

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: Manston Airport Deadline 8
Date: 14 June 2019 22:55:47

Your reference for me: 20013718

Dear Sirs,

Deadline 8

Since I made my original comments regarding the airport at the initial hearing in January, I find that five months on nothing has changed and my concerns and questions have not been answered by the applicant. I had three points:

1. Before the airport closed, I found low-flying small aircraft immediately above my house very frightening. Due to the very low number of flights at that time; one or two a day for only a few days a week, it was tolerable. This would change. We should be subject to a barrage, an onslaught of large freighter aircraft. I find it difficult to see if my property would be considered by RSP to be under the flight path by the applicant's contour map, however, I am certain that I and my neighbours would be seriously affected since we live very close to the Royal Harbour and are clearly under the flight path. All of us live in a Conservation area. All our houses are listed. We are not permitted to install double glazed windows. Our 191-year-old houses just simply cannot be sound-proofed due to their construction, let alone the constraints of meeting English Heritage's requirements. No amount of monetary compensation would suffice – and how would we fare on those hot days that summer sometimes provides? We couldn't have our windows open, that's for sure. Venturing out into the garden would, instead of a pleasure, become a nightmare. I don't believe the applicant's noise contour map is adequate and neither is the compensation they are suggesting. Please, Inspectors, insist on a realistic noise contour map and some serious and genuine compensation – even up to purchasing any residents' houses at realistic market prices to enable them to move away should this terrible freight hub notion come to fruition.
2. My second concern was about the effects on schools of constant large low-flying aircraft and the disruptive noise they would cause. In addition, since then, others have pointed out the danger to health of emission particles from such aircraft, which would be very concerning indeed as those young people are still in development and their health could consequently be compromised for the whole of their lives.

I see that the applicant has offered some derisory "compensation" to a mere handful of schools. Looking at the 'Schools in Thanet District March 2019' map published by Kent County Council I can see clearly that there are at least ten schools in Ramsgate which will be severely affected by incoming flights:

1. Newington Community Primary School and Nursery
2. St Laurence in Thanet C of E Junior Academy
3. Ellington Infant School
4. Priory Infant School
5. Chatham and Clarendon Grammar School
6. St Ethelbert's Catholic Primary School
7. Chilton Primary School
8. Christ Church Junior School
9. Ramsgate Arts Primary School
10. Newlands Primary School

The effect on schools of one of two low-flying small aeroplanes flying over head at low altitudes on two or three days a week up until the airport closed in 2013 would probably have been negligible, however, the volume of heavy traffic envisaged by the applicant is a totally different

prospect should the plan be accepted. Lessons will be frequently interrupted to the detriment of learning. There is some mention of sound-proofing, however, not all lessons take place indoors. Outdoor education, whether it is sports based, geographical, or wildlife based is essential for our children. No amount of soundproofing will compensate for this. In addition, outdoor play is vitally important for young children. Part of the benefit of being in school rather than being home educated is that our children develop social interaction, much of that is achieved during unstructured playtime; how will that be achieved if their health is at risk from particulates and their ears at risk from noise, every time they venture outside? The compensation offered by the applicant is so far short of what would be needed, it would be laughable if not so serious. There is a potential knock-on effect on schools, too, which may not be immediately obvious. Since teachers have been "paid by results" many have been denied uplifts in their pay by being set impossible targets and then failing to meet them. In this way, schools have managed to meet their own financial targets by keeping their salaries bill low. Teachers in a school where, despite their best efforts, pupils' results decline, do not stay at the school and accept no pay rises for the rest of their career; they seek employment elsewhere where the odds are not stacked against them. A continual heavy turnover of teachers in a school is not healthy for the school's well-being; schools need a balance of old and new teachers to establish continuity and innovation equally. These children are the future of our country – I doubt they would forgive us if this proposal was allowed.

3. My third point was about the congestion on the roads, not just those in the immediate vicinity of the airport and around Thanet, which have been talked about by others, but those which would be severely affected in the South-east of the country by the additional goods lorries and fuel tankers travelling up and down the motorways, mostly the A2/M2 but also the M20 and around the M25, in order to distribute goods to the rest of the country. I submitted a table showing the increase of traffic at just one point where the A2 meets the M25 from the year 2000 to the year 2017 which were the latest published figures I could find. The total number of vehicles at that one junction increased from 27,064 to 37,782 in seventeen years. Add to that number an unknown quantity of freight lorries on a daily basis travelling to and from a Manston freight hub and the logistics become impossible. I travel in that direction no more than once a week, but even at that low rate I am often involved in long hold-ups due to other vehicles' problems. I have been unable, despite contacting Highways England, to find any figures to show just how many hold-ups there are on these essential routes, so I can only speak from my own experience. I missed a dear friend's funeral due to being trapped on the M2 motorway for several hours caused by a single lorry overturning and spilling its contents across the road. I recently missed my own birthday dinner due to one broken down vehicle on the Dartford Bridge causing chaos to the A2/M2 in both directions. This is without the aeroplane fuel tankers and additional goods lorries joining the traffic as proposed by RSP.

This proposal would adversely affect the whole of South East London and North Kent, in particular - not just Thanet. I have heard nothing, in the five months since I submitted my concerns, from the applicants to suggest this will not be a problem, or should it prove to be, how they would solve it. None of my points of concern have been addressed by the applicant in all the time this process has been ongoing. The proposal to reopen Manston as a freight hub is not in the National Interest in any way at all. It will be to the detriment of many thousands and if there should be any benefit to anyone it will be to one or two unknown secret investors in far-away islands.

The applicants have not given any reassurance to address any of my concerns. Please recommend against this proposal.

Jill Saunder-Airs
Ramsgate Resident