

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: Re: Manston Airport (TR020002)
Date: 15 June 2019 01:04:32

Dear Sirs

I am writing again as a concerned resident who strongly opposes RSP's application for a cargo hub on the former Manston Airport site. I have attended many of the hearings and seen the changes made to the application but frankly I find it extraordinary that this application continues but I understand it has to.

It continues to surprise me just how gullible RSP think the ExA and the residents of Ramsgate and Herne Bay are as they think we will take them at their word but their word is not worth a jot. They claim they have sufficient funds for the project but, even though at every deadline they have promised to show the ExA proof of funds, these have never materialised and yet another excuse has been made. (Incidentally, this is exactly what happened when RSP (RiverOak as they were then) tried to persuade two different administrations running TDC at the time when they were trying to obtain the airport via a CPO. They didn't have the money then and they don't have it now; not by any traceable means anyway.

Another claim RSP has made in their application is how the noise will affect residents of Ramsgate and Herne Bay. Their version of the noise created by their plans is so different to the recent submissions on noise from five ten twelve and also that from No Night Flights both which show noise contours obtained via the CAA (which RSP failed to obtain from this authority as producing their own would set the scene as far less damaging and, let's face it, cheaper for RSP by way of compensation as, instead of the few hundred RSP would have to compensate, when the real numbers are examined, this compensation will likely be applicable to thousands of residents. The detailed submissions from five ten twelve and from No Night Flights clearly explain the averaged level of noise that people can be subjected to, but more importantly the actual level of noise that we have in the past and could possibly, in the future, experience, on a daily basis.

I find it astonishing, but quite believable, that these studies were paid for by residents of Ramsgate and Herne Bay because RSP, as is clearly shown, could not be trusted to provide a truthful report on noise that could potentially ruin thousands of people's lives.

With regard to night flights (which most Ramsgate residents are opposed to) as was pointed out at the hearings, even though RSP say they don't want night flights, they are actually planning to have them. If they truthfully did not want night flights then they would not need any Quota Count at all. The ExA need to protect local residents by saying there should be no night flights and therefore a Quota Count should not be included in the application.

To be clear, the ExA and RSP agree that there should be no scheduled or timetabled night

flights. However that does not discount cargo being flown in via chartered flights which is the ONLY method cargo is flown in by. Saying no timetabled flights will show on the record that there were no flights as chartered flights are NEVER timetabled. This is clearly the reason RSP accepted the ExA's change of words regarding night flights. For the sake of the residents' health and well-being, please ensure that unless there are emergency or humanitarian reasons for using Manston at night, there should be no scheduled **or chartered night flights** between 11pm and 7am written into the DCO.

Finally, at the latest hearings a representative of The Ramsgate Society asked a simple question which was so appropriate to why this application should be denied. I paraphrase that pertinent question: If you were planning a new town for a population of over 43,000, would you honestly consider building one less than a mile from a cargo hub with over 17000 atms per annum?

Kind regards

Kim Edgington
Ramsgate resident

From: Manston Airport <ManstonAirport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Sent: 11 June 2019 14:51



Dear Sir/ Madam

**Planning Act 2008 – Section 89 and The Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 8(3)**

**Application by RiverOak Strategic Partners Ltd for an Order Granting
Development Consent to upgrade and reopen Manston Airport**

**Notification of Procedural Decision and consequential variation to
the Examination Timetable**

Your reference: 20014733

Please be advised that the Examining Authority has made a Procedural Decision to issue Fourth Written Questions (ExQ4). This decision causes consequential variations to the Examination Timetable. For more information please visit the link below:

[https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004182-TR020002%20Rule%208\(3\)%20etc%20June%202019.pdf](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004182-TR020002%20Rule%208(3)%20etc%20June%202019.pdf)

If this link does not open automatically, please cut and paste it into your browser.

You can also view the notification on the project page of the National Infrastructure Planning website:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/manston-airport/?ipcsection=docs>

Please contact us if you have any question relating to this notification.

Yours faithfully

Manston Airport Case Team
National Infrastructure Planning
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Web: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/> (National Infrastructure Planning)

Web: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate
(The Planning Inspectorate)

Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.