

From: [REDACTED]
To: ManstonAirport@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: Manston
Date: 15 February 2019 15:53:45

ID20012765

“I oppose the RSP’s application for DCO on the Basis that it is not in the national interest to have a cargo hub on a remote patch in far East Kent. There is far more capacity at other airports that are more central to both south and north England.

The local residents need housing not a cargo hub. The local area is vastly populated so close to the airport runway that it is a high risk to local residents both with the noise pollution and the proximity of low-flying aircraft on the approach to the runway. Let alone allowing a airplane breakers yard where craft at the end of their useful life are flown in for breakage. This is high risk as many a company may risk safety by not investing in planes for their last voyage. Where’s the personal safety zone? The noise mitigation is insufficient to cover costs, so if RSP have under calculated that and plan to put a noise monitor in the sea, how is this application being taken seriously? What did the CVs of the main players tell the inspectorate?

Research audits have proven that there is no viable future for any commercial type of airport at this location.” It looks more and more like the Seabourne incident? Except worse as one of the main men is experienced with the previous Manston ventures.

I cannot support this DCO application on any level as it worries me that basic information changed from consultation to application despite the clear messages given regarding night flight concerns and assurances from RSP and MPs that ‘night flights were not needed. Only in a Emergency or for humanitarian aid’. That’s not how this application reads, does it!

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
