have been passive receptors to the noise of innumerable airshows that have drawn vast crowds and enthusiastic support from locals and visitors to our towns. During both World Wars a great many anti-aircraft batteries were positioned in public squares and parks and utilized to fire huge numbers of explosive shells against enemy airships and bombers in the First World War, and against formations of hostile bombers and fighter aircraft during the Second World War. During the Battle of Britain, no airport in the United Kingdom was subjected to a heavier level of bombardment, and the importance of Ramsgate Harbour was not lost upon the enemy. The town had heavy coastal defence batteries that fired on the enemy to protect our shores: those batteries, too, inflicted collateral percussive noise that impacted upon our built architecture.

That architecture and particularly its rich heritage survived, as is clear from the very first "listings" that date from the late 1940s. The noise impact from the scale of air traffic that is anticipated at Manston Airport is paltry by comparison. Even in Ramsgate, flights into and out of Manston Airport are highly unlikely to be problematical for our historic buildings or for those who love, cherish and inhabit them. Furthermore, as I evidenced in a previous Written Submission, on the basis of the Five10Twelves Ltd. submissions, and the same is clear from the Applicant's calculations done by Woods (consistently rated in the top tier of the most reputable consultants in environmental appraisals in the world, with more than 20,000 active environment and infrastructure projects on their books) the rest of Thanet and East Kent isn't affected by the relevant noise contours significantly if at all.

If it were so problematical, then much of London and its suburbs in Surrey, Middlesex, Sussex and Kent would have been subject to the same dangers, the same level of loss and damage from passing aircraft. I have seen no evidence of that in Kew, in Acton, in Richmond, in Kingston, in New Malden, in Hounslow, in Windsor or Central London even around Heathrow or Gatwick or Southend. I have lived or worked within nearly all of those localities or have family members who do. I therefore speak from personal knowledge.
Grade 2 listed buildings often have interior wooden shutters or can have secondary double glazing. They often have exceedingly thick walls with interior lathe and plaster separated from those thick walls by air gaps (dry-wall construction provides very effective sound-damping). The outer walls will be built of large imperial bricks, they will not have portland cement but slaked lime cement that is very resilient and absorbs sound well. And if you take back the dados (which themselves are built of solid wood, sometimes in panels but often put together in long horizontal lengths with long wedges that are) you will find that there is again an air space that helps in attenuating sounds because of the way sound travels through two solid materials react to each other when separated by a void. but you will also tend to find that when the brick walls were built, timbers were laid sideways inset into the brickwork, often at three-foot intervals. these supply acoustic cushions, reduce the cracking of brickwork and were what saved many a Georgian building from collapse during the bombings sustained during both of the world wars.

Years ago, I worked with a structural engineer to calculate the effect of the ground-roll from the concussion of even a 500 pound bomb falling a quarter of a mile away. I was shocked to learn that in the case of a home I then had in Rochester, the whole terrace was lifted by about eight inches and then dropped back in place: hard to believe but small Georgian town houses did not have foundations if built directly onto underlying chalk. Ramsgate listed buildings also sit upon chalk. The effects described help to explain why it is that it was not just from concussive blasts transmitted

through air that so many of our listed buildings have no original glass left and why so much glazing came to be replaced so often by thicker modern float glass.

More to the point, it is important to appreciate that most historic listed buildings are often incredibly resistant to vibration from heavy traffic or passing aircraft. Indeed, the danger from heavy road traffic (or trams of yore) was and is far less for listed buildings than less solidly constructed twentieth century counterparts, except for those Georgian and Regency buildings that had rubble cores between their inner and outer skins of exterior walls: those are very susceptible to low-frequency road vibrations that transfer to them through the ground in quite different ways than airborne noises affect them from passing aircraft. Rubble-core buildings (which tend to look rather more grand and have higher ceilings, too) are not likely to be affected by the intensity, duration and frequency profiles of the rising and falling noises that occur as aircraft approach, pass overheard and move beyond earshot within a few seconds.

Many Grade 2 listed buildings have already had inappropriate double-glazing installed or have had inappropriate 'Kentucky Fried Doors' installed in place of properly built full-width heavy front doors: many of these greatly reduce the width and height of the door openings. Those can be replaced very effectively with full-sized composite doors that look far more in keeping and provide exceptionally good noise insulation. For effective noise insulation, it is also standard advice to dispense with letterflaps: they are not appropriate or original in houses built before the Victorian period and most of Ramsgate's listed buildings are far older than that. For Residents who insist upon having letter flaps, putting wooden boxes on the inside of the door will reduce adventitious noise transmission, but in truth exterior letter boxes are far better at keeping the sound insulating qualities of exterior doors.

A number of our local listed buildings have bow windows: it is well-known and easily demonstrated that they greatly reduce street noise, and their sash windows (but not the total window area) will be smaller than in houses without them. Grades II, II* and I Listed buildings tend to have smaller window panes than in more modern houses (although having said that, homes built since the end of the Twentieth Century have very much smaller windows than most listed buildings due to changes in Part L Building Regulations to reduce heat losses).

Window panes in listed buildings may be thin and are most likely single-glazed unless 'improved' by idiots or replaced due to war damage. I appreciate that single-glazed windows are not going to provide significant attenuation, but wooden interior shutters are effective in reducing night-time noises and secondary double-glazing in effective in daytime. Thanet's Conservation Officers have been sympathetic when home owners have sought to install secondary double-glazing in Grade II properties.

Proper Fanlights with glazing panes separated by cast-iron or lead frames can be vulnerable but many people have secondary glazing behind them to provide far better noise and above all thermal insulation. Central heating of houses tends to "blow" Georgian and Regency period fanlights, placing them at greater risk than anything attributable to passing aircraft. The risks are reduced by interior secondary glazing behind cast fanlights or by entry hall doors that buffer the effects of over-heating hallways, reduce heat-loss and reduce street and aircraft noise through ground-floor hallways.

Many people have a secondary interior door 3 or 4 feet inside the front door (to provide greater thermal insulation): those can be upgraded sensitively. The same can often be done with back doors. Likewise, covering over light-wells between front or side pavements and basement doors and windows with translucent materials provides great reductions in heat loss but may also attenuate noise or the rattling of windows or relatively light-weight half-glazed doors.Four-over-four or six-over-six large sashes and their cast iron or lead weights that are commonly found and especially where houses don't have bay windows are very effectively damped by their original astragals. If they have two-over-two side-sashes, those will be heavily damped by their frames and by their iron or lead weights. Modern spring-balanced sashes are also well damped for noise in part because of the weight of the sashes (although they will be less well-damped than sashes with lead or iron weights: spring-balanced sashes are often double-glazed anyway, but the air-space may not be wide enough to provide effective sound insulation. Secondary double-glazing, of course, is far more effective than double-glazed units. Secondary double-glazing is commonly found in listed buildings and twentieth-century homes, office blocks, colleges, banks, embassies, hotels, etc., in London and other large cities for precisely that reason and can look very attractive.

Local residents are highly unlikely to be using Georgian hobgrates in every room of their houses, front and back: most now have gas-fired central heating. The coalmen and their deliveries are long gone. Gasfire conversions are attractive but are thermally so inefficient that they will not contribute significantly to home heating. If such cast-iron period fireplaces have register grates, unused, they can form the basis of very effective insulation due to the heavy cast iron plates of which they are constructed. “Modern” small grates retrofitted in the 1920s to 1950s are almost always covered and unused over these days except for small ventilators that can be ‘soundproofed’ if required.

Many of our listed buildings have exceedingly dense front doors: 200-year-old Baltic or Pitch Pine has dried out to a density not far off from Oak, and density matters. Same goes for their floors which are likely to be >1 inch thick, with far wider floorboards than in modern constructions and therefore very effective in damping noise. They are also nailed to heavy joists at far narrower centres and at relatively narrow spans: they may not be as deep as in modern buildings but they are solid and fit for purpose. Where a bungalow may have floor joists at up to 2-foot centres, a good Georgian house will have 12 - 14-inch centres. That extra solidity, and the long squared-off cut-nails that are driven through floorboards into each one of those joists are profoundly important in producing a very rigid structure that resists noise penetration through these multi-storey buildings.

Traditional lathe & plaster ceilings won't have multiple 2 or 3-inch holes cut through them for the fitment of luminaires that penetrate into attic spaces or between storeys, and they are denser by far and fixed better than normal plasterboard. Plaster cornices, covings and ceiling roses will help dampen noise.

Furniture in listed buildings is probably heavier and denser than in more modern houses: most people who live in listed buildings do not have light-weight “flat pack” furniture.

And then there is one of the most effective forms of insulation anyone can have against noise: the abundance of mature trees and shrubbery that typically grace the gardens of listed buildings. Such trees and shrubbery are immensely helpful in attenuating noise for any homes, as it happens. No accounting for that has appeared in any of the anti-aviation, anti-airport submissions made against the Manston Airport nationally significant infrastructure project.

So much is nonsense that we've read on the anti-sites in social media, in leaflets No Night Flights and others have circulated, and in submissions made by them to the Examining Authority. They have misled many individual local residents into writing similar objections. How do I know it is nonsense? Because I lived in and faithfully restored several Georgian townhouses over a period of about thirty years and have advised others on the same, with careful advice from the V&A and from academic specialists and tradesmen experienced in the restoration and protection of our great architectural heritage. I'm also aware that Regency, Victorian and Edwardian listed buildings are often built to an even more robust standard than the Georgian buildings with which I'm personally far more familiar, not least with the use of far more prime hardwoods than the largely pitch and Baltic pine that were most commonly used in our predominantly small local Georgian townhouses or their grander counterparts that can also be found in each of our East Kent towns.

I know what it is to take heavy Georgian timber baulks from the terrible wreckage of some of the buildings in Chatham Dockyard, get them rip-sawn into smaller pieces, planed and transformed into wonderfully authentic dado rails and panels, using spindle moulders to faithfully copy profiles preserved in neighbouring properties in order to recreate what had been stripped out my own home in the 1950s by the kind of previous owners who also took out marble fire surrounds and installed 'modern' concrete fireplaces in front of classic Georgian and Regency hobgrates. I know what it is to use fine tools and brushes to strip away whitewash from plaster coving and cornices and carefully restore them. I've done that. My passion for these things endures as does my understanding of how much that same passion may be shared by others. But this does not mean that a nearby airport will destroy all that owners of historic buildings value or any of it. That just WON'T happen!

I have a strong distaste for hysterical claims by objectors to nationally significant infrastructure projects but especially to those projects that actually will leave most local residents adversely unaffected in any or any significant ways. It is national policy to support such projects except where there are truly serious impediments to their implementation that are so strong that the Applications cannot be said to have greater benefits than detriments. It is highly uncommon for detriments to be regarded as show-stoppers, as is manifestly clear from the very small percentage of DCO projects that are refused consent under the Planning Act 2008 regime. The PA 2008 system was designed to ensure than NSIPs were consented and so knee-jerk nimbyism would not prevail. Public support for Manston Airport has always been strong. The noisy minority of objectors has relied upon misrepresentation, ad hominem attacks and outright deception. Bit by bit that has been exposed but the tactic persists. In no way does the Manston Airport Project fail to produce far greater benefits than detriments, not in East Kent as a whole (which is relevant), not in Thanet as a whole (which is relevant) nor even in Ramsgate as a whole (which is relevant).

Sound **pressure** (=**amplitude**) declines by 6 dB, in accordance with the formula $p \sim \sqrt{I}$ or $p2 = p1 \times (r1/r2)$, with every doubling in distance between the source and receptors. Sound **intensity** I (=**energy**) falls inversely proportional to the square of the distance 1/r2 from the sound source $I \sim p2$ or $I2 = I1 \times (r1/r2)2$. In **decibel** terms sound **pressure** (amplitude) levels and sound **intensity (**energy**)** levels decline at the **same** rate. Accordingly, the hundred-metre radius within which these eighty-five listed **buildings** occur are **sure** to include all listed **homes** that, following the logic of anti-airport campaigners, may reasonably be deemed to include the homes of outstanding architectural or historical significance **most** likely to be affected by maximum actual sound **pressure OR intensity** levels, not least by reference to the contour lines commissioned from the

CAA by Five10Twelve Ltd., yet these **buildings** (many of which are **NOT** classed as purely properties) account for either just 10% of all listed buildings (or perhaps 4% of all Heritage England listings: it isn't immediately obvious which it is!) in Ramsgate. What is also clear is that not one of these properties within the 200m corridor is a Grade I or a Grade II* listed building, and that's highly relevant when it comes to how RiverOak's contractors may choose to mitigate whatever noise may provide a significant nuisance to home owners.

Providing noise mitigation for Grade II listed buildings is far, far easier and is generally acceptable to Conservation Officers in Thanet and elsewhere. The claim that it is impossible to do that or prohibitively expensive is generally wrong. There may be particular difficulties where cylinder glass panes are involved, but those are a great rarity in Ramsgate. In addition it is worth pointing out that cylinder glass windows, where they do exist, tend to be very effective in reducing the transmission of external noise, but folds of heavy brocade or velvet curtaining will also help to reduce noise significantly in front of all sash windows. Within bay windows it is also possible to have a second set of curtaining across the whole of the bay and that has been common for hundreds of years as a means of reducing heat loss associated with bay windows during much of the year. I've done that myself and it works to reduce noise as well as heat loss.

No Night Flights and other anti-airport, anti-aviation opponents of the Manston Airport DCO Project have adduced **not one shred of evidence** that **ANY** of those homes and other listed buildings have **EVER** been damaged by sound pressure or intensity levels produced by any military or civil aircraft that followed that flight path. (In terms of physical damage, it would be sound **pressure** (=**force**) that would matter when it comes to effects on physical structures (e.g., buildings).

The 'argument from silence' suggests that failure to provide even a single instance where any owner or occupier of a listed dwelling has sustained physical loss or damage through sound pressure or intensity levels in Ramsgate or any other Thanet town is consistent with only one conclusion: there has been no such incident in the past century, and that in turn suggests that such an eventuality is quite unlikely to occur in future, particularly as aircraft are becoming quieter, not noisier.

When I submitted the text of this all of the above Written Submission to a local Acoustics Engineer, John Copeland, who has had many years of experience in the measurement of the acoustic properties of houses, he agreed with all of it. But he also had a few other observations that he suggested I should make. He said that houses that are more than 200 years old are generally 2 dB quieter than houses that were constructed in later periods. He also pointed out that these houses and others across the town of Ramsgate (and other towns in Thanet and East Kent) had been subjected to far greater stress in the 1950s when the USAF Sabre Jets and Super-Sabres were stationed at Manston and frequently kicked off with their afterburners on full thrust directly over Manston. Concorde pilots also used to ignite their afterburners on departures, with flames shooting out behind their engines as they accelerated directly after takeoff: he remembers seeing that on many occasions! He also reminds me, an historian of that period who should have been the first to note, that Ramsgate was the first place in the United Kingdom to experience the Blitz, well before London, and so the devastating effects that I described from heavy aerial bombardment were manifestly greater here than in surrounding towns yet ALL of the listed buildings we have today in this beautiful town (and its neighbours) survived all of that.

Our listed buildings have also survived hundreds of years being subjected to extreme weather conditions including heavy winds and storm damage that can be as extreme as small nuclear explosions. The effects of storms greatly exceed the effects of passing aircraft and commonly last many hours, even days, not just the few seconds that a passing aircraft may visit upon any structure it flies over. With storm winds you have gusts and then a return spring effect, and during that backlash it is common for more damage to be done than in the winds themselves. Aircraft noise pulses are nothing like as severe as that, and my acoustic engineer friend and airport supporter also notes that vortex strikes have also become far more uncommon even than they have been in the past because now the wing-tip devices that are fitted to them deflect what actually was almost invariably the source of those vortex strikes: air that spiraled out from the wing-tips. The same can occur, I am told, by tailplanes, but those tend to be much more minor and are even rarer occurrences.

Finally, John Copeland informed me, we live in an area where ground tremors are far more common than we might suppose. These tend to be on the order of 1.2 to 1.4 on the Richter Scale, which is not high but is still far more vigorous than the effects of aircraft acoustics upon building structures. The effects of these are like pebbles skipped across water: they cause ripples that affect the surface, and of course on land buildings sit on surfaces that are affected by these same forces: that's physics. ALL of these, however, are effects that our listed buildings have taken in their stride, and they are listed because they are deemed to be fine enough and significant enough to be worthy of preservation. Having achieved that, having lasted for centuries past, so they will easily cope with the far less challenging effects of the acoustic energy released by passing aircraft.

I hope that all of this will offer a measure of reassurance to those within Ramsgate in particular who are genuinely concerned about the Chinese whispers of environmental calamities to their homes, daily existences and mental health.

Taking all of these matters into consideration, I believe it will be evident that the noise of aircraft like the noise and effects of weather, are matters to which we become habituated. But to the extent that they must be mitigated, RiverOak's proposals are generous in terms of the amount of money they are prepared to commit in improving properties that are especially affected in accordance with noise contour levels that are generally applied by airports in the United Kingdom. Our airport supporters are legion, and while we live across this isle and beyond, they also include many who have lived in Ramsgate throughout their lives or who have come here from other places far more affected by noise than they will ever experience by the numbers of air traffic movements and hours of operation that are in permitted in the draft DCOs that have been refined during the course of the present Examination. I firmly believe that there is only one outcome that can reasonably be reached: I expect the Examining Authority to report and recommend the approval of the Manston Airport Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and I feel sure that the Secretary of State for Transport will make the Order granting it development consent.

Dr. R. John Pritchard

Listed Properties within a 200m Glidepath Corridor From Ramsgate Seafront To the centre line of the Manston Airport Runway[1]

1. Customs House with Forecourt [Ramsgate Town Hall], Harbour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1068641 (13ix1974)
2. Royal Oak Hotel, Royal Oak Shades, 66 Harbour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085379 (26x1978)
3. ***No. 4 with Railed Area, Albion Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085422 (13ix1974)***[2]
4. The Crown Hotel, York Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1347806 (4ii1988)
5. ***No. 32 Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1347806 (4ii1988)***
6. Ramsgate Library, Guildford Lawn: Grade II, List Entry Number 1357573 (4ii1988)
7. No. 10 York Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336345 (4ii1988)
8. The Perseverence Dining Room, 8 York Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1285419 (4ii1988)
9. No. 6 York Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1086051 (4ii1988)
10. The Obelisk: Grade II, List Entry Number 1086090 (4ii1988)
11. ***Nos. 18 – 38 with Railed Areas, Abbot's Hill: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085447 (7xi1983)***
12. F Hinds, 19 & 21 Harbour Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1356173 (4ii1988)
13. ***No. 132 Grange Road: Grade II, List Entry Number 1084368 (4ii1988)***
14. ***No. 2 and Railed Area, Albion Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336653 (13ix1974)***
15. Royal Victoria Pavilion, Harbour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336672 (13ix1974 & 22v2019)
16. ***Nos. 1 & 2 Queens Court: Grade II, List Entry Number 1086085 (13viii1968)***
17. **Nos. *9, 11, 13 & 15 Cavendish Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1100313 (4ii1988)***
18. ***East Cliff House, Wellington Crescent: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085382 (4ii1988)***

1 All data from Historic England website: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/map-search?clearresults=true as at 8vii2019.

2 All entries in bold italics appear to be used exclusively as private residences. There appear to be 32 such **List Entry Numbers** within the corridor as defined here, but some of those include more than one separate dwelling so on reviewing each number individually, there are a total of 74 separate residences within the defined corridor.

Within the whole of Ramsgate proper there are at this date 5 **List Entry Numbers** for Grade I listed buildings; 12 for Grade II* Listed Buildings, and 453 for Grade II Listed Buildings, 1 Scheduled Monument and 2 Park & Garden, according to Historic England as at 8vii2019. These figures exclude the outlying villages of Acol, Cliffsend, Manston, Minster, and Monkton which come under Ramsgate. The total number of individual premises embraced by the Grade II List Entry Numbers in Ramsgate proper is significantly higher.

Within the Isle of Thanet as a whole, the number of List Entry Numbers for Grade 1 is 13, for Grade II* is 31 and for Grade II is 1050.

19. Former Alexandra Hotel, 70 – 70A Harbour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1068630 (4ii1988)
20. ***Nos. 24 & 26 and Railed Areas, Albion Hill: Grade II, List Entry Number 1392983 (4ii1988)***
21. Former Kent Adult Education Centre, Chapel Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1392983 (22ii2006)
22. ***No. 12 with Railed Areas, Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085407 (4ii1988)***
23. National Westminster Bank, Harbour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336670 (4ii1988)
24. ***Nos. 1 – 6 with Railed Areas, Kent Terrace: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336688 (13ix1974)***
25. Lloyds Bank, 1 – 7 Queen Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1086083 (4ii1988)
26. ***No. 10 Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085408 (4ii1988)***
27. Memorial to the Great War, Madeira Walk: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085348 (4ii1988)
28. Railings & Gate about 10 Meters North of Ramsgate Library, Guildford Lawn: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336648 (4ii1988)
29. ***No. 36 Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1101746 (4ii1988)***
30. The Castle Hotel, 68 Habour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085380 (26x1978)
31. Eastcliff Lift, Harbour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1391989 (1vi2007)
32. ***No. 44 Abbot's Hill: Grade II, List Entry Number 1101734 (4ii1988)***
33. Ramsgate Fire Station, 18 – 20 Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1101734 (23v2019)
34. The Red Lion, 1 King Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085339 (13ix1974)
35. ***No. 29 Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1252979 (13iii1989)***
36. ***No. 51 Queen Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1460979 (22v2019)***
37. Railings and Wall about 20 Metres West of Chancery House, Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1347785 (4ii1988)
38. *No. 3 with Railed Area, Albion Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1099157 (13ix1974)*
39. Rock Gardens and Cascade, Madeira Walk: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336691 (4ii1988 & 22v2019)
40. Clarendon House Grammar School, Groundskeepers' Lodge, Walls & Railings, Clarendon Gardens: Grade II, List Entry Number 1460833 (22v2019)
41. The Queen's Head, Harbour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085381 (4ii1988)
42. ***No. 6 and Railed Area, Cliff Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1101783 (4ii1988)***

43. Albion House, No. 27 Albion Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085418 (13ix1974)
44. No. 1 (Chancery House) and No. 5 Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336644 (4ii1988)
45. Nos. 1 – 19 with Railed Areas, Guildford Lawn: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085414 (13ix1974)
46. No. 31 Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1252980 (13iii1989)
47. Pair of K6 Telephone Kiosks, Harbour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336671 (6i1988)
48. No. 34 with Area Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085405 (13ix1974)
49. No. 24 Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085406 (13ix1974 & 22v2019)
50. Gateway to Barber's Almshouses, Elms Avenue: Grade II, List Entry Number 1461618 (22v2019)
51. N*o. 5 with Railed Area, Albion Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1099153 (13ix1974)*
52. Royal Sailors Rest, Harbour Parade: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085378 (4ii1988)
53. No. 6 with Railed Area, Albion Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085421 (13ix1974)
54. The Admiral Fox, Grange Road: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336646 (4ii1988)
55. No. 10 with Railed Area, Albion Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1336652 (13ix1974)
56. Nos. 47 & 49 Queen Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1086084 (4ii1988)
57. The Rising Sun, Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1083595 (4ii1988)
58. No. 15 Harbour Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1068668 (4ii1988)
59. Albion Place Gardens (Park & Gardens): Grade II, List Entry Number 1001386 (20vii1998)
60. Anglo-Saxon Cemetery South of Ozengell Grange: Grade II, List Entry Number 1004228 (6i1981)
61. No. 20 Albion Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085419 (13ix1974)
62. No. 1 with Railed Area, Albion Place: Grade II, List Entry Number 1099168 (13ix1974)
63. Nos. 10 – 14 with Railed Area, Kent Terrace: Grade II, List Entry Number 1052310 (17x1988)
64. 29 – 31 Harbour Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085382 (4ii1988 & 5i1990)
65. 35 Effingham Street: Grade II, List Entry Number 1085403 (13ix1974)


PARK ROAD
Ellington Park
CHAPEL ROAD
HIGH STREET
St Lawrence
BLOCMSBURY ROAD
VALE ROAD
EDITH ROAD
ST MILDREDS ROAD
SAXON ROAD
NORMAN ROAD
LONDON ROAD
MINSTER ROAD
DOWNS ROAD
MARK AVENUE
WARWICK DRIVE
DURLOCK AVENUE
ROYAL ESPLANADE
WATCHESTER AVENUE
MILITARY ROAD
WEST CLIFF ROAD
VALE SQUARE
Westcliff Leisure Park
Key
Filter


PARK ROAD
Ellington Park
CHAPEL ROAD
HIGH STREET
St Lawrence
BLOCMSBURY ROAD
VALE ROAD
EDITH ROAD
ST MILDREDS ROAD
SAXON ROAD
NORMAN ROAD
LONDON ROAD
MINSTER ROAD
DOWNS ROAD
MARK AVENUE
WARWICK DRIVE
DURLOCK AVENUE
ROYAL ESPLANADE
WATCHESTER AVENUE
MILITARY ROAD
WEST CLIFF ROAD
VALE SQUARE
Westcliff Leisure Park
Key
Filter