

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Application to reopen Manston Airport by Riveroak Strategic Partners Ltd  
**Date:** 14 June 2019 13:16:32

---

We are responding in relation to the above, in time for D8 14/06/2019. We wish to make the following personal representations. Please note we wish to redact our email address.

We are located directly under the flight path of the proposed new cargo hub, and cannot understand why anybody would advocate such a proposal, overflying a town with a population of 40,000. We are also fearful of the huge scale of the proposal, with potentially more flights in a 24-hour period than there were previously in a year, when the airport was open, as well as the obvious concerns about the noise and pollution, plus sleep deprivation.

We are extremely concerned about the increased possibility of a catastrophic accident, due to the number of aircraft movements proposed, owing to the close proximity of the flight paths to the properties the planes will overfly.

When the airport was previously operational, we could see the planes approach at a very low level, and they certainly disturbed us, even with the windows closed. We never got used to it, but tolerated it as there were very few flights.

RSP have provided noise contours which in no way represent what will happen in reality! It cannot be equitable that the general public have had to fund independent noise contours which provide a more accurate indication of the true level of noise and pollution which will affect the town.

The people in favour of the airport use the excuse of "jobs for locals". We contend that more jobs will be lost to the area from the damage to local businesses, and also tourism. The jobs promised are not necessarily "better jobs" than existing jobs within the area, as is often stated. How do they come to this conclusion? ; especially with increased automation in the cargo airport industry.

If this project goes ahead, nobody will benefit, apart from those people (from a distance) seeking to profit from people's misfortunes; there will be a blight on houses, the only Royal Harbour in the country, and the character of Ramsgate. We really do believe that a majority of those in favour of the airport do not really understand the nature and enormity of the project; most do not live in Ramsgate (certainly not under the flight path), and the reality is that they are hoping for a passenger airport to avoid them having to travel too far to other airports for their holidays!

The other argument put forward is "Airport, not houses". The local plan has reallocated housing which was designated for the brownfield Manston site, to other smaller greenfield sites in the area, with the resultant lack of infrastructure which is a less stringent requirement on smaller developments. Transport networks will be clogged with HGVs - both cargo and fuel, so the argument about houses creating more traffic is ridiculous, as a cargo hub will generate much more traffic.

We would request that this project is not recommended to the Secretary of State to proceed.

Yours sincerely

J & R Everest.