

Your registration identification number is 20012450.

We live very near the Airport (Nethercourt Estate) and at present I am enjoying a quiet relaxing home. We can walk down to the seafront and surrounding areas without having a thundering plane overhead. My biggest fear is that my lifestyle will be totally ruined if this DCO is allowed. We strongly believe my home will devalue and we will be stuck living in a home I will be unable to sell and in turn my life would be unbearable.

1. No Public Safety Zones, they expect to carry on with previous arrangements. This is totally unacceptable as previous operations were nothing like that which is planned, this is a total disregard of all the residents in the area.

The current policy is that PSZs should be established at those airports which are shown to average more than 1500 ATM's a month and are likely in due course to exceed 2,500 ATM's a month. RSP suggest 17,000 a year in the first year which would place them just under the 1500 ATM's a month but going forward their expectation is 83,000 per year which is over 6,900 ATM's per month. I would expect for the sake of good order they would start with a PSZ.

These planes would be roughly 100m above my property as I live approx. 1.5km from the Airport. The documents also show that the Company are not putting any caps on the numbers, once again this proves the need for a PSZ.

In DFt Circular 01/2010 Control of Development in Airport Public Safety Zones (page 3 section 3) it says "The Public Safety Zones are based upon risk contours modelled looking 15 years ahead, in order to allow a reasonable period of stability after their introduction. The Public Safety Zones should be sufficient size to allow for possible future growth in the number of aircraft movements, without affecting unnecessarily large areas of land. Third party individual risk contours around airports will be remodelled at intervals of about seven years, based on forecasts about the numbers and types of aircraft movements fifteen years ahead. It is likely that this will lead to the redefinition of the Public Safety ones, though the changes will not necessarily be significant. In the meantime the contours will be remodelled in the event that a significant expansion of an airport approved which has not already been assumed in the modelled risk contours. In addition, the Public Safety Zones will need to be redefined if a runway is extended or if a landing threshold moved."

So why is the applicant not even having a PSZ.

2. Noise disturbance – We just cannot begin to image the significant adverse effects on people living close to an airport, including: interference with communication, sleep disturbance, annoyance responses, learning acquisition, performance effects and cardiovascular and psycho-physiological effects. From past experience we can honestly say the planes interrupted any conversations, made it impossible to hear the radio/television, stopped any telephone conversations and in Ramsgate Town when they flew over it was unbearable. This is certainly not what I envisaged in my retirement – since the planes stopped I have been able to enjoy my garden and various surrounding areas such as protected nature reserves, walks along our wonderful coastline which I find incredibly relaxing - not quite so relaxing with cargo planes going over all the time. We also question the positioning of the Noise Monitors.
3. Not only will we be subjected to planes flying very low overhead, it appears that we will also be coping with HGV's and numerous fuel bowsers travelling in and out of the

planned airport, and for the amount of flights quoted we are talking vast amounts Time and time again we have been informed that RSP do not need night flights so why have they applied – the answer I was given when the question was raised was because PINS told them to.

4. At a meeting we attended an Executive head teacher stated: “It breaks my heart to think of our school children if their sleep gets disturbed. I guarantee that will affect their education. And if it affects their education it will affect their life choices.” This really concerns me as we like many have children and grandchildren that will have to live with these consequences.
5. We feel that we have 2 MP’s in the area that are not listening to the voters and certainly do not represent my views and many others. 1 of them has hosted events for RSP on the terrace of House of Commons on more than 1 occasion – the other failed to declare he owns an airline, both regularly attend BBQ’s with the group that wants to Save Manston Airport. At the A.G.M. one of the MP’s is actually on video stating “I know I’ve been called the member of parliament for Riveroak and I actually wear that as a badge of honour!” All we want is someone to listen to the people that have to endure this day and night, various polls have been around but in all honestly the only thing that should come into play is “Is this of National Importance” we think it plainly is not.
6. Tourism contributes at £319 million to the Thanet economy each year supporting 7950 jobs. (Cambridge Model Economic Impact Survey 2017). More than 4.2 million visitors come to Thanet every year. The Isle of Thanet is rapidly becoming the place to visit, to work and to live. If the idea of a Cargo Hub is allowed to go ahead then the numbers of visitors will soon drop back down again which in turn will reduce the number of jobs and stop Thanet from continuing to grow as a thriving coastal area. The picture below shows just how low the planes fly over our Coastal Area.

