

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).

Date 28, Sept. 2018

Dear Sir,

I strongly disagree with the proposal to reopen Manston as a cargo hub.

As a resident of Central Ramsgate for thirty-four years I have first hand experience of the negative effects of previous attempts to reopen the airport.

With this experience of living under a landing flight path I wish to concentrate my representation on 'Health and the Quality of Life'.

RiverOak's proposal indicates in excess of 10,000 air freight movements per year including up to eight night flights. This equates to 27.4 flights per day, seven days a week.

Despite this amount of flights RiverOak states: in year one, only 115 resident dwellings will be exposed to significant noise annoyance while by year twenty 225 dwellings will be exposed to significant noise annoyance and sleep disturbance. (1)

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

JOHN DAVISON

28th September 2018.

RiverOak also states that there will be only small adverse effects on health (one hospital admission, two additional deaths and 329 cases of hypertension) (2)

RiverOak's proposal on the number of houses affected and the perceived effect on the health of the population is, in my view, at best incompetent or at worst economical with the truth and therefore should be rejected.

No less than 'The World Health Organisation' in numerous independent studies has come to the conclusion that living under a flight path is detrimental to physical and mental health. In study after study there has been shown links to increases in lung cancer, asthma, cardiovascular illness, obesity and mental health problems, with children being particularly vulnerable.

With W.H.O.'s conclusions in mind consider these facts: The landing flight path is directly across Central Ramsgate. Planes on approach will only be 235 m above sea level over the Royal Harbour. The building of Clarendon House Grammar School, because of its arrow shape, is used as a marker for planes, passing at a height of 209 m making teaching impossible. The planes then fly over South Eastern Road at a height of 203 m while the residents of Nethercourt endure planes overhead at

a height of 138ms.

Written communication relies on comprehension, understanding and empathy. What it lacks is the ability to provide experience. Therefore, may I invite a group of inspectors to my house, on a day convenient for both parties. I would be grateful if you could hire a plane; either a light aircraft or a 747 Jumbo jet and experience for yourselves the reality of living under a potential 24/7 lancting flight path.

The legal owners of the site 'Stone Hill Park' want to build a mixed development of high-tech industry and houses.

Thanet needs houses and jobs, not a cargo hub.

Sajid Javid when Minister for Housing, I believe, stated Manston was not of national importance for aviation.

Why, at the very time diesel cars are being phased out, should the residents of Ramsgate be subjected to cargo planes flying 500 feet over their roof tops?

A freight hub would seriously endanger the health and wellbeing of the local community.

I urge the inspectors to reject RiverOak's proposal.

References

- ① R.S.P. Non-Technical Summary, July 2018
Page 16, paragraph 4.1.44
- ② R.S.P. Non-Technical Summary, July 2018
Page 20, paragraph 4.1.17.