

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Manston Airport: request for compensation on a par with other UK airport expansions
Date: 23 June 2019 21:44:25
Attachments: [190623 57dB Petition Letter 1 0.pdf](#)
[190623 Petition Signatures Redacted.pdf](#)

Dear Examining Authority,

We note under F.4.2, F4.3, F4.4 of the Fourth Written Questions that the Examining Authority makes reference to consultation through its second draft DCO [PD-018] on a suggested new Requirement 9b stating that:

“Residential properties with habitable rooms within the 60dB LAeq (16 hour) day time contour will be eligible for noise insulation and ventilation detailed in Noise Mitigation Plan.”

We also note the Examining Authority’s rationale for this to be that the Government is currently consulting on a change in relevant policy and that it would be prudent for the Applicant to secure sufficient funding based on a 60dB LAeq (16 hour) threshold rather than the its current plan of 63dB LAeq (16 hour).

Whilst we are very appreciative of the Examining Authority’s direction to the Applicant in this regard we do not believe it goes far enough. Please see attached Deadline 8 submission containing the rationale for this position.

To avoid argument later and to make a robust recommendation to the Secretary of State we respectfully request that the Examining Authority require the Applicant to commit to parity between this scheme and the Noise Mitigation Plans associated with other UK Airport expansion schemes and offer noise insulation and ventilation compensation from 57dB LAeq (16 hour). Details of other UK Airport schemes can be found via the link below, on the ExA portal.

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004385-AS-%20Stone%20Hill%20Park%20-%20Manston%20-%20Urgent%20submission.pdf>

We also request that for the most severely impacted households (63dB LAeq (16 hour) there is no cap on the compensation on offer.

To help the Applicant, the Examining Authority, Local Government and other Government Officials understand the strength of feeling on this issue we have very recently started a petition objecting to the unfairness with which local residents are being treated on this matter. We attach the responses received to date.

This submission is being sent in the name of a group of local residents, Manston Airport: Fair Noise & Insulation Compensation.

We hope very much that you, our County and Local Authority representatives and Mayor and Deputy Mayor of Ramsgate will support us in this request, which would ensure compensation is offered on a par with other airport operator noise mitigation schemes in the south of England.

Yours sincerely,

MAFNIC

Manston Airport Fair Noise Insulation Compensation (MAFNIC)
Deadline 9 Submission

Dear Sirs,

We note under F.4.2, F4.3, F4.4 of the Fourth Written Questions that the Examining Authority makes reference to consultation through its second draft DCO [PD-018] on a suggested new Requirement 9b stating that:

“Residential properties with habitable rooms within the 60dB LAeq (16 hour) day time contour will be eligible for noise insulation and ventilation detailed in Noise Mitigation Plan.”

We also note the Examining Authority’s rationale for this to be that the Government is currently consulting on a change in relevant policy and that it would be prudent for the Applicant to secure sufficient funding based on a 60dB LAeq (16 hour) threshold rather than the its current plan of 63dB LAeq (16 hour).

Whilst we are very appreciative of the Examining Authority’s direction to the Applicant in this regard we do not believe it goes far enough, for the following reasons:

1. The threshold set for financial support to homes and schools is a critical decision that will directly influence the extent of adverse impacts on homeowners’ enjoyment of their homes and local children’s ability to sleep at night and fulfil their potential at school. **60dB LAeq (16 hour) fails to take account of the latest scientific evidence regarding the adverse impacts of aviation noise on health and wellbeing** (World Health Organisation on Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region 2018) which provides ‘strong guidance’ to mitigate the impacts of aviation noise at much lower noise thresholds
2. In its D8 submission [REP 8-027] **Kent County Council has reiterated its request of the Examining Authority to adhere to the WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines**, originally submitted in its D3 Local Impact Report paragraph 2.14 [REP 3-143]
3. **60dB LAeq (16 hour) is not on a par with other expanding UK airports** including London Heathrow; London Stanstead; London City Airport; Bristol Airport all of which will compensate residents at 57dB LAeq (16 hour)
4. The Applicant continues to fail to provide clarity on night flight ATMs, QCs, hours of operation, numbers of chartered, scheduled and timetabled night flights; numbers of night flights excluding emergency landings. **It is therefore currently IMPOSSIBLE to obtain a reliable view of likely night noise impacts from which to base night noise mitigation compensation thresholds.** This is unacceptable. Noise goes to the very heart of Hatton & Others v The United Kingdom which demonstrates Articles 8 and 13 of the European Convention for Human Rights to be engaged in cases of Aviation noise. In the absence of reliable night noise contours from which to enhance the mitigation offer we believe parity with other reputable airport operators based on daytime measures to be all the more important

Manston Airport Fair Noise Insulation Compensation (MAFNIC)
Deadline 9 Submission

5. **Manston Airport is closed. It has been closed for over 5 years.** Added to which local residents have never experienced aviation noise and the number of ATMs on the scale proposed by the Applicant. This application is not about an incremental increase in existing Aviation noise levels but rather an absolute increase in Aviation noise in the area. The impact cannot be overstated, especially for homeowners who have bought in this time and were not made aware of aspirations to reopen Manston
6. Noise contour thresholds are averages. Consequently, even at >53,000 ATMs per annum it is important to recognise that the lesser number of ATMs at Manston means that each noise event triggered by Manston will be significantly louder within a given noise contour than each noise event in London in that same noise contour. If this Applicant achieves its current plans then this will result in c145 daily, deafening intrusions into our homes and lives, our children's education and sleep, our town's health and wellbeing. This is corroborated by historic lived experience and the No Night Flights D8 submission [REP AS-156] that shows based on the noise contours from the Civil Aviation Authority that **over 22,000 households will experience >80dB when a B747-400G departs to the East.**

To avoid argument later and to make a robust recommendation to the Secretary of State we respectfully request that the Examining Authority require the Applicant to commit to parity between this scheme and the Noise Mitigation Plans associated with other UK Airport expansion schemes and offer noise insulation and ventilation compensation from 57dB LAeq (16 hour).

We also request that for the most severely impacted households (63dB LAeq (16 hour) there is no cap on the compensation on offer.

To help the Applicant, the Examining Authority, Local Government and other National Government Officials understand the strength of feeling on this issue we have very recently started a petition objecting to the unfairness with which local residents are being treated on this matter. We attach the responses received to date.

Regards,
Manston Airport Fair Noise Insulation Compensation (MAFNIC)



This petition has collected
535 signatures
using the online tools at www.ipetitions.com

Printed on 2019-06-23

GIVE THANET SAME PROTECTION AS LONDON AGAINST AIRCRAFT NOISE

About this petition

Over 6,000 homes in Thanet could be missing out on noise compensation of up to £10,000 each from the proposed airport development at Manston.

At the moment just 225 homes will qualify for this important financial support. You can do something about this by signing this petition

Airport developers Riveroak Strategic Partners (RSP) are planning to develop a cargo airport that will create significant disruption from low flying aircraft to houses under the Manston flight path.

RSP are using noise levels of 63dB (decibels) for compensation. London City Airport operators are offering compensation at 57dB .

At that level up to 6,500 homes in Thanet should be entitled to compensation .

If you think that RSP should be doing more to protect Thanet residents and that compensation should start at the same level as London City Airport (57dB) then register your support and sign the petition today.

To see how the proposed cargo hub at Manston really affects you click here: [Ramsgate Voice](#)

(To find out if you are one of the 225 households eligible for compensation under Riveroak's currently inadequate threshold, click on the link and scroll to Appendix A: <http://tiny.cc/bya67y>)

Want to find out more about the health impacts of noise and International guidelines on noise protection?

The World Health Organisation in its report, Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region 2018 states:

"For average noise exposure, the GDG strongly recommends reducing noise levels produced by aircraft below 45 dB Lden, as aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse health effects.

For night noise exposure, the GDG strongly recommends reducing noise levels produced by aircraft during night time below 40 dB Lnight, as aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse effects on sleep."

This report is available online.

Signatures

1. Name: A Nixey on 2019-06-14 15:28:07
Comments: This information is crucial to residents of Ramsgate. Compensation starts at 63db in rsp's proposals, but 57db in other airports where residents are further away!

2. Name: Laura on 2019-06-14 15:37:49
Comments:

3. Name: Dr Philip Shotton on 2019-06-14 15:51:48
Comments:

4. Name: H Frencken on 2019-06-14 17:15:29
Comments: If London City Airport offers compensation/mitigation starting at 57dB Leq16, why should RiverOak not offer the same.
Are we second class citizens??

5. Name: Susan Kennedy on 2019-06-14 22:06:32
Comments: RSP's noise contour modelling downplays the significant noise that will impact thousands of people/homes. Their noise mitigation plan is derisory.

6. Name: Georgina Rooke on 2019-06-15 00:25:09
Comments: Any airport operator at Manston should provide appropriate compensation to sound-proof local homes and schools under the flight path

7. Name: Samara Jones-Hall on 2019-06-15 10:54:42
Comments:

8. Name: C Mullin on 2019-06-15 11:04:24
Comments:

9. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 11:22:11
Comments: There shouldn't be an airport here at all... It is not viable - therefore will not create the promised benefits - RSP have no money, so can't pay for development OR employees and it will destroy Ramsgate and set us back 30 years. REFUSE the DCO.

10. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 13:44:10
Comments: I hope Manston NEVER reopens. It will destroy Ramsgate and its tourism with cargo flights every 10 minutes 24/7. Pollution and noise will blight the people and visitors of Ramsgate.

11. Name: Cllr David Green on 2019-06-15 14:14:01
Comments:

12. Name: Paul on 2019-06-15 14:45:48
Comments:
-
13. Name: lucas harding on 2019-06-15 15:06:28
Comments:
-
14. Name: Peter Scott on 2019-06-15 15:10:37
Comments:
-
15. Name: Rita Burns on 2019-06-15 15:14:06
Comments:
-
16. Name: Simon Crow on 2019-06-15 15:19:51
Comments:
-
17. Name: Jill Pulman on 2019-06-15 15:26:52
Comments: Scandalous!
-
18. Name: Laven on 2019-06-15 15:31:13
Comments:
-
19. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 15:33:46
Comments:
-
20. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 15:34:39
Comments:
-
21. Name: Ken wraight on 2019-06-15 15:35:05
Comments: Yes we deserve the same protection
-
22. Name: Sophie Fowler on 2019-06-15 15:36:39
Comments:
-
23. Name: Kevin Coller on 2019-06-15 15:46:36
Comments:
-
24. Name: Thomas Norton on 2019-06-15 15:46:37
Comments:
-
25. Name: James Chappell on 2019-06-15 15:48:02
Comments: Quite right too.
-

26. Name: Barbara Warner on 2019-06-15 16:04:51
Comments:
-
27. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 16:11:23
Comments:
-
28. Name: Dan Johnston on 2019-06-15 16:19:54
Comments:
-
29. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 16:25:41
Comments:
-
30. Name: Paul Dawkins on 2019-06-15 16:28:46
Comments: RSP need to lower the noise level and compensate all the homes under the flight paths
-
31. Name: Mike Wood on 2019-06-15 17:11:13
Comments:
-
32. Name: Ns on 2019-06-15 17:13:44
Comments:
-
33. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 17:16:09
Comments: Ramsgate residents must have parity with London residents for all the disturbances they will suffer.
-
34. Name: Ian Scott on 2019-06-15 17:25:13
Comments: We live directly under the flight path and will get nothing.
-
35. Name: Kim Edgington on 2019-06-15 17:28:51
Comments:
-
36. Name: Nikke Hollins on 2019-06-15 17:35:33
Comments:
-
37. Name: Ben Chester on 2019-06-15 17:58:23
Comments:
-
38. Name: Jason Jones-Hall on 2019-06-15 18:02:11
Comments: DO NOT GRANT THE DCO! Mitigation is not possible for Ramsgate's glorious Royal Harbour or burgeoning tourism industry and no amount of compensation will replace this.
-

39. Name: Dawn Cole on 2019-06-15 18:02:27
Comments: Thanet resident
-
40. Name: David Beeching on 2019-06-15 18:08:00
Comments: All cargo planes due to age are more noisy.
-
41. Name: Trevor Roper on 2019-06-15 18:11:12
Comments: The money will not improve the quality of life of those effected, but it would at least show that someone cares!
-
42. Name: Michelle Meyer-Masterson on 2019-06-15 18:23:20
Comments:
-
43. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 18:28:55
Comments:
-
44. Name: Joseph Dance on 2019-06-15 18:37:57
Comments:
-
45. Name: Gilbert House on 2019-06-15 18:45:12
Comments:
-
46. Name: Hilary Scott on 2019-06-15 18:55:34
Comments:
-
47. Name: Fiona Simmons on 2019-06-15 18:59:58
Comments: I live in Ramsgate and am appalled by the proposals to reopen the airport and sacrifice the health and wellbeing of my community, as well as our many sites of special environmental protection. All at a time when global warming dictates that we must cut back emissions from air traffic.
-
48. Name: Heather James on 2019-06-15 19:16:31
Comments: The suggestion that such small number of people will be affected by this proposal in terms of noise and disruption is quite ridiculous. It is obvious that a huge number of residents of Ramsgate and the surrounding area will be adversely affected by these proposals.
River Oak have got their numbers wrong either deliberately or because they have not actually conducted proper research
-
49. Name: Stephen Melton on 2019-06-15 19:26:20
Comments: The airport would make Ramsgate an extremely undesirable place to live.
-
50. Name: Rebecca Hyman on 2019-06-15 19:29:13
Comments:

-
51. Name: Jennifer Selmes on 2019-06-15 19:35:30
Comments: We will be severely affected by noise and air pollution.
-
52. Name: David Cooper on 2019-06-15 19:40:00
Comments:
-
53. Name: Andrew kitchener on 2019-06-15 19:46:20
Comments: Will suffer from the noise if the airport opens as the planes will fly over my house
-
54. Name: TR Fennell on 2019-06-15 20:30:44
Comments:
-
55. Name: Fiona De bulat on 2019-06-15 21:08:50
Comments:
-
56. Name: Laurie Hudson on 2019-06-15 21:35:49
Comments: Penny pinching RSP cannot afford to run an airport so they want to avoid mitigation cost
-
57. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 21:43:04
Comments:
-
58. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-15 21:50:55
Comments:
-
59. Name: Sue Gyde on 2019-06-15 21:53:31
Comments: All residences that have increased noise from new airport should get compensation at the same level as London
-
60. Name: Kay Norton on 2019-06-15 22:07:01
Comments:
-
61. Name: Denis booth on 2019-06-15 22:40:40
Comments: I need massive sound insulation and compensation for noise and pollution against my home and life.
-
62. Name: Vivien on 2019-06-15 22:47:46
Comments:
-
63. Name: Barrie Coombs on 2019-06-15 23:15:03

Comments: For ruined lives

64. Name: Jacqueline McBride on 2019-06-15 23:22:42
Comments:

65. Name: Sally Tedder on 2019-06-16 02:20:34
Comments:

66. Name: David Payne on 2019-06-16 04:56:59
Comments:

67. Name: Diana Turner on 2019-06-16 06:11:44
Comments: We need to protect every citizen in the UK from noise and pollution.

68. Name: Janet Davies on 2019-06-16 06:18:47
Comments: 57dB at night is appallingly loud. When the cargo plains came in low over our 200 yr old houses, they shook.

69. Name: Lynne wallis on 2019-06-16 06:41:33
Comments: We need be properly compensated if this monstrous project goes ahead. Why should we be offered less for having higher noise levels imposed on us than elsewhere?

70. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 07:09:55
Comments: Why should I have to put up with aircraft noise because someone wants to start up a cargo hub down the road. The SPL limits for London are far too high. Why should quiet rural communities put up with even higher sound levels. No thanks.

71. Name: Ronald Blay on 2019-06-16 07:17:19
Comments: RSP are trying to pull a money saving fast one and must be stopped

72. Name: Jonathan Bradley on 2019-06-16 08:12:15
Comments:

73. Name: Ros McIntyre on 2019-06-16 08:30:55
Comments:

74. Name: Matthew Griffiths on 2019-06-16 08:36:07
Comments:

75. Name: Toby on 2019-06-16 08:46:06
Comments: I live in manston. My bedroom window overlooks where the planes start. When i was a baby the funes used to come in my room so my parents would have to shut

the window and put sheets up. I love manston but the planes are a pain and so would the people be if they moved into the airport. So this seems like the only good viable option

76. Name: Rebekah Smith on 2019-06-16 08:58:31
Comments: My house and bed and breakfast business falls within the contours where I can expect significant disruption and not only will I be affected, my business will suffer dramatically as clearly if you stay in a bed and breakfast, you expect a good night's sleep.
-
77. Name: Susan Carroll on 2019-06-16 09:06:22
Comments:
-
78. Name: Diana Cox on 2019-06-16 09:09:50
Comments:
-
79. Name: Ceri diffley on 2019-06-16 09:10:55
Comments:
-
80. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 09:18:19
Comments:
-
81. Name: Raushan Ara Rahman on 2019-06-16 09:19:07
Comments:
-
82. Name: Mrs Janice Best on 2019-06-16 09:22:15
Comments: I live right under flight path and my family are dreading the though if the airport opening as a cargo hub.
-
83. Name: Michael Saxton on 2019-06-16 09:24:21
Comments: I do not agree with the airport dealing with freight as it will ruin the environment and the resort
-
84. Name: Elizabeth Green on 2019-06-16 09:24:40
Comments:
-
85. Name: Natalie Hancock on 2019-06-16 09:28:13
Comments: We deserve parity
-
86. Name: Paul Naudin on 2019-06-16 09:38:28
Comments:
-
87. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 09:38:47
Comments:

-
88. Name: Katie Gerrard on 2019-06-16 09:38:48
Comments:
-
89. Name: Matt Feekings on 2019-06-16 09:39:19
Comments: With the noise quota they have applied for and proposal allowing the use of aircraft banned at other airports due to the noise they emit, even if you support this application, why should the sound level criteria, at the very least, be any less than other airports!
-
90. Name: Kenneth Wildon on 2019-06-16 09:54:17
Comments: Surely it would be criminal not to provide people in one part of the country with the same protection as in another?
-
91. Name: Jim Plimmer on 2019-06-16 09:55:30
Comments:
-
92. Name: Jane Hetherington on 2019-06-16 10:18:44
Comments:
-
93. Name: Bunny La roche on 2019-06-16 10:22:06
Comments:
-
94. Name: JASON ROBBINS on 2019-06-16 10:26:59
Comments:
-
95. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 10:44:23
Comments:
-
96. Name: Lesley Streeter on 2019-06-16 10:44:29
Comments:
-
97. Name: Phil Shotton on 2019-06-16 10:54:16
Comments:
-
98. Name: Margot Bandola on 2019-06-16 11:02:29
Comments:
-
99. Name: Raymond Burns on 2019-06-16 11:04:04
Comments:
-
100. Name: Tony Ovenden on 2019-06-16 11:05:55

Comments:

101. Name: Samantha Smith on 2019-06-16 11:08:13
Comments:

102. Name: chris mills on 2019-06-16 11:15:25
Comments:

103. Name: Claire dugue on 2019-06-16 11:28:02
Comments:

104. Name: Lynne Goff on 2019-06-16 11:38:47
Comments:

105. Name: Peter collard on 2019-06-16 11:40:55
Comments:

106. Name: Col Longmore on 2019-06-16 11:51:13
Comments: My home will be blighted by aircraft coming into land, day or night.

107. Name: Mark Tilton on 2019-06-16 11:52:56
Comments:

108. Name: Patrick Lucas on 2019-06-16 12:02:06
Comments: We are directly under the flight path, and within a mile of the runway! All of Thanet should get compensation for the noise suffered!

109. Name: Dave Ford on 2019-06-16 12:18:10
Comments:

110. Name: Christine isted on 2019-06-16 12:27:36
Comments: Against proposals for manston Aircraft

111. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 12:41:01
Comments:

112. Name: Cathy on 2019-06-16 12:54:01
Comments:

113. Name: Doreen Brown on 2019-06-16 12:55:55
Comments: £10,000 is a joke. Would not compensate for quality of life ruined, and business ruined too.

-
114. Name: Jo Mallett on 2019-06-16 13:05:29
Comments: NO AIRPORT NO NIGHT FLIGHTS
When will sense prevail and ditch this ludicrous proposal for ruining Ramsgate.
No amount of compensation can allow us to sleep without disturbance or protect our children from interrupted education and inevitable pollution.
-
115. Name: Maggie Whiteman on 2019-06-16 13:08:47
Comments:
-
116. Name: Michelle Vincent Baines on 2019-06-16 13:16:43
Comments:
-
117. Name: Catherine Gardiner on 2019-06-16 13:17:30
Comments:
-
118. Name: Alan Ashby on 2019-06-16 13:21:59
Comments: Go for it.
-
119. Name: Heather Perkins on 2019-06-16 13:25:57
Comments:
-
120. Name: Deb Shotton on 2019-06-16 13:35:24
Comments: It's only fair! This part of the country is poor enough. It shouldn't be discriminated against in this way.
-
121. Name: Keith Owen on 2019-06-16 13:35:40
Comments:
-
122. Name: Paul Hudson on 2019-06-16 13:39:14
Comments:
-
123. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 13:46:38
Comments:
-
124. Name: ANDREW CROOK on 2019-06-16 13:50:11
Comments: I am directly under the flight path in Rydal ave.
-
125. Name: Steve Black on 2019-06-16 13:50:54
Comments:
-
126. Name: Tiago Gambogi on 2019-06-16 14:07:38

Comments:

127. Name: Daniela Flowerdew on 2019-06-16 14:22:05
Comments: Who do our local MPs (Roger Gale and Craig Mackinley), who are supposed to represent our interests, consider our lives and health of less value than that of Londoners. It is bad enough that they refuse to take the concerns of local people seriously and push for this plan without properly publicising and consulting. This idea that Thanet residents can just put up with it, even though other areas of the country wouldn't sums up the appalling attitude of these two MPs to their constituents. They are more interested in their own business deals than the local people. Needless to say, neither of them is under the flight path. They are true members of the 'Nasty Party' and the ultimate hypocrits
-
128. Name: andrew mansfield on 2019-06-16 14:24:27
Comments:
-
129. Name: Harriet Needham-Steddy on 2019-06-16 14:33:54
Comments: I'm signing this because, my house is right near where the airport will be and the noise will disrupt the peace and quiet I enjoy. And also, being ill which means I'm tired nearly all the time, it won't help me to sleep to have aircraft flying over my house.
-
130. Name: Yvette Graham on 2019-06-16 15:00:53
Comments:
-
131. Name: Jennifer Rath on 2019-06-16 15:09:39
Comments: I oppose the opening of the defunct mansion airport on every level, there is nothing that is good about it
-
132. Name: Cary Elcome on 2019-06-16 15:20:26
Comments:
-
133. Name: Peter Batt on 2019-06-16 15:22:44
Comments: The air freight hub would be a disaster for Thanet and its residents. The noise alone will wreck our quality of life, along with the district's tourism industry. The plan is madness.
-
134. Name: Olivia on 2019-06-16 15:26:28
Comments:
-
135. Name: Jeni Butler on 2019-06-16 15:27:24
Comments: If this terrible proposal/land grab goes ahead it will destroy jobs, devalue homes and damage the health and education of so many people - of course those affected should be compensated for this!
-

136. Name: Chris Lowe on 2019-06-16 15:41:08
Comments:
-
137. Name: Andy Hodder on 2019-06-16 15:41:23
Comments:
-
138. Name: Chris Welch on 2019-06-16 15:57:32
Comments:
-
139. Name: Karen Constantine on 2019-06-16 15:58:55
Comments:
-
140. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 16:02:03
Comments:
-
141. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 16:06:04
Comments: The airport will blight our town. It always was very noisy and I've enjoyed the peace since it stopped!
-
142. Name: Vivienne Yankah on 2019-06-16 16:13:52
Comments:
-
143. Name: Clare Dove on 2019-06-16 16:15:22
Comments: Compensation is no substitute for not having a noise and air polluting freight airport. But to unjustly penalise the residents, including lowering the value of their homes, is wrong, RSP clearly has financial problems but to be cheapskates in respect of devaluing peaceful amenity of the residents is nothing short of anti-social behaviour.
-
144. Name: Valerie Wicks on 2019-06-16 16:15:47
Comments:
-
145. Name: Jo Hanchett on 2019-06-16 16:18:42
Comments: Of course we need to be compensated in line with London
-
146. Name: Chris Gell on 2019-06-16 16:35:06
Comments: If anything it should be higher than in London as noise levels are greater there than in Ramsgate.
-
147. Name: Andrew Jordan on 2019-06-16 16:40:10
Comments:
-
148. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 16:51:18
Comments: It is only right

-
149. Name: Fotios Pantelios on 2019-06-16 16:52:59
Comments:
-
150. Name: Sandra Brightman on 2019-06-16 16:54:22
Comments:
-
151. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 16:54:24
Comments:
-
152. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 16:55:11
Comments:
-
153. Name: Pippa Thorman on 2019-06-16 16:56:03
Comments: Just another injustice, but we hope that Manston Airport never happens! That will be the proper outcome.
-
154. Name: Kanndiss Riley on 2019-06-16 16:58:53
Comments:
-
155. Name: Lisa Francis on 2019-06-16 17:01:27
Comments:
-
156. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 17:08:30
Comments:
-
157. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 17:08:35
Comments:
-
158. Name: John Iaven on 2019-06-16 17:16:08
Comments:
-
159. Name: Annie Sutton on 2019-06-16 17:25:27
Comments:
-
160. Name: Heidi Rogers on 2019-06-16 17:26:15
Comments:
-
161. Name: Dawn Sandison on 2019-06-16 17:27:36
Comments:
-
162. Name: Steve Alexandrou on 2019-06-16 17:39:37

Comments: This failure of an airfield must not happen, however with the idiocy of the local government without vision and the MPs of the same supporting a multiple time failed airfield for there own gains, we must not have night flights for the sake of residents and many schools which will be effected. Substantial compensation for loss of quality of life, pollution, and home price drops we demand large compensation per home within a quarter mile of the flight path and under it.

163. Name: Jacqui ansell on 2019-06-16 17:51:43
Comments:

164. Name: Martin Northrop on 2019-06-16 17:57:49
Comments: Why are we different to London?

165. Name: Guy Foord-Kelcey on 2019-06-16 17:59:28
Comments:

166. Name: Frances Turton on 2019-06-16 18:02:53
Comments:

167. Name: Barbara Quittenden on 2019-06-16 18:03:40
Comments:

168. Name: Denis on 2019-06-16 18:03:56
Comments: Parity with London 57db

169. Name: Susan Murray on 2019-06-16 18:12:57
Comments:

170. Name: Margaret Symonds on 2019-06-16 18:16:54
Comments:

171. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 18:19:52
Comments:

172. Name: Susan Holton on 2019-06-16 18:27:48
Comments:

173. Name: Mr Roger Gifford on 2019-06-16 18:29:40
Comments:

174. Name: Janet Wilmer on 2019-06-16 18:31:48
Comments:

175. Name: Mike slade on 2019-06-16 18:32:51
Comments:

176. Name: Rober wilmer on 2019-06-16 18:33:08
Comments:

177. Name: Rosie Eaglen on 2019-06-16 18:35:28
Comments:

178. Name: Clare Rosay on 2019-06-16 18:42:55
Comments:

179. Name: Matt Baker on 2019-06-16 18:53:15
Comments:

180. Name: peter boosey on 2019-06-16 19:00:29
Comments:

181. Name: Jan Petersen on 2019-06-16 19:29:32
Comments:

182. Name: Karen Dewing on 2019-06-16 19:33:15
Comments:

183. Name: Carly Jeffrey on 2019-06-16 19:33:41
Comments:

184. Name: Tina St George on 2019-06-16 19:38:20
Comments:

185. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 19:38:35
Comments:

186. Name: Amanda Woodrooffe on 2019-06-16 19:43:39
Comments:

187. Name: Desmond Cullen on 2019-06-16 19:50:55
Comments:

188. Name: Greg Shapland on 2019-06-16 19:56:21
Comments:

189. Name: Alan Yeomans on 2019-06-16 20:01:12
Comments:
-
190. Name: Andrew Dimoglou on 2019-06-16 20:06:58
Comments:
-
191. Name: Chris Warner on 2019-06-16 20:09:22
Comments:
-
192. Name: Julia Phibbs on 2019-06-16 20:10:14
Comments:
-
193. Name: Andrea Slaughter on 2019-06-16 20:42:51
Comments:
-
194. Name: Amelia on 2019-06-16 20:51:50
Comments:
-
195. Name: Robert Flint on 2019-06-16 20:54:38
Comments:
-
196. Name: Chloé Ralph Harding on 2019-06-16 21:02:20
Comments: Give Thanet same rights
-
197. Name: Stephen Davies on 2019-06-16 21:03:33
Comments: All airport operators equally should be held to the same standard for noise and nuisance. If the Manston plans go ahead are our ears in Kent any less sensitive than those in the neighbourhood of London City Airport?
-
198. Name: Jane Roberts on 2019-06-16 21:08:26
Comments:
-
199. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 21:12:21
Comments: Thanet should have a future is in tourism, services and innovation - not noisy, smelly polluting cargo planes
-
200. Name: Veronica Pratt on 2019-06-16 21:16:12
Comments:
-
201. Name: Natasha H on 2019-06-16 21:24:16
Comments:
-

202. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 21:25:50
Comments:

203. Name: Philip Coulson on 2019-06-16 21:26:25
Comments:

204. Name: Nikki Hildesley on 2019-06-16 21:32:02
Comments:

205. Name: Deborah Walsh on 2019-06-16 21:34:23
Comments:

206. Name: Linda Mockett on 2019-06-16 21:50:29
Comments:

207. Name: Sandra Rafferty on 2019-06-16 21:58:50
Comments:

208. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-16 22:58:14
Comments: The RSP figure is outdated like the rest of their application.

209. Name: Christine Tongue on 2019-06-16 23:06:36
Comments:

210. Name: Jaimee on 2019-06-16 23:30:00
Comments:

211. Name: Samantha Ohara on 2019-06-17 05:19:12
Comments:

212. Name: Christine Hudson on 2019-06-17 05:56:45
Comments:

213. Name: Tricia Austin on 2019-06-17 06:16:13
Comments:

214. Name: Michael Holton on 2019-06-17 06:21:06
Comments:

215. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 06:28:30
Comments:

216. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 06:46:35
Comments: I'm assuming this is academic but of course wider compensation would be needed should this terrible idea somehow go ahead
-
217. Name: Lorraine Best on 2019-06-17 07:11:38
Comments: Please give alongside affected by the possible reopening of Manston compensation
-
218. Name: Walter Finn on 2019-06-17 07:29:40
Comments:
-
219. Name: David Neiles on 2019-06-17 07:54:50
Comments: What is proposed is tottally unacceptable, its against all planning conditions and what would be outlined in a S106 which should be issued by the planners and Thanet Council, this is a legal requirement.
-
220. Name: Tracie Ha'ris on 2019-06-17 08:14:51
Comments:
-
221. Name: Dennis Pointer on 2019-06-17 08:20:19
Comments: We are outside the compensation area, although will have substantial noise pollution if previous experience is anything to go by.
-
222. Name: Paula Myers on 2019-06-17 08:30:12
Comments:
-
223. Name: Jason Cross on 2019-06-17 08:31:07
Comments:
-
224. Name: Kim Phaedona on 2019-06-17 08:53:21
Comments: I live in the flight path and sometimes planes have flown low over my house. The planes take off in the other direction but if they have taken off in our direction then it has been noisy . If there are night flights this will cause sleeping problems. Also aggravate people with anxiety and stress related illnesses.
-
225. Name: Alan Maxted on 2019-06-17 08:56:18
Comments:
-
226. Name: Patricia P on 2019-06-17 09:09:56
Comments: Let's hope no airport is ever given permission to operate from Manston again.
-
227. Name: Raymond may on 2019-06-17 09:15:07
Comments: RSP are trying depress the rightful compensation level to minimise their costs as their financial status is as dodgy as a black marketeers'.

-
228. Name: Ronald Shewen on 2019-06-17 09:17:27
Comments:
-
229. Name: Christine Pointer on 2019-06-17 09:39:01
Comments: I consider the area indicated as totally unrealistic .
Having lived here since the 70s I know what the noise is like and how low they can come in. I am against the return of an airport due pollution and noise effects.
-
230. Name: Debz Robinson on 2019-06-17 10:04:56
Comments:
-
231. Name: Kay Smith on 2019-06-17 10:14:49
Comments: Why put an airport that is not needed, in a place nowhere near a motorway?
Why destroy the tourism industry in Thanet with 24/7 noise from cargo planes?
-
232. Name: Dave Macmillan on 2019-06-17 10:25:51
Comments: It is outrageous that RSP should consider the acoustic impact of this airport operation should not be properly compensated, not only with the noise levels but, with the devaluation of property prices on the area.
-
233. Name: Jill Macmillan on 2019-06-17 10:29:57
Comments: It is wrong that full compensation to London City airport levels is not being proposed by RSP. Besides the acoustic level we would be subjected to, property prices would certainly be affected.
-
234. Name: Tracy Williams on 2019-06-17 10:49:02
Comments:
-
235. Name: Will Holman on 2019-06-17 11:01:47
Comments: This is outrageous - the whole process is corrupt.
-
236. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 11:23:21
Comments:
-
237. Name: marianne dissard on 2019-06-17 11:33:22
Comments:
-
238. Name: evelyn on 2019-06-17 11:36:33
Comments:
-
239. Name: Cheryl Nichol on 2019-06-17 11:40:28
Comments:

240. Name: Derk Smith on 2019-06-17 11:57:48
Comments:

241. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 12:06:06
Comments: The climate emergency says no more new airports!

242. Name: Mark on 2019-06-17 12:12:13
Comments:

243. Name: Stephanie Lafourcade on 2019-06-17 12:15:45
Comments: Show me the money

244. Name: Grahame Birchall on 2019-06-17 12:31:29
Comments:

245. Name: A Redvers-Mutton on 2019-06-17 12:48:33
Comments:

246. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 12:48:59
Comments:

247. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 12:51:38
Comments:

248. Name: Jean Robinson on 2019-06-17 13:22:21
Comments:

249. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 13:26:08
Comments:

250. Name: Leanne Brown on 2019-06-17 13:30:36
Comments:

251. Name: Antonia on 2019-06-17 13:34:43
Comments:

252. Name: Chris Whitley on 2019-06-17 13:42:26
Comments:

253. Name: Margaret Taggart on 2019-06-17 13:56:14
Comments: Just hope noise is not too bad moved here for peace and quite lived near

Heathrow airport planes every minute that one of the reasons I moved

254. Name: Terence Connor on 2019-06-17 13:58:40
Comments:

255. Name: David Cornelius on 2019-06-17 14:33:21
Comments: I don't want a cargo hub at the Manston site. Old heavy planes flying low over Ramsgate is a recipe for a huge number of casualties should something go wrong.

256. Name: Ernest Perkins on 2019-06-17 14:34:22
Comments:

257. Name: Simon Boswell on 2019-06-17 14:36:13
Comments:

258. Name: Samantha Holmans on 2019-06-17 14:57:20
Comments: Ramsgate residents should be entitled to the same compensation as London residents blighted by aircraft noise.

259. Name: edward and rose baldwinson on 2019-06-17 15:00:26
Comments: as they fly directly over our heads on the nethercourt any flights would be intolerable

260. Name: Talma Gow on 2019-06-17 15:16:31
Comments:

261. Name: Jezz Etheridge on 2019-06-17 15:29:53
Comments:

262. Name: Christopher Penny on 2019-06-17 15:38:46
Comments:

263. Name: Alan Currie on 2019-06-17 15:42:52
Comments:

264. Name: Owen Thomas on 2019-06-17 15:45:02
Comments:

265. Name: Jane Stow on 2019-06-17 15:49:54
Comments: The noise and disruption was unacceptable last time the airport was open!

266. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 16:12:07

Comments: If this joke of an Freight Airport from RSP goes ahead then residents of Thanet should be compensated for all the noise and air pollution that we will experience

267. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 16:13:11
Comments:

268. Name: Daniel Alger on 2019-06-17 16:21:53
Comments:

269. Name: Eudu on 2019-06-17 16:39:57
Comments:

270. Name: Karen Hodgson on 2019-06-17 16:47:29
Comments:

271. Name: Andre Hessler on 2019-06-17 17:19:45
Comments:

272. Name: Karen Roper on 2019-06-17 18:15:24
Comments: RSP adopts a cavalier attitude towards the undoubted effects of a large cargo hub airport upon the health of Thanet residents living within a 6 mile radius, and 26 miles downwind of the proposed airport. Already suffering the worst health record in Kent (a fact which RSP appears to cynically use as a justification for this exploitation) , Thanet residents deserve at least the same consideration as those residing near Heathrow.

273. Name: John Walker on 2019-06-17 18:17:27
Comments: The RSP noise mitigation proposals are totally unacceptable

274. Name: Rosemary on 2019-06-17 18:25:58
Comments:

275. Name: Monica Tobon on 2019-06-17 18:37:05
Comments:

276. Name: Ashley-James Turner on 2019-06-17 18:38:22
Comments: We live less than 200 metres from the airport and are apparently not eligible for the support!!!

277. Name: Federica Fimognari on 2019-06-17 18:41:21
Comments:

278. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 18:45:18

Comments:

-
279. Name: Emily Peasgood on 2019-06-17 18:58:39
Comments:
-
280. Name: Kai toenjes on 2019-06-17 19:03:37
Comments:
-
281. Name: Graeme on 2019-06-17 19:21:15
Comments: This airport will definitely be nothing but the most horrendous nightmare for my whole family!!
-
282. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 19:23:46
Comments:
-
283. Name: Lynda on 2019-06-17 19:26:06
Comments: If this madness of a airport ever happened the people of thanet should be given the same compensation as London
-
284. Name: T Bolder on 2019-06-17 19:44:07
Comments: My house is directly under the flight path, we suffered from loud aircraft noise when the airport was functioning as an airport
-
285. Name: Max Lunn on 2019-06-17 19:47:28
Comments: Noise is one issue the pollution is another. Ramsgate is a historic town that will loose tourists and investment.
-
286. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 19:48:34
Comments:
-
287. Name: Harry Best on 2019-06-17 19:57:22
Comments: Please make sure we all get treated equally regardless of what airport we live near
-
288. Name: Stuart Carter on 2019-06-17 20:08:22
Comments:
-
289. Name: Andrew Bayross on 2019-06-17 20:11:45
Comments: RSP clearly gave no care for local residents and are doing the absolute bare minimum
-
290. Name: Kit Jolly on 2019-06-17 20:14:43
Comments:

-
291. Name: Jay Perry on 2019-06-17 20:15:20
Comments: If Manston is such s fantastic economic opportunity, why shouldn't people be properly compensated for the blight it will cause?
-
292. Name: Cherisse Thorne on 2019-06-17 20:43:15
Comments: This would be a disaster for residents of Ramsgate and I am opposed to the airport.
-
293. Name: Theresa Smith on 2019-06-17 20:44:50
Comments:
-
294. Name: Gabriel Holland on 2019-06-17 20:55:26
Comments:
-
295. Name: Georgie Thorman on 2019-06-17 21:05:06
Comments:
-
296. Name: Becky Wing on 2019-06-17 21:14:05
Comments:
-
297. Name: Maureen Elliott on 2019-06-17 21:25:21
Comments:
-
298. Name: Zuza Atkinson on 2019-06-17 21:36:36
Comments:
-
299. Name: Ian Atkinson on 2019-06-17 21:37:44
Comments:
-
300. Name: Marta Kucharska on 2019-06-17 21:39:05
Comments:
-
301. Name: Michael Bannon on 2019-06-17 21:39:37
Comments:
-
302. Name: Margaret Ward on 2019-06-17 21:43:02
Comments:
-
303. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 21:47:39
Comments:
-

304. Name: F Donnachie on 2019-06-17 22:08:14
Comments:
-
305. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-17 22:29:31
Comments: No resident in the whole of the flight path should suffer any detrimental impact on their existing quality of life without full and proper compensation.
-
306. Name: Britt Steine on 2019-06-17 22:32:28
Comments: Thanet residents should have the same protection/rights as those in the rest of the country including our capital city.
-
307. Name: Angie on 2019-06-17 22:53:11
Comments: I am totally against this cargo hub. We need to stop this proposal. To protect our ramsgate.
-
308. Name: Marta Kucharska on 2019-06-17 23:11:11
Comments:
-
309. Name: Shahla Rushworth on 2019-06-18 05:22:24
Comments:
-
310. Name: Nicola Deacon on 2019-06-18 05:22:37
Comments:
-
311. Name: Mike Garner on 2019-06-18 05:48:28
Comments:
-
312. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 06:13:54
Comments:
-
313. Name: Chris Villanueva on 2019-06-18 06:18:17
Comments:
-
314. Name: Marguerite McGinty on 2019-06-18 06:22:53
Comments:
-
315. Name: Matthew Smyth on 2019-06-18 07:01:01
Comments:
-
316. Name: Julia Henderson on 2019-06-18 07:08:21
Comments:
-

317. Name: john smart on 2019-06-18 07:11:19
Comments: i moved here after the airport closed, i would not have done so i i knew there was the remotest chance of it reopening, My next door neighbours have since moved saying that it was horrendous living here because the plane fly directly overhead and the noise and pollution are unbearable

test chance of it reopening

318. Name: Jeremy Green on 2019-06-18 07:11:37
Comments:

319. Name: Shirley Green on 2019-06-18 07:16:55
Comments:

320. Name: Eliza Fennell on 2019-06-18 07:17:34
Comments:

321. Name: Dina Green on 2019-06-18 07:23:22
Comments:

322. Name: Dina Green on 2019-06-18 07:24:52
Comments:

323. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 07:27:03
Comments:

324. Name: Stanley Green on 2019-06-18 07:27:13
Comments:

325. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 07:29:46
Comments:

326. Name: Charlotte Ellis on 2019-06-18 07:33:44
Comments:

327. Name: Barry Latchford on 2019-06-18 07:42:13
Comments:

328. Name: Moyra partridge on 2019-06-18 07:47:03
Comments:

-
329. Name: Isobel Green on 2019-06-18 07:56:03
Comments:
-
330. Name: Harry Rook on 2019-06-18 08:00:58
Comments:
-
331. Name: George Arnheim on 2019-06-18 08:17:43
Comments: From past experience we are aware of the noise from previous years and object to any night flights.
-
332. Name: A Pajdowska on 2019-06-18 08:19:09
Comments: A cargo hub with proposed between 8-16 night flights in addition to day flights, warrants noise protection for all residents health that are affected in the area. Cargo planes are much larger , noiser , the pollution is greater and impacts the environment more. When trying to run a business from home to contribute to the economy and pay my taxes, my health is of vital importance to me. I want the same protection offered to London City airport residents.
-
333. Name: Barney Harsent on 2019-06-18 08:25:18
Comments:
-
334. Name: James Calver on 2019-06-18 08:25:43
Comments:
-
335. Name: Thea Kate Arnold on 2019-06-18 08:28:06
Comments:
-
336. Name: Estelle Worth on 2019-06-18 08:53:39
Comments:
-
337. Name: Rita Ricketts on 2019-06-18 09:12:25
Comments: All noise containment measures should be taken and compensation for those affected
-
338. Name: David Frankel on 2019-06-18 09:19:35
Comments:
-
339. Name: Caroline A on 2019-06-18 09:21:38
Comments:
-
340. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 09:26:11
Comments:

-
341. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 09:27:00
Comments:
-
342. Name: KENT mathews on 2019-06-18 09:27:06
Comments:
-
343. Name: Julie Purdie on 2019-06-18 09:30:55
Comments: Do not want this Cargo Airport to open at all.
-
344. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 10:21:07
Comments: I live on East Cliff Ramsgate. I am not against a small regional airport, unfortunately this is not financially viable as demonstrated by various previous operators. A large scale cargo hub IS NOT what this area needs and would be damaging to our health and environment.
-
345. Name: Bobby Knine on 2019-06-18 11:00:44
Comments:
-
346. Name: Mick Feekings on 2019-06-18 11:19:33
Comments:
-
347. Name: MWard on 2019-06-18 11:34:31
Comments: Definitely everyone should be given same protection-but why choose such a lovely area to fly over in the first place.Ramsgate is so far unspoiled
-
348. Name: Innes coward on 2019-06-18 11:40:10
Comments:
-
349. Name: Lachlan coward on 2019-06-18 11:41:34
Comments:
-
350. Name: Innes Lyle on 2019-06-18 11:42:51
Comments:
-
351. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 11:43:56
Comments:
-
352. Name: Viv on 2019-06-18 11:44:00
Comments:
-
353. Name: Ben Olins on 2019-06-18 12:40:28

Comments:

354. Name: Kitty Spicer on 2019-06-18 12:48:48
Comments:

355. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 12:57:46
Comments:

356. Name: Richard Oades on 2019-06-18 13:07:19
Comments: An unworthy scheme from a dodgy company that would destroy Ramsgate and the well-being of the community.

357. Name: James Warner on 2019-06-18 14:21:28
Comments:

358. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 14:54:33
Comments:

359. Name: Irina Perkins on 2019-06-18 15:12:55
Comments:

360. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 15:24:08
Comments:

361. Name: Bianca Jones on 2019-06-18 15:24:20
Comments:

362. Name: Ian Johnstone on 2019-06-18 16:28:55
Comments: Just moving into mill cottage at the top of ivy Cottage Hill under the impression that the airport was finished

363. Name: steve gambrell on 2019-06-18 16:50:06
Comments:

364. Name: Jonathan Dahms on 2019-06-18 17:01:49
Comments: As someone living on the Flight path I see no reason why we should get less protection from noise than those adjacent to any other planned airport or airport expansion.

365. Name: Vicki maguire on 2019-06-18 17:16:15
Comments:

366. Name: William Williamson on 2019-06-18 17:25:46
Comments: Fairness & equality please
-
367. Name: Jill Stocken on 2019-06-18 17:28:33
Comments: This will affect our house in Crescent Road we are in the flight path. We will most certainly need extra sound proofing.
-
368. Name: Barry Stocken on 2019-06-18 17:35:51
Comments: We may need soundproofing as we are almost certainly in the flight path.
-
369. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 17:36:00
Comments:
-
370. Name: Chloe on 2019-06-18 18:12:32
Comments:
-
371. Name: Jake Roberts on 2019-06-18 19:02:54
Comments:
-
372. Name: Mr m contreras on 2019-06-18 19:03:25
Comments: We live under the flight we are concerned about excess noise of the plane,
-
373. Name: Ian Aldridge on 2019-06-18 19:21:22
Comments:
-
374. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 20:07:41
Comments:
-
375. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 20:14:14
Comments:
-
376. Name: William Gary Latham on 2019-06-18 20:29:01
Comments: There is no way I would of moved to Ramsgate if the airport at Manston was open. There was no indication that it would open as a 24/7 cargo hub when we decided to move here for the peaceful seaside we love!
-
377. Name: Michele Dobson on 2019-06-18 21:15:06
Comments:
-
378. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 21:21:14
Comments:
-

379. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-18 21:41:48
Comments:
-
380. Name: Francesca Day on 2019-06-18 22:13:12
Comments: Household owners we do not wish for aircrafts to be active again , we do not wish for the pollution _noise _and all night service. We do not feel that the locals will be supplied with jobs due to no experience you will bring out siders in
-
381. Name: lee sellman on 2019-06-18 22:38:20
Comments:
-
382. Name: Liz Langston on 2019-06-19 03:16:59
Comments: Residents affected by the potential freight airport hub around Manston should be treated no differently from those in London. It's disgusting to try to cheat them out of compensation from what will have a serious affect on their daily lives.
-
383. Name: Christopher Brockwell on 2019-06-19 04:12:49
Comments:
-
384. Name: JOHN PG HALL on 2019-06-19 06:18:39
Comments:
-
385. Name: Fabienne Canale on 2019-06-19 06:37:09
Comments: If this ridiculous airport idea goes ahead, it would be unjust for those who will bear the brunt of the situation without adequate compensation to try to soften the hugely detrimental impact on the quality of their lives. As a bear minimum this compensation must be brought in line with National levels. The reasonable thing to do is evaluate the nature of the historic buildings in the area and provide full finance to adapt these beautiful, often grade 2 listed buildings, to the horrors you are proposing to inflict on its residents. Plus you need to arrange for permission from Thanet to make all necessary modifications to these beautiful historic structures.
-
386. Name: Nick Thomson on 2019-06-19 06:41:03
Comments:
-
387. Name: Sharon on 2019-06-19 06:49:24
Comments:
-
388. Name: Deborah Wells on 2019-06-19 06:57:58
Comments: 60 decibels is higher than other existing airports and causes huge problems with noise pollution. The compensation is inadequate and needs to cover far more homes.
-
389. Name: Shelly goldsmith on 2019-06-19 07:02:19

Comments:

390. Name: keziah stilwell on 2019-06-19 07:46:14
Comments: I dont want an airport in Thanet, especially one for cargo. However, if it does go ahead, this is thr least that could be done for local people.
-
391. Name: Pauline Brown on 2019-06-19 07:56:45
Comments: Should be standard across the country
-
392. Name: Jane Ellison on 2019-06-19 08:00:22
Comments: I live under the Manston flight path and have experienced noise levels from descending aircraft in the past. All indications show that residents are being misled about projected noise levels, should Manston Airport ever reopen.
-
393. Name: Gemma Dempsey on 2019-06-19 08:16:04
Comments: i work in music & voice /over & bought a house in Ramsgate to work in peace which will be ruined if Manston opens!
-
394. Name: Suzanne French on 2019-06-19 08:29:28
Comments:
-
395. Name: Matt Cutrone on 2019-06-19 09:39:03
Comments:
-
396. Name: Angela Jones on 2019-06-19 09:48:03
Comments:
-
397. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-19 10:23:42
Comments:
-
398. Name: tracy macassey on 2019-06-19 11:17:57
Comments:
-
399. Name: Lynne on 2019-06-19 13:45:21
Comments: Though I will be happier with no airport
-
400. Name: Michael Norton on 2019-06-19 15:02:15
Comments:
-
401. Name: Chris Parks on 2019-06-19 17:53:44
Comments:
-

402. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-19 20:02:51
Comments:
-
403. Name: Georgina Kennedy on 2019-06-19 20:26:16
Comments:
-
404. Name: Anna on 2019-06-19 20:27:57
Comments:
-
405. Name: Sean Lithman on 2019-06-19 20:47:39
Comments:
-
406. Name: Kate Rigby on 2019-06-19 21:00:35
Comments:
-
407. Name: Virginia Vilela on 2019-06-19 21:19:00
Comments:
-
408. Name: C summers on 2019-06-19 21:21:29
Comments:
-
409. Name: George Stocken on 2019-06-19 21:24:49
Comments:
-
410. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-19 21:26:50
Comments:
-
411. Name: Susan Gibson on 2019-06-19 21:27:11
Comments:
-
412. Name: glenda west on 2019-06-19 21:36:13
Comments:
-
413. Name: Chloe on 2019-06-19 21:48:48
Comments:
-
414. Name: lisa woodgate on 2019-06-19 22:00:29
Comments:
-
415. Name: Ange Martin on 2019-06-19 22:11:12
Comments:
-

416. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-19 22:14:59
Comments: Would love to see Manston airport a success, but aware of people living in the flight path
-
417. Name: Justin Stocken on 2019-06-19 22:25:32
Comments:
-
418. Name: Robert Taylor on 2019-06-19 23:05:16
Comments: No other job would be allowed to receive this treatment from the employer/
That the employer is US is neither here nor there.
-
419. Name: Beverly Godfrey on 2019-06-19 23:55:39
Comments:
-
420. Name: John Moon on 2019-06-19 23:56:32
Comments:
-
421. Name: Lucy Greenwood on 2019-06-20 02:46:33
Comments: seeing that Nursry Close is undr the flight path it will give me a violent headacke as i live upstairs.....
-
422. Name: Jackie Obrien on 2019-06-20 03:56:29
Comments:
-
423. Name: Lucas Harding on 2019-06-20 04:35:50
Comments:
-
424. Name: Lizzie Warner on 2019-06-20 05:15:03
Comments:
-
425. Name: Ruth E rollason on 2019-06-20 05:17:40
Comments:
-
426. Name: Paul Cliffe on 2019-06-20 05:29:19
Comments: This lamd grab DCO has gone far enough.
-
427. Name: Jon Fowler on 2019-06-20 05:32:35
Comments:
-
428. Name: Alisdair Gibson on 2019-06-20 05:41:51
Comments:
-

429. Name: Mr and Mrs A Reynolds on 2019-06-20 05:45:00
Comments:
-
430. Name: Jean Tedder on 2019-06-20 05:47:52
Comments:
-
431. Name: Ben jones on 2019-06-20 06:07:07
Comments: If our town is blighted by a polluting cargo hub I demand fair compensation.
-
432. Name: Peter Borrough on 2019-06-20 06:52:38
Comments:
-
433. Name: Jackie Lowe on 2019-06-20 07:06:20
Comments:
-
434. Name: Simon Kiff on 2019-06-20 07:21:29
Comments:
-
435. Name: Ruth Baird on 2019-06-20 09:48:53
Comments:
-
436. Name: Claire L Jones on 2019-06-20 09:51:08
Comments:
-
437. Name: Jill on 2019-06-20 10:32:18
Comments:
-
438. Name: Fred Johnson on 2019-06-20 11:00:31
Comments:
-
439. Name: Dan Longford on 2019-06-20 11:01:25
Comments:
-
440. Name: John Elliot on 2019-06-20 11:01:53
Comments:
-
441. Name: Jo on 2019-06-20 11:02:22
Comments:
-
442. Name: Loes on 2019-06-20 11:02:41
Comments:
-

443. Name: Marva Rees on 2019-06-20 12:13:37
Comments: Of course I hope there won't be an airport near Ramsgate but RSP has clearly got its calculations wrong. And of course money can't compensate for the loss of peace and quiet. But I'm signing this anyway.
-
444. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-20 12:59:42
Comments:
-
445. Name: Margarita Moscoso on 2019-06-20 15:27:40
Comments:
-
446. Name: Kevin Inman on 2019-06-20 16:44:48
Comments:
-
447. Name: Malcolm Kirkaldie on 2019-06-20 16:46:13
Comments:
-
448. Name: Robert Edwards on 2019-06-20 17:40:41
Comments:
-
449. Name: Deborah Green on 2019-06-20 18:24:32
Comments:
-
450. Name: Deborah Green on 2019-06-20 18:26:39
Comments:
-
451. Name: Michelle Dobson on 2019-06-20 18:35:04
Comments:
-
452. Name: Lyn Hallum on 2019-06-20 18:41:47
Comments: Compensation should be automatic when peoples lives are disrupted by government agreement.
-
453. Name: I Simpson on 2019-06-20 18:56:20
Comments: medical reports show aircraft noise can increase heart problems most definitley need to sound proof homes
-
454. Name: Peter Binding on 2019-06-20 19:22:49
Comments: As the pro-airport campaign is run, in the main, by people who live nowhere near the flight path and wouldn't be affected by the noise, I see no reason why the people fighting this abominable proposal should not be receive similar support. Personally, I doubt that £10,000 is anywhere near sufficient compensation. House prices are likely to be devalued by somewhere between 10 and 20%. With upwards of 10,000 properties affected I can see the compensation bill running to hundreds of millions.

-
455. Name: m castellino on 2019-06-20 20:13:53
Comments:
-
456. Name: Stella Kirkland on 2019-06-20 20:29:13
Comments: My grade 2 house and 18 others in my street have single glazed Georgian Windows. I hope that we will get grants to put in triple glazing if not, the mental health unit will be getting extra clients.
-
457. Name: Leonora Shapland on 2019-06-20 21:42:54
Comments:
-
458. Name: Belinda Newth on 2019-06-20 22:24:29
Comments:
-
459. Name: Andy Ball on 2019-06-20 23:07:32
Comments:
-
460. Name: Gordon Streek on 2019-06-20 23:26:31
Comments:
-
461. Name: Pam Hancock on 2019-06-20 23:29:38
Comments:
-
462. Name: CLIVE ASLET on 2019-06-21 00:38:57
Comments:
-
463. Name: Clive Holland on 2019-06-21 03:21:36
Comments: My windows rattle when planes fly overhead, this is particularly difficult in the middle of the night.
-
464. Name: alison hall on 2019-06-21 05:52:18
Comments:
-
465. Name: Helen Crittenden on 2019-06-21 06:04:42
Comments:
-
466. Name: TS on 2019-06-21 06:29:43
Comments:
-
467. Name: Grant Duncan on 2019-06-21 07:34:24
Comments:

-
468. Name: Mike Thorne on 2019-06-21 08:00:34
Comments:
-
469. Name: Sarah Duncan on 2019-06-21 08:08:18
Comments:
-
470. Name: A Bootes on 2019-06-21 08:15:19
Comments:
-
471. Name: Anthony Harley on 2019-06-21 08:29:53
Comments: No Airport is the best deal
-
472. Name: Maoping Yang on 2019-06-21 08:32:19
Comments: No night flight
-
473. Name: M Best on 2019-06-21 08:54:14
Comments: Business must be encouraged but not at the expense of people's mental and physical health.
-
474. Name: Vernon Sumray on 2019-06-21 09:18:47
Comments:
-
475. Name: Scott Wallace on 2019-06-21 09:20:07
Comments:
-
476. Name: Melinda Winter on 2019-06-21 09:31:14
Comments: I still say, NO to aviation.
-
477. Name: Chris Pullman on 2019-06-21 09:32:49
Comments:
-
478. Name: Lorraine Pullman on 2019-06-21 09:34:01
Comments:
-
479. Name: Adam Pullman on 2019-06-21 09:34:46
Comments:
-
480. Name: Keith Stevens on 2019-06-21 09:45:39
Comments:
-
481. Name: David Mancini on 2019-06-21 09:48:34

Comments: I agree with the comments

482. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-21 10:14:25
Comments:

483. Name: Alexander Thorne on 2019-06-21 10:22:28
Comments:

484. Name: Abigail Beattie on 2019-06-21 10:39:16
Comments:

485. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-21 11:13:43
Comments:

486. Name: Andrew Kane on 2019-06-21 11:35:13
Comments:

487. Name: Christabel on 2019-06-21 11:51:31
Comments:

488. Name: Colin Dixon on 2019-06-21 11:52:24
Comments:

489. Name: John on 2019-06-21 12:57:50
Comments: I love this town and the airport noise is going to ruin it completely. We shouldn't have to move to get the peace we moved here for. Compensation? How about £1 million! Each! So we can move!

490. Name: Dale Norton on 2019-06-21 13:45:09
Comments:

491. Name: Mrs Christine prior on 2019-06-21 13:46:58
Comments:

492. Name: Philip Davies on 2019-06-21 13:50:10
Comments:

493. Name: Peter Sharman on 2019-06-21 13:51:20
Comments: Noise and pollution from low flying aircraft can be a health hazard for anyone living under the flight path or within a mile either side of it, all these affected residents should be properly and fairly compensated.

494. Name: Moyra Partridge on 2019-06-21 15:05:40
Comments:
-
495. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-21 15:38:04
Comments:
-
496. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-21 15:38:45
Comments:
-
497. Name: Helen Marsh on 2019-06-21 16:02:55
Comments: Terrifying, a huge cargo hub poisoning us. It will ruin Thanet. Please stop this.
-
498. Name: Nessa Warner on 2019-06-21 16:15:20
Comments:
-
499. Name: Lee Phillips on 2019-06-21 16:27:15
Comments:
-
500. Name: Alex Jones on 2019-06-21 16:39:41
Comments:
-
501. Name: Mr N Redvers Mutton on 2019-06-21 16:41:12
Comments:
-
502. Name: Gina Langley on 2019-06-21 16:44:32
Comments:
-
503. Name: James Curl on 2019-06-21 16:45:38
Comments:
-
504. Name: Annie Robertson on 2019-06-21 17:01:40
Comments:
-
505. Name: Russell White on 2019-06-21 17:19:18
Comments:
-
506. Name: Sarah Dutton on 2019-06-21 17:25:02
Comments:
-
507. Name: Jennifer Morley on 2019-06-21 17:58:36
Comments:

-
508. Name: Telsa Oswald on 2019-06-21 18:47:53
Comments:
-
509. Name: Christa Drennan on 2019-06-21 19:29:12
Comments:
-
510. Name: Robert Kirkum on 2019-06-21 19:54:02
Comments: I am simply asking that we in Thanet are compensated for noise at the same level as those enduring similar but who live near London City Airport.
-
511. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-21 20:16:33
Comments:
-
512. Name: Pat Finch on 2019-06-21 21:07:20
Comments: Thanet residents deserve to be treated the same as London residents, as it affects their lives the same
-
513. Name: Barry Finch on 2019-06-21 21:10:40
Comments: Why shouldn't Thanet residents be treated the same as others
-
514. Name: Sally Smart on 2019-06-21 22:27:29
Comments:
-
515. Name: Matthew Moore on 2019-06-21 22:57:14
Comments:
-
516. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-22 05:11:38
Comments:
-
517. Name: Terry Prue on 2019-06-22 06:45:35
Comments: This is only fair given the nighttime disturbance that would be caused
-
518. Name: Davena Green on 2019-06-22 09:36:53
Comments:
-
519. Name: Citron Cairney on 2019-06-22 09:44:00
Comments:
-
520. Name: George Hawes on 2019-06-22 10:00:47
Comments:
-

521. Name: Mr Roy Thomas on 2019-06-22 10:27:05
Comments: With a 3rd runway at Heathrow this is not a viable plan but all of Ramsgate needs soundproofing if it is stupidly allowed to proceed. RT
-
522. Name: Jonathan aw Barrett on 2019-06-22 11:27:09
Comments:
-
523. Name: Gary Lewis on 2019-06-22 12:27:16
Comments: I doubt that they will be granted a CPO based on current info however if they do we should consider legal action to enforce compensation at this level. A potential liability of £ 60 million may make them think twice about this ridiculous proposal
-
524. Name: Anne Knapper on 2019-06-22 19:23:15
Comments: Airport should be in a non residential area
-
525. Name: Alison Jones on 2019-06-22 20:07:31
Comments:
-
526. Name: Ron Whitbread on 2019-06-22 21:44:44
Comments:
-
527. Name: Gary Cavell on 2019-06-23 04:16:21
Comments:
-
528. Name: David Mosley on 2019-06-23 06:45:49
Comments: We don't want any flights at all over Ramsgate.
-
529. Name: ROGER CHARLES MELLOR on 2019-06-23 07:58:30
Comments:
-
530. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-23 09:07:55
Comments:
-
531. Name: [REDACTED] on 2019-06-23 09:29:43
Comments: No to Manston airport
-
532. Name: judith castle on 2019-06-23 10:02:19
Comments:
-
533. Name: Marilyn Elliott on 2019-06-23 10:16:11
Comments:
-

534. Name: Berni Cunnane on 2019-06-23 10:50:24
Comments:

535. Name: Graham Woolnough on 2019-06-23 16:42:12
Comments: Aircraft noise would reverse all the social and environmental improvements that have been made since 2014
