From:	
To:	Manston Airport
Subject:	Objection to RSP submission from Ansell family
Date:	14 June 2019 21:17:04

I write as a resident of Ramsgate, mother of four, home owner, and heritage professional to lodge objection to RSP'S plans with regard to the following:

RSP have failed to provide evidence that their plans meet criteria of NSIP with unrealistic business model (relying on rivalling and displacing jobs from other airports rather than new job and business creation).

East Midlands has capacity (in s shrinking freight market) and is better placed geographically and in terms of transport and storage facilities to act as a 'hub', than the former Manston Airport at the far end of the country, surrounded on three sides by water.
RSP have failed to provide convincing evidence that they have finances in place to

pursue their plans (should criteria for national need be met).

- The better situated Prestwick airport is their business comparison but is currently struggling and up for sale - proof that thir plans are unrealistic and/or more suitable locations than Manston might be found.

- RSP have built their case (and stirred up support amongst locals) with wildly optimistic job creation figures (rising ftom '50 jobs after 3 years' which is what Mr Freudman informed me at the 1st Ramsgate consultation event to many thousands listed in their most recent submissions.

- RSP have failed to account for jobs lost in the thriving Thanet tourist industry in their calculations.

- RSP have failed to carry out adequate environmental impact studies that take into account Thanet - unique maritime ecosystem and sites of Special Scientific Interest. The impact of Thanet 's blue flag beaches and Pegwell Bay nature reserve bring two examples of nationally significant assets threatened by this proposed project.

-RSP'S plans for compensation/triple glazing/noise mitigation take no account of Ramsgate's unique architectural heritage and prominent Grade 1, 2 and 3 listed buildings. The Grade 1 Pugin Grange (built by interior designer of Houses of Parliament) is directly under the flight path, cannot be protected from noise. This tourist attraction would doubtless lose revenue through guests being awoken/disturbed. RSP'S submission admits the -significant adverse effects' that the town and it's open spaces would suffer from. - even if flights were mostly in the daytime the level of noise over schools such as Chatham House in central Ramsgate means that Education would be interrupted and life opportunities blighted by noise and particulate pollution.

overhead.

- stress caused by sleep deprivation has been proven to have longterm (but unseen) effects. Riding coronal levels are triggered by aircraft noise (which I have experienced at first hand when the airport was last operational.

- even without night flights (and without these RSP would be unlikely to meet their air movement quota) flights during the -shoulder period disrupt sleep and damage health.

Yours Jacqueline Ansell (on behalf of family of six).