

After following the DCO process for many months I wish to bring the examiners attention to the points below.

In spite of promising over several months to give the examiners a detailed legitimate credible funding statement including a list of investors RSP have not. All they will say they have investors who have expressed an interest. This means nothing, I have expressed an interest in a Ferrari but doubt I will ever get one. All RSP have done is timed out the examination period waiting until now to tell the ExA they do not have to supply these. As Chris Wells has already told the examiners this is how previous incarnations of RSP behaved when they sought to get TDC to compulsory purchase the site on their behalf. How can the examiners have any faith that RSP can complete the project? Would they be happy to sell their houses under similar circumstances' exchanging contract not knowing that if the buyer has funds or has access to them ? Their only funding details to give a list of banks who give mortgages. The ExA said when the DCO was accepted for examination it would fail without evidence of adequate funding and that is exactly where we are now.

Listening to the issue specific hearings RSP have not done costings and do not have a business plan to prove viability. They have no carriers at all ready to sign up. There is only vague rumours relayed via SMAA BBQs. They also say within 15 years, from a standing start, Manston will handle twice the freight East Midlands Airport does but provide no evidence how this will be done. Do they expect East midlands to stand idly by and see their customers stolen? How can the ExA make any recommendation to pass the DCO without further evidence?

Given the number of ATMS the airport is capable of, 17,170 cargo, 9298 passenger and 38,000 General Aviation, why haven't RSP considered public safety zones (PSZs) ? This would also affect the local plan as it is for a 20 year supply of housing and some developments would no longer be possible. This would put further pressure on greenfield sites which are already being used due to displacement of houses that could have gone on Manston. It would also put a planning blight on most of Ramsgate.

RSP have continually stated they do not want nor need night flights but they say up to 8 "late" arrivals a night between 11.30pm & 6.00am with a big rush between 6.00-7.00am, all this using a noise quota of 3028 and allowing 747's a QC4 aircraft. How is this not night flights ?

RSP are also hiding the true impact of noise on residents by using average noise contours which bear no resemblance to the real life noise levels experienced by people living in Ramsgate. Levels of 90-100db were regularly recorded by noise monitors in Ramsgate and recorded in the KIACC reports which NNF have sent in. You would not be allowed to work in an environment with levels that high without ear protection so why is it acceptable for residents? I have seen another submission which puts into doubt the validity of RSPs noise contours as it encompasses a larger area. I suspect the main reason is to limit claims for noise insulation payable by RSP, which is a laughable £4,000 anyway. I am also very concerned that RSP have put ambient noise monitors in the gardens of SMAA members, why not somewhere independent. Have RSP considered how noise levels of this magnitude would affect workers in Ramsgate exposed to these levels?

Would there be a health and safety assessment as per HSE guidelines? Taken from the HSE web site : <http://www.hse.gov.uk/noise/regulations.htm> The level at which employers must provide hearing protection and hearing protection zones is now 85 decibels (daily or weekly average exposure) and the level at which employers must assess the risk to workers' health and provide them with information and training is now 80 decibels. There is also an exposure limit value of 87 decibels, taking account of any reduction in exposure provided by hearing protection, above which workers must not be exposed. This would include all places of employment including schools, offices and any other workers exposed in the course of their employment.

RSP want to include a large number of issues in an S106 agreement I am very concerned that this will not be effective in controlling operations at Manston should the DCO be approved not least because, under Mr Freudmann's control, previous operators at Manston took no notice of the agreement in place at the time. There is also the fact an S106 could be varied at some point in the future. RSP also seem to be trying to stop TDC having control over any S106 therefore stopping any local involvement in decision making. A lot of these points should be in the DCO to make them legally binding & any S106 agreement should remain in local control as I don't think it is acceptable for control to be taken out of the area.

The main selling point RSP keep bringing up is jobs but they have not quantified or qualified what jobs would be available at Manston nor have they stated how many would be displaced from other airports or how many local jobs would be lost due to the impact on the local tourist trade. As this is meant to be a state of the art cargo hub it is not unreasonable to conclude there will be a high degree of automation. Offices can be anywhere in the world and it has been mentioned by RSP that ATC could be done remotely. So what jobs does that leave, very few I suspect. I would ask the ExA to take this into consideration.

There is also the question of impact on Pegwell an SSSI. It seems RSP have done very little to assess the impact on the various nesting birds and the area generally.

There is not the support for the airport reopening our MP's would have you believe. I notice Roger Gale has said in his submission that support for the airport could be gauged by the last local election results when candidates who supported the airport reopening were voted in. Since then there have been local elections in May. It is worth pointing out that in Ramsgate the candidates voted in for Thanet District Council & Ramsgate Town council were overwhelmingly voted in on an anti-airport mandate. Both Mr Gale & Mr MacKinlay both refuse to engage with any constituents who ask for their support in fighting RSP's proposal. Mr MacKinlay our MP has had a previous relationship with Mr Freudmann when he tried to start his own passenger service from Manston, MaMa Airlines. Mr MacKinlay had to apologise to Parliament for failing to declare an interest during several debates. Even then it was only after a local resident complained to Parliamentary standards.

I am very concerned that should there be a major disaster has RSP assessed whether local services could cope given our location as the only real road in & out of Thanet is the M2 a two lane motorway built in the 60's. Have they considered contingency plans & what would be needed in such an event as a plane crash?

My final question is would anybody in their right mind really consider building an airport less than a mile from a town of 44,000 people if there hadn't been a (disused) runway there already ??

In summing up for a DCO to be passed it has to qualify as an NSIP. Given the evidence RSP has provided I cannot see they have passed that test. It also has to be a balancing act of the benefits outweighing any detrimental effects. RSP have evidenced nothing concrete that would benefit local people or the country as a whole. Local residents & groups on the other hand have submitted evidence of the detrimental effects and shown how badly the local area and residents would suffer.