

Ian & Hilary Scott  
Ref : 20013013 & 20014097  
Manston DCO Deadline 3

We are aware that other people & groups are going into the facts & sending in evidence regarding whether RSP's application constitutes a NSIP, noise level & impacts on health so we did not want to duplicate that. Part of the examination process is to judge the impact on people who live under the flight path & how it will affect their lives so we are commenting on that. We live on Nethercourt estate which is among the closest housing to the airport starting approximately 1.3 KM from the Runways end so we will be among the worst affected, not that Ramsgate town fares much better with the sea front only about 4km away. RSP are asking for no limits or caps on flights with a very large night time quota. In fact it appears they want to do whatever they want without any restrictions. In today's age that is not acceptable. The planes will fly directly over our house between 300-400 feet. If this project goes ahead it will be disastrous for us & our already poor health. I have had [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Unfortunately my wife also has had a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] too which has left her with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which are exacerbated by a poor nights sleep so I am very concerned about the impact on her. In fact we suspect there will be a very large increase in mental health problems should this go ahead. Given there is a wealth of evidence to show that the noise & pollution from living close to an airport is detrimental to both physical & mental health is it acceptable to risk the wellbeing of 40,000+ residents of Ramsgate? General poor health issues are a very well documented consequence of an airport being so close to a built up area. It is a recognised fact that Thanet already has some of the worst health outcomes in the UK. The negative effects such a project will have on residents are just plain common sense so we don't feel the need to add any evidence here.

We would like the ExA to ask as NHS health services are already struggling in the UK would local services be able to cope with a major incident such as a plane crash. Especially as plane crashes are most likely to occur during the first three minutes and last eight minutes of the flight there is no doubt they will come down on homes. Also Cargo planes tend to be, on average, 3 years older & have a poorer safety record than passenger planes.

It seems to us that RSP are trying to play down the negative impact of noise on residents by using such ploys as quoting households affected rather than the number of people, use of average db estimates & not addressing the full environment impact of a project capable of 83,000 air traffic movements (ATMs) per annum. In fact the number of ATMs seems to vary all the way through their DCO application depending on what is (or isn't) needed to justify the situation at the time. Low enough so as not to have to consider public safety zones or compensation but then high to justify an NSIP. We have to wonder why RSP did not use existing real time noise measurements. Available in the KIACC reports from the time the airport was operational. Mr Freudmann would be well aware of these. Copies of KIACC reports have been sent in with the Nethercourt Action Group submission (20013745). Indeed we wonder how any Local Impact Report could be written with any accuracy due to the incomplete, conflicting & differing ATM counts in RSP's application.

We now have two rescue dogs, one from Battersea & one from the RSPCA, both are very frightened of thunder & lightening so it is doubtful they would cope the noise created when planes fly over us. We would seriously have to consider putting them to sleep. Again this would greatly diminish enjoyment of our lives.

We both started work at 16 & went without things like holidays to buy our own house. It is not as if we could move as our home would be practically un-saleable unless sold for a greatly reduced price, something we could not afford financially. Our home is our only asset & we were hoping to downsize later and release funds to help our finances which would no longer be possible.

We have also noticed that RSP have failed to meet the deadline to provide a credible & legitimate funding statement citing a change in their company structure. Are the ExA now allowing RSP to making up their own deadlines? If not what action will the ExA being taking against RSP & when? More to the point I would ask the ExA & PINS is this still the same company & have they legal standing to continue with the DCO or should they have to withdraw & re-apply under the new company. If RSP continually fail to produce the relevant documentation, as they have done in the past, at what point will the ExA stop the examination and deny the DCO application. We know that the Riveroak Investment Company (a previous incarnation of RSP led by Mr Freudmann) & Thanet District Council (TDC) compulsory purchase indemnity saga is being evidenced by David Green a former Mayor of Ramsgate & TDC councillor at the time so we have not added details. Given the recent Seabourne ferry debacle we hope due diligence of the highest order will be applied by the ExA in regard to RSPs finances, directors & investors.

We are very concerned about the knock on effect the DCO application has had on the local plan. Pro-airport councillors on TDC have gone against the advice and recommendations of officers & voted through a local plan (LP) without any evidence to back it up. In fact the LP voted through seems to block any development of the site by the legal owners SHP for 2 years. SHP have a planning application in with TDC for the site to build much needed homes in collaboration with housing associations, new homes & infrastructure such as schools, doctors surgeries etc. Because of this DCO application TDC have voted through a LP that will involve building on green field sites such as farmer's fields and every green site around the villages of Thanet without any additional infrastructure to support it. This will make everyone in Thanet's lives poorer & we ask the ExA to take this into consideration.

We are finding Roger Gale MP for North Thanet's continual comments, in any forum he can, very unhelpful & misleading in the extreme. He keeps mentioning people "down from London" and inferring they should have no right to comment or have any influence on what happens at Manston. He also makes claims in support of RSP that totally contradict the DCO application, night flights being one. There is not the local support he claims & we would ask the ExA to get him to produce hard evidence to back up his claims or stop using his position to further the plans of what is a private company to the detriment of local residents views.

We are just ordinary people but have been trying to keep up with all the evidence presented. So far we have seen nothing that supports need or viability of such a project. All we have seen are comments such as “it has always been an airport” which isn’t true as it shut nearly 5 years ago after losses of millions and “we want the airport back”. None of which are legal reasons to allow this DCO. The proposals of the legal owners, SHP, seem a far better & more sustainable use of the land which in the long run will create far more employment than a freight hub ever will. Again we would urge the ExA & PINS to fully take on board the disastrous impact of such a project on the lives of tens of thousands of people for very little gain. At the end of the day at best this is a very speculative application at worst a land grab with RSP misusing the DCO process to wrangle the land off the legal owners for a fraction of its true value.

We would like the ExA to ask RSP the following questions

1. Why no mention public safety zones for an airport capable of 83,000 ATMs. This is best practice for other airports.
2. Why have they not provided environment reports for the full capacity of the project (83,000ATMs) given they want no limits or caps on ATMs & want a large night time quota.
3. How many extra deaths in Thanet do they expect in Thanet due to the pollution from planes & extra vehicles needed to service it?
4. Can local services cope with a major incident such as a plane crash on a built up area or a fire in the fuel farm so close to homes?
5. Exactly how many direct jobs are promised by RSP as they came up with stupid numbers like 30,000 at the consultations? When it was pointed out that was ridiculous added “in the larger economy” whatever that means.
6. What exactly will the jobs be?
7. How many jobs will be lost in the growing tourist industry due to people no longer wanting to visit Ramsgate? We suspect there will be a net loss
8. Exactly how many lorries & fuel tankers will be needed to service such a cargo hub and can the roads really cope?
9. What about security, especially for the proposed fuel farm which is less than 150mtrs from housing?