

Date 16/20/9/18

Here you should summarise the aspects of the *application* you agree and/or disagree with and say why. Outline what information, local knowledge or evidence you have which supports this. Please aim to limit this section to no more than 500 words (please use extra paper if needed).


I live directly under the flight path of aircraft inbound to Manston Airport and therefore have experience of aircraft noise associated with past operations there. I cannot state exact altitudes above my home, but can say that the undercarriages were lowered and any fuselage lettering was legible unaided. I am objecting to the granting of a DCO to reopen the airport on the grounds of noise and air pollution.

- (1) Other than seeing an advertisement placed in the local newspaper, I can confirm that neither myself or any of my near neighbours have received any direct communication from RSP regarding their project.
- (2) Since the government has not made any policy statement that the UK needs a new freight airport, and there is no prediction for any growth in the number of flights required for airfreight, can the application demonstrate a clear and compelling need for a DCO to be granted?
- (3) From the available reports I have read, RSP's noise predictions are deeply flawed and unsatisfactory in that they use incorrect modelling standards and measurements, and include some questionable assumptions. eg. They will secure runway choices that will reduce the historic noise exposure of Ramsgate residents. How can that be achieved if safety of take off and landings are dependant on wind direction/runway orientation?
- (4) The above point brings up the question of RSP's attitude to safety. It seems that their proposed 10,000 - 17,000 flights are conveniently below the 18,000 ATM threshold for requiring public safety Zones (PSZs) which they have ignored, contrary to best practice. Have they carried out a proper risk analysis given their capability assesement of 83,220 ATMs per annum? Should this influence the legality of their DCO application?

CONT:

Please check that you have completed all relevant sections, otherwise you may not be able to take part in the later stages of the examination.

Please sign your form, print your name and give today's date, below:

Signature  20/9/18

CHRISTOPHER BURROWS

(5) Much is made by RSP and the MP Roger Gale regarding there being no need or desire for night flights (scheduled). I cannot agree with this statement as unscheduled night flights are what they really want, which would be just as bad. The project viability would not be sustainable without them. RSP clearly sees viability being dependant on accepting night ATMs rated at QC 4, which are prohibited from the London airports on noise grounds. RSP also assert that free night flights would attract operators from E. Midlands Airport.

(6) Have the applicants made the Planning Inspectorate aware of the likely amount of LGV activity which would be generated by their Project? A considerable amount of jet fuel would be required for the refuelling of long range aircraft, all of which would have to be conveyed to the airport by road tankers. To this would be added the number of LGVs needed to move the projected volumes of air cargo. Has sufficient consideration been given to the impact this would have on the areas road infrastructure and environment? Consideration should be given I feel, to the seasonal peaks and fluctuations of traffic bound to and from the channel ports and tunnel.

(7) RSP arguably have a reputation for being either evasive or unsure regarding how they are actually going to achieve their goals. Given the amount of available evidence which strongly refutes the viability of their project, could their application have been unrealistically inflated in order to appear good enough on paper to qualify for a DCO?

Q. 20/9/18

CHRISTOPHER BURROWS