

Dear Sirs,

We are writing to you as a group of residents of Ramsgate. Each of us has lived in the town for over 20 years. We were here when the airport was only an airfield. We were here when the RAF were in residence at Manston. We have experienced the noise of the flights passing directly over our homes at around 550ft (approx 2.5km from the airport) when Manston became a commercial airport and the noise was such that it was impossible to hold a conversation with someone in the room or on the phone.

We have noted with interest the ongoing DCO hearings and would like to make some points about some of the things discussed:

Ramsgate Residents are not in favour of a cargo hub

On a number of occasions we have heard that Ramsgate was in favour of a cargo hub. The ExA have been told that surveys show that anything from 89-99% of residents are in favour.

Given that there have been **no impartial or authoritative surveys** carried out (online houses vs. airport surveys carried out by SMAA, open to the www are not impartial or authoritative) we can only go by the latest TDC and RTC election results as an indicator of what the people of Ramsgate think regarding the cargo hub.

12 out of 16 Ramsgate Town Councillors were voted into office in a “no airport/no cargo hub” manifesto. 3 out of the 4 pro-airport councillors were voted in for Northwood ward which is not under the flight path and **12 out of 15 Thanet District Councillors** were voted into office in Ramsgate wards on an “no airport/no cargo hub” manifesto.

The election results clearly show that there is very little support for the cargo hub in Ramsgate.

Business Plan

Throughout the hearings we heard discussions regarding what other airport(s) could Manston be compared to. Responses ranged from “Manston is unique” to “Manston is like Prestwick”.

The answer seemed to depend on the validity of the business plan. At one point during questioning by SHP’s QC the author said that he “wouldn’t describe it as a business plan”.

York Aviation’s has also said that Azimuth have misunderstood/misinterpreted their results.

Given that the author of RSP’s one page business plan/spreadsheet wouldn’t describe it as a business plan and York Aviation say that RSP have misused their report why should the ExA give the RSP “business plan” any weight?

Prestwick

In the news over the past few days has been the selling off of Prestwick airport which on a number of occasions RSP used as a comparison to Manston.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-business-48627212>

Prestwick Airport is being put up for sale by the Scottish government.

The airport [was taken into public ownership six years ago](#) after it was threatened with closure following heavy losses.

In January, it emerged that the debt owed by Prestwick Airport to the Scottish government had risen from £30m to £38.4m.

Accounts lodged with Companies House showed the holding company made a loss of £7.6m in the year to March 2018, down from £8.6m the previous year.

<https://www.scotsman.com/news/transport/no-buyer-yet-as-prestwick-airport-put-up-for-sale-1-4946859>

No buyer yet as Prestwick Airport put up for sale

The airport was bought by the Scottish Government for a nominal £1, but it has since needed loans totalling nearly £40 million to stay in business and loses some £7m a year.

Ryanair is Prestwick's only passenger airline, but further income comes from cargo and military flights, and other operations.

There appear to be many similarities between Manston and Prestwick aside from the fact they were both owned by Infratil.

Noise Contours

Noise contours produced by RSP are inadequate and again it has been left to residents to fund their own noise contours through the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). Please refer to the noise contours have been submitted by NNF and Samara and Jason Jones-Hall.

Comparing the new noise contours to RSPs noise contours it appears that RSP has understated the noise impact that its plans would cause.

Given that the CAA are the body who would do this work why did RSP not use them to produce their own noise contour maps? Is this again an attempt to hide the true noise contours from those living under the flight paths or another attempt to do things on the cheap?

It is shameful that a company who claim to be able to get funding of over £300m would not pay out for noise contour maps from the CAA.

This also ties in with the lack of consultation by RSP i.e. postcards which RSP claim to have delivered to 50,000 residents did not land on doormats of those under the flight path.

This again raises the question why – given that both the Vattenfall and SHP projects both delivered brochures successfully to residents across Ramsgate.

Was this a deliberate avoidance tactic by RSP to keep anyone who would be interested in the fact that 24/7 cargo planes would be flying over their homes or a lack of money to properly fund the printing of or delivery of postcards?

We believe RSP did not use Royal Mail for delivery like Vattenfall or SHP did but used airport supporters to carry out the deliveries.

Night Flights

Our main concern is night flights and we have taken little comfort in the fact that RSP are now stating that there will be no SCHEDULED/TIMETABLED night flights but there will be LATE ARRIVALS.

In essence this still means there will be night flights.

Given this statement there could be an unlimited number of flights landing during the night due to late arrivals given the extremely high QC that RSP have applied for.

Based on the high QC we can only surmise that RSP intend to have an unlimited number of “late arrivals” coming into the airport during the night.

If RSP, as they claim, do not need night flights and that late arrivals will be the exception and there will be very few then we would ask the ExA to severely limit the QC.