

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** For the attention of the Manston Airport Case Team  
**Date:** 08 July 2021 20:49:20

---

Dear sirs

We live in [REDACTED], Ramsgate, close to the flight path of the former Manston Airport, and are extremely worried over the prospect of it re-opening. Since its closure we have noticed an improvement in our health, sleep and the re-generation in the area, which has brought in many visitors to the historic town of Ramsgate, where I grew up and where my Parents and family live. I and my children are, once again, able to enjoy the outside life, without the fumes, pollution and noise we were expected to put up with whilst the airport was open. My children grew up in Ramsgate and had to attend school and put up with having lessons interrupted by aeroplane noise. Their prospects in future life improved the day it closed. Now, once again, they and I may have to endure all the pitfalls of the airport on their lives and futures.

If the plans that RSP have put in are implemented, I feel it would be an environmental disaster for me, my family and thousands of other people.

We have been told that RSP has no limit on Air Traffic Movements during the night despite its "worst case" assumption of 8 flights per night, which was quoted at a consultation meeting earlier this year. It now seems that they are applying for a quota count system which could mean unlimited night flights.

A few years ago we suffered with old freight planes going over our houses at about 450ft day and night, with decibel readings of 90db + (recorded at Chatham House school & in KIACC reports which were sent in by Nethercourt action group). It will be the same again but all night long, residents will suffer from a lack of sleep, resulting in many health problems and thus putting a further strain on the Health Service.

Since the airport has closed Ramsgate has become a better place to live and many more people have been attracted to the area. A cargo hub would stop people investing in the area and many jobs would be lost. Tourism in the area would fall, no-one will want to visit an area where you cannot hear what is being said to you or it is impossible to get any sleep!

Vibrations would have an adverse effect on my house as well as the whole of Ramsgate and many beautiful old buildings in Ramsgate which need protection, not shaken and destroyed. Even Pugin would have been appalled; his house is right under the flight path!

Our local church, St Laurence church, which was built in 1062, and is one of England's oldest. It was cracked by an earthquake and struck by lightning years ago. The planes come right over it and would shake it to pieces.

Ramsgate has the largest conservation area of Regency and Victorian houses in the county. These older buildings are particularly difficult to insulate and are susceptible to vibration.

Even if we could all insulate our houses, a cost which we certainly cannot afford, we cannot live inside a house which the noise wouldn't permeate, for 24 hours a day, 365 days a year! We need our outdoors to enjoy and fresh air to breathe.

There is no evidence that we need a freight hub as there is adequate capacity at existing airports. It would affect not just the lives of the people of Thanet, but also the surrounding area as the roads are already full, to propose even more lorries transporting freight and fuel to and from Manston would be a nightmare.

Even the bird numbers in our garden have gone up since Manston closed; they didn't like the pollution either! So it must affect the nature reserves in the area as well.

We do need more jobs in our area, but feel these will come from the sustained increase in tourism in Thanet over the last few years & SHPs proposed technical business park development at Manston. Any jobs created at the proposed airport will probably be filled from outside our area & zero hour contracts as they were before. There would be very few jobs for locals!

The last examiners responded that the level of freight that the proposes development could expect to handle are modest and could be catered for at existing airports (Heathrow, Stansted, East Midlands airports and others) if the demand existed. The EXA considers that Manston appears to offer no obvious advantages to outweigh the strong competition that such airports offer, and therefore concludes that the applicant has failed to demonstrate sufficient need for the proposed development.

Manston has failed three times with the losing owners investors TDC & KCC millions. There have been four reports from credible aviation experts, Falcon Consultancy, Avia Solutions, Altitude Aviations and York Aviations, all showing that Manston Airport is unviable and unnecessary. York Aviation states that the applicant has not provided any evidence that would be worthy of a DCO. We had four very experienced planning inspectors who conducted a long examination for the DCO. They took many hours of oral evidence and hundreds of written

submissions into consideration. More people took part in this DCO examination than any other with the majority being opposed to RSP's plans. The examiners conclusion was the DCO should be refused on many issues. In spite of this overwhelming evidence the SoS decided to pass it anyway but had to concede a judicial review because he couldn't back up his decision.