

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [manstonairport@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:manstonairport@pins.gsi.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** Manston DCO  
**Date:** 02 July 2019 17:49:18

---

Dear PINS

I am writing as Albion House, Ramsgate and have taken excerpts from a previous submission in relation to noise mitigation and highlighted specifically how this is relevant to us as a business.

Kind regards

Ben

RSP is offering to help with noise mitigation for residents within a 63db noise contour and the examiners have asked for this to be reduced to 60db. I understand that London City Airport provides assistance to people in the 57db contour and that the proposal for those at Heathrow being considered under an identical airport DCO is either the 57db contour or the 55Lden contour, whichever is the bigger. It is also my understanding that the WHO is recommending a move to 54db and this is being considered by the U.K. Government (see extract from Heathrow Expansion document below). Under these circumstances, I think it would seem right for the residents of Ramsgate and Herne Bay to be offered the same degree of help as those at these other airports and would ask you to direct RSP to provide assistance at these levels, at least 57db, if not the future expected 54db.

I would ask that the noise contours provided by RSP - which were derived by somebody with no previous experience of doing so and on dubious and incomplete assumptions - be disregarded. Two sets of independent noise contours have been provided by the CAA at the expense of private individuals and these should be adopted instead.

Properties in Wellington Crescent and Albion Place for example, **Albion House (Hotel), Ramsgate** are on the eastern cliff top coast of Ramsgate and directly under the very low 3 degree descent into the airport. Planes are only a few hundred feet over these 4 storey Georgian, in many cases Grade II listed (**we are Graded II listed and have single glazed and refurbished slim line double glazing**), single glazed houses and it is inconceivable that they should not receive help with noise mitigation – but they would not based on conclusions drawn from the RSP contours. The contours provided by the CAA would include these properties and offer a more realistic expression of our historical real-life experience.

It would seem that the contours derived by RSP were done so in an attempt to ensure noise mitigation compensation was kept to a minimum. This seems to be confirmed by comments from RSP counsel that there was “no more money”. Surely the noise mitigation package for residents affected by a sponsor’s projected cannot be dictated by the amount of money that sponsor can afford? The proper compensation package should be assembled for whatever remedial means would need to be undertaken for the properties on Wellington Crescent and Albion Place. **Budgets should be driven by the necessity of maintaining good public health. In other words, no compromise of peoples' health due to noise disturbance from aircraft noise because of adequate noise mitigation.**

I also note that RSP have proposed fines for planes exceeding specified maximum noise levels. These fines seem disproportionately small compared to the nuisance caused to residents, much too low to be an effective deterrent and the noise levels are out of line with the levels I understand apply to other airports. Perhaps the examiners could ask RSP to justify their approach with particular reference to other airports and developing government policy.

**Fines will not be paid. This is flimsy and will not be enforced.**

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---