

**Written Submission to Secretary of State for Transport: Re: ROSP's application to seek a DCO to re-open Manston Airport as a nationally significant air cargo hub (amended)**

Registration Identification No: 2001 4264

Original submission sent: 15-5-19

Amended submission sent: 31-1-20

Mr Raymond May



I am representing myself and my wife.

Comments in support of : Five10Twelve Ltd. Documents dated: 17-10-19; 27-10-19; 1-11-19; 19-12-19; 20-12-19; 23-12-19.

Comments in support of : Chris Lowe. Document dated: 6-1-20.

Personal testimony and facts regarding noise pollution from aircraft.

**Facts that do not support a DCO to re-open Manston as a nationally significant air cargo hub**

First and foremost RSP apparently lacks an understanding of the geographical fact that Manston's position, situated at the extreme eastern tip of Kent, with sea on three sides and where transport exiting from the site to London and beyond can only go in one direction, westwards. Its potential competitors in the cargo freight market: Stansted, Luton and East Midlands, are centrally located and are therefore better able to export and import freight, coming from and going to national destinations, over much smaller distances and at a cheaper cost. In essence, RSP has submitted a case that Manston is the only viable option to making up for the predicted shortfall in air freight business capacity over the next 20 years (a claim made by RSP). In its conclusion it says: "that the UK cannot afford to lose one of its long- serving and strategically significant airports." Well, the facts do not support these assertions. The airport has been closed for nearly 6 years. The former owners, Infratil, a NZ company with assets of just under one and a half billion pounds (2016/17), a capital investment of 70 million and a long experience in transport (1). They own Wellington airport and used to own Lubeck airport in Germany, in addition to Glasgow airport. They could not make Lubeck, Glasgow or Manston airports, return a profit. They could have invested in Manston and tried to expand but obviously acted on wise counsels that it would not be feasible. (Both Glasgow and Manston were reportedly offloaded for £1!). RSP also ignores the facts that the dedicated airfreight business has been in decline for a long time. The majority of freight is carried in belly-hold passenger aircraft. Those airports that specialise in airfreight: Stansted, Luton and East Midlands, are well established, have the infrastructure in place and, above all, are in close proximity to where the cargo is going to or coming from. Moreover, those airports can manage night flying as there are few people living under their flight paths: Stansted's nearest conurbation is Harlow, 16 Kms from its runway. East Midlands airport has no conurbations under its flight path and only Luton's extreme southern edge is under the flight path of its airport. In comparison, Manston has large populations under, or near its flight path in nearby south/central Ramsgate and other smaller village populations nearby. RSP have conveniently ignored evidence from nationally commissioned studies on the future airport capacity in SE England. Apparently, "Manston airport is a regional and national asset." But few people seem to support RSP's view. Not the least, the air industry, who failed to put in a bid when the airport was auctioned; nor the government who didn't even mention this "national asset" in the Southeast Airport Enquiry. In regard to Azimuth Associates assertion, that the London airports have no spare capacity to meet a growing need of the air cargo market, they disregard the fact that Heathrow, the largest freight handler in the country, is to massively expand its capacity with a third runway in the near future. Stansted Airport's CAA data (See table A) on cargo tonnage and ATM's show fluctuations in cargo tonnage with no

steady increase over 2016, 2017, 2018. The ATM's show an upward trend over the same period indicative of an increase in passenger traffic. The data demonstrates the fact that Stansted has spare capacity. Moreover, the head of business and cargo aviation at MAG (the operator for Stansted), Conor Busby, Speaking in October 2017, was confident that, "Stansted has potential to meet up to half of London's capacity shortfall over the next few years, and cargo will contribute towards this growth." (2). Stansted has an established trade in importing perishable produce from Africa, a trade that Manston had before and would rely on in the future, and so would be in direct competition with Stansted. RSP's claims and forecasts are highly unrealistic and inflationary. In its submission RSP makes a false assumption in its master plan that freight tonnage/flights will rise inexorably over the next 20 years with not a blip in sight! If you examine the operational data from all the main London airports and, in particular, the dedicated airfreight businesses at Stansted, Luton and East Midlands, the tonnage figures vary on a regular basis and do not follow the Manston pattern suggested by RSP. (See table B). The most damning criticism of Azimuth Associates is reserved for its forecast of future freight tonnage at Manston. After just 2 years it states that there will be 97,000 tonnes, 43% of Stansted's 2016 tonnage and nearly a third of East Midlands tonnage. Then it says that after 10 years of operations it will handle 212,000 tonnes, 95% of Stansted's tonnage and 71% of East Midlands tonnage. Then by year 20 Manston has now one and a half times more tonnage than Stansted (341,000 tonnes to 223,000) and 114% higher than East Midlands (300,000). Where is this massive increase in air cargo coming from? Its main competitors have advantages galore- central locations, established infrastructure, long standing business connections here and abroad, investors to hand and fewer restrictions on night flying (3).

### Consultation Flaws

The consultation by RSP has been selective, both in the locations covered and information conveyed in a confused manner in terms of environmental impacts, in particular night flights, fuel delivery system and effects on road traffic. The delivery has often been aggressive when they have been challenged from the floor. The impression one had was that they wanted to emphasise all the advantages of easy access to passenger flights to Europe for locals to win them over, but were rather coy about laying down the environmental impact of tens of thousands of cargo ATM's on the people of Ramsgate, local villages and parts of Herne Bay. Where it was raised the trite response was that we have it all covered with our mitigation plans.

### Environmental Impacts

The environmental impact of a 24/7 cargo hub as envisaged in this application is massive. The two main effects being noise and air pollution. The PEIRs in the RSP document section convey an impression that relatively few people would suffer from noise and air pollution resulting from a fully operational airport. My wife and I have lived in St Nicholas-at Wade throughout the period when Manston was used for freight and passenger flights. The village is directly under the western flight path at 4.4 Km from the runway. My sleep was always disturbed during any night flights that occurred. The type of aircraft made no difference, as did the decibel count. You cannot make a scientific claim that certain "low quota" aircraft will not disturb peoples' sleep, nor can you draw lines on a map indicating certain noise levels, and then say people living outside that area will not be affected. (see night flight disturbance- personal evidence as an attachment). This relates to two years 2010/11 when there were 1,151 ATM's in 2010 and 1,472 ATM's in 2011 (4). After 5 years Azimuth Associates are forecasting over 9,900 ATM's, after 10 years the forecast is over 11,600 ATM's and 17,171 ATM's after 20 years. And these figures do not include passenger ATM's.(5). Mitigation by insulation or altering flight paths cannot eliminate sleep disturbance. Furthermore, we could clearly hear every reverse thrust of jet aircraft landing at the western end of the runway at 4.5 km away. This noise will be much louder in Minster, Cliffsend and south-western parts of Ramsgate, all closer to the runway than St.Nicholas. Summers are getting hotter and windows and doors remain open for longer to provide ventilation and relief. Day flights affecting the quality of life should also not be overlooked as it impacts upon the enjoyment of one's garden and other outdoor pursuits. Just under 900 people live in St. Nicholas and I suspect that their fears have not been given a proper airing at the open floor hearings. We moved to Minster in October 2016, living at the extreme southern edge of the village.

(1.86 Km south-southwest of Manston's west end runway). We, along with 3,780 (8 years since the last census) Minster residents, will be adversely affected by noise and air pollution caused by the proposed 17,171+ ATM's that RSP claim will be operating after 20 years. Minster's boundary is just 600 metres south-west of the western end of the runway. The whole of Minster is within 2 Km of the runway. Thanet District Council's Draft Local Plan 2031 (6) has 250 (750+ people) houses earmarked for the Northern end of the village, the northern edge of which would be just 250 metres from the flight path. In addition, a further development of 130-140 houses (400+ people), east of Tothill Street, is planned, starting just 600 metres from the flightpath (7).

Further to the effects of night flying, 59% of dedicated cargo ATM's at East Midlands airport are at night. There were 19,357 freighter ATM's. This makes 11,420 night ATM's, or 31 per night.(8) There are no large urban areas near the runway, unlike Manston where the south of Ramsgate, lying under the flight path, has tens of thousands of people (the area starts at 1.2 Km (Nethercourt) to 4.2 Km from runway at Ramsgate sands(7). The type of freight trade envisaged by Manston, long distance from Africa, would inevitably result in regular night flying and with 70% of flights to and from the eastern side of the airport would harm the residents of this area in terms of noise, air pollution, sleep deprivation and mental well-being. (RSP maintains that it can reverse the historical flying record of Manston of 30% western use to 70% eastern use, thereby defying the fact of prevailing winds directions which determine choice of approach!). There are other populated areas that the Minister may not be aware of which are close or adjacent to the Manston site. (see table C). They include: St Nicholas-at-Wade, Minster, Cliffs End, Manston, Monkton. The first mentioned is directly under the western flight path as mentioned earlier. The other four villages are all within 1.5 km of the Manston site or flight path. This amounts to over 8,000 people affected to go with the approximately 20,000 people of south/central Ramsgate; and several thousand who live in Hillborough and Beltinge (suburbs of Herne Bay) which are under or near the western flight path of Manston; although some 11.25 km from the runway these areas are affected by aircraft landing from the west (6). There are other potential populated areas that would be impacted from 24/7 cargo hub airport. In the Draft Thanet Local Plan (2031) the Council have seen fit to choose option 2 in opposition to the government's preferred choice of using brownfield sites. As a result, the 2,500 houses earmarked for the Manston site will now be distributed on greenfield sites around Thanet, almost all of which will be grade 1 agricultural land currently being farmed for crops. Westgate, in the north of Thanet, for example, will have to accept 2,000 houses. There are numerous sites planned for new housing estates that are close to the Manston site. The largest is SHLAA 013(1,200 houses) which starts some 700 metres from the runway and are under or near the flight path). There are 16 other sites, totalling 1,658 houses to the south, south-east, east and north-east of the Manston site. Thanet District Council has submitted a local plan for 2,993 houses equating to nearly 9,000 people (3 per house) who would be subject to serious noise and air pollution. (see table D).

A comprehensive environmental assessment of the impact of a 24/7 air cargo hub at Manston airport has never been done. This is an essential requirement. The air over Thanet and surrounding areas would become more polluted from nitrous oxide, sulphates and soot. Tourism in Thanet, and particularly in Ramsgate, is on the upturn. Ramsgate has attracted visitors with an array of heritage assets. All this would be put at risk, both in terms of enjoyment of the facilities, but also of the very fabric of the historic buildings, by the deleterious effects of noise, vibration, air pollution and visual disturbance.

I should like to comment on the impact of increased traffic flows in and around the airport. There has not been enough importance given by RSP in relation to the impact of increased road transport on the A299, M2, A249, M20, M26, M25 (Dartford crossing area), caused by a large air freight airport. In time there will be big increases in HGV diesel vehicles driving to and from Manston serving its operational, fuelling and maintenance needs. After year 5 Azimuth's Associates' plans forecast over 19,000 diesel driven HGV's. They do not state a figure for diesel driven aviation fuel tankers necessary to supply the aircraft. After 10 years of operation the HGV figure rises to 27,400 movements, and after 15 years to nearly 42,000 movements per year, a frightening 5 per hour throughout the year(5). Over time this heavier traffic would have serious affects relating to increased

travel time, delays, air and noise pollution. Particulates from diesel exhausts are widely recognised as a very serious cause for concern for peoples' health.

Lastly, I should like to give some time to Climate Change that gets barely a mention in the raft of PEIR document on the RSP website. It states "that a full assessment of climate change impacts has yet to be completed, and will be included in the ES." Has the ES been published? Have the Planning Inspector Team seen this ES? May I be so bold as to suggest that the evidence of Manston's operation in respect of greenhouse gas emissions should be a vital element in weighing up its proposed benefits with the damage that a very large carbon footprint would cause. So I say to the Secretary of State for Transport, how would allowing a 24/7 cargo freight hub to be built and operate in terms of greenhouse gas, nitrous oxide, sulphates and soot emissions, from burning aviation fuel used by long distance cargo transport from Africa and increased passenger flights to Europe (in preference to rail travel), sit with now much stricter government targets to reduce carbon emissions urgently, in the face of overwhelming evidence that the warming earth will result in a greater severity and frequency of storms, rainfall levels, droughts and sea level rises that would potentially turn Thanet into an island that it once was- so much for the prospects of the government's buzzword "connectivity," with the Wantsum Channel under seawater!

Alternative Use of the Manston Site

What RSP do not announce loudly is that is that TDC's plan for 2,500 houses at Manston, on a brownfield site, will now go on greenfield sites around the urban boundaries and adjacent to where many of their supporters live! The proposal for Westgate on sea is now for 2,000 houses, double the original allocation. 2,000 houses equates to a minimum of 7,000 people which would more than double the size of the town (2011 census: 6,996)! In addition, this development would be on grade 1 agricultural land. This is in contrast to the government's stated aim, to build on brownfield sites, in preference to food producing land. Stone Hill Park, the former owners, had plans for housing, a manufacturing focused industrial Park, leisure areas including a large country park, sports complex and an Olympic-sized swimming pool, and part of the runway to be transformed into an events and recreational space(9). I believe a plan similar to this for Manston would be more realistically achievable than RSP's plan; it could provide jobs and much needed housing without the threat of serious environmental harm.

Conclusion

The Secretary of State for Transport has an important decision to make. He must look at the facts. The history of Manston airport as a successful aviation business is littered with master plans that were fanciful in their projections, cost the taxpayer big time and served only to prove the one obvious truth that Manston is in the wrong location to work as the air freight hub saviour propounded by RSP. The Minister and his team should carefully examine the credentials of RSP itself: A company with little or no experience in developing and operating a supportable airport. The former owner's mixed development plans for the site were reasonable and measured. As part of that plan it should be made available for housing on its brownfield site, surely a sounder preference. Lastly, and most crucially, the Transport Minister and his team must take into consideration the overriding account of the 35,000 (this will increase substantially over the next decade) people who live, work and play under the flight path or near the airport itself. These are the people who will pay the price for the so called "national asset" operating at the economically viable level.

References:

- 1- Infratil website
  - 2- Sorry but I have mislaid the website reference for this quote
- Table A (source CAA)

<b>Airport</b>	<b>Tonnage/ATM's</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Stansted:	Tonnage	224,312	203,746	226,128
	ATM's	164,473	172,201	184,485

Table B (source CAA)

<b>Airport</b>	<b>Tonnage/ATM's</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Stansted:	Tonnage	237,045	224,312	203,746	226,128
	ATM's	155,913	164,473	172,201	184,485
East Midlands	Tonnage	266,569	272,203	274,753	334,536
	ATM's	60,754	58,841	61,295	61,298
Luton	Tonnage	23,108	17,992	38,095	26,193
	ATM's	92,005	106,336	107,270	105,723

- 3- Report by Avia Solutions to TDC August 2017
- 4- Night flight disturbance- personal evidence as an attachment
- 5- Table 3.7 Azimuth Associates- Manston Airport air freight forecast
- 6- Distance references from Google Maps
- 7- Thanet Draft Local Plan 2031 ref: SHLAA 072
- 8 CAA data
- 9- SHP website

Table C- (2011 Census data)

<b>Village</b>	<b>Population (2011 census)</b>	<b>*Distance from Runway/Flight path</b>
St. Nicholas-at-Wade	853	4.5 km
Minster	3569	Less than 1.5 km
Cliffsend	1,822	Less than 100 m to l.t. 1.5 km
Manston	1,138	Less than 700m
Monkton	661	1.25 km

\*at nearest point

Table D- Thanet Draft Local Plan 2031

<b>SHLAA</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>No of Dwellings</b>	<b>Potential Residents</b>
013	Manston Court Rd/Haine Rd. Ramsgate	1,200	3,600
016	Cliffsend . S of Canterbury Rd	27	84
018	Haine/Spratling Rds. Ramsgate	85	
020	Opposite Eurokent Business Park/Haine Rd. Ramsgate	250	750
021	Manston Road, Ramsgate	64	132
048	Eurokent-new Haine Rd. Ramsgate	550	1,650
066	Manston Rd Industrial estate. Ramsgate	170	510
?	West of Tothill Str. Minster	250	750
072	East of Tothill Str. Minster	135	405
075	FoxboroughLane, Minster	35	105
076/078	St Nicholas at Wade	61	183
080/081/082	Cliffsend	70	210
087	Manston Rd Allotment Grds. Ramsgate	61	183
0534	Haine Farm, Ramsgate	35	105
Totals		2,993	8,979

Rt Hon Grant Shapps MP  
Secretary of State for Transport  
Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London SW1P 4DR

Raymond May

Email : [REDACTED]

Identifier Number: 2001 4264

Submitted 30-1-20

**Re: ROSP's application to seek a DCO to re-open Manston Airport as a nationally significant air cargo hub**

I wish to respond to the Secretary of State for Transport's request for comments and further information. I refer to Climate Change-Section 22.

May I respectfully point out to the Minister that we are all in a "climate emergency." The inconvenient truth is that we now have 12 years maximum to keep the increase in global temperatures to around 1.5 degrees C. Anything above this means dangerous warming, affecting every aspect of life on earth. We are already at more than 1 degree C above pre industrial levels, a heating phenomenon that the world has not experienced in 3 million years. And all down to the pollution going into the atmosphere from human activity. (40 billion tons per annum- and rising). Aviation is a growing source of carbon dioxide emissions and its impact is understated because aircraft also emit nitrous oxide, sulphates and soot, all polluting substances. When taking into consideration the altitudes (and resulting contrails) at which these emission occur the IPCC has estimated that, "the climate impact of aviation is double to quadruple the effect of its carbon emissions alone." Moreover, it is the fastest growing emitter in the transport industry and with the Committee for Climate Change (CCC) saying it will be largest contributor of polluting emissions by 2050. They want to see "bold plans to accelerate the decarbonisation of transport including automotive, freight and rail and stronger governance to drive further climate action across government." The government, as you know, has responded with proposals to strengthen environmental protection with a new public body: "The Office For Environmental Protection." This has promised to hold the government to account in matters of climate change and the decarbonisation of transport. In addition there is the recently formed Climate Change Assembly.

If you give permission for this NSIP: Proposed reopening of Manston Airport as a nationally significant air cargo hub, perhaps you can explain to my children and grandchildren how that can help to minimise aviation's growing carbon footprint; how it will better enable Britain to achieve a net zero carbon situation in the 12 years that many people of wisdom fear we have left to act decisively. Furthermore, perhaps you can explain to the 35,000+ people living in East Kent, during this period, who live under or near the flight path of the proposed airport, and whose health and well-being will suffer, in the near and long term. You are quoted as saying: "We want to work with industry and communities around the country to develop this plan – to make our towns and cities better places to live, help to create new jobs, improve air quality and our health, and take urgent action on climate change." In regards to making our towns better places to live, improving air quality and health, and taking action on climate change, I maintain that in allowing this development you would be hard pressed to convince the people in central, south Ramsgate, eastern Herne Bay, St Nicholas-at-Wade, Sarre, Monkton, Minster, Cliffs-End and Manston (all these areas are under or near the flight paths at Manston airport), plus many of the planned housing areas in the Thanet Local Plan, that you were telling the truth. I have omitted the creation of new jobs as that is a moot point and one argued forcibly and convincingly of RSP's flawed business case by others more qualified than me.

Five,10 Twelve Ltd have in their recent submission, quite rightly pointed out that: *“The Government’s carbon emissions forecast for aviation did not and does not include the proposed Manston airport. The UK has a carbon budget for carbon emissions which is based on the UK Aviation Forecasts 2017. The UK Aviation Forecasts 2017 did not include a passenger ATM’s forecast for Manston Airport and did not include a cargo aircraft ATM forecast for Manston Airport.”* Furthermore, Five,10 Twelve Ltd states that: *“The Applicant’s proposal to use at least 1.9% of the total UK aviation emissions target has not been accounted for and any development at Manston would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.”* Moreover, *“it would put at risk the Airports NPS and/or expansion elsewhere.”* For too long the aviation industry has been the Cinderella in the emission reduction debate. The deputy director, Carl Hewitt of the Aviation Environmental Federation says, *“The Government’s dodged the issue of aviation emissions for too long. With climate targets that are now tougher than ever, it’s time for them to look again at plans for new runways, bigger airports and more flights, and focus instead on delivering an effective plan to make the aviation sector accountable for its emissions.”* In addition, he states that, *“British people currently take more international flights than anyone else in the world., but there’s a growing public recognition that this feels out of step with the action we need to take on climate change. This situation is exemplified by the fact that the UK has the highest per capita, aviation carbon footprint in the world. All other areas of economic activity, both, industrial and domestic, are being cajoled and encouraged to make dramatic changes to reduce their carbon emissions and aviation cannot claim an exemption from those changes.*

Only a few days ago Uttlesford District Council refused planning permission for Stansted Airport to expand its capacity to more than 43 million passengers per year. John Lodge, the leader for the Resident’s for Uttlesford Group was quoted, saying: *“Crucially any expansion is incompatible with the council’s own Climate & Environmental Emergency, and at odds with the government’s carbon net-zero 2050 target. He went onto say: “...it is likely that the airport’s owners will appeal this decision, leading to the first test case that pits the demands of the private transport sector against the moral imperative on us all to halt climate change. If that happens we would hope that environmental groups would join the defence of any appeal.”* We are now in new territory where the status quo is challenged on grounds of scientific probity, namely, the reality of potentially calamitous climate change on a global scale if we do not act to reduce harmful emissions.

So I urge the Secretary of State for Transport to look at this application in the light of its (RSP’s) falsely claimed justification; to look at the application in the glaring light of our climate emergency; and most urgently to look at this application in the light of its potential impact on the health and well-being of over 35,000 people living in NE Kent who live under, or near the Manston flight paths.

Yours sincerely,

Raymond May

CC: Planning Inspectorate

During 2010 and 2011 Manston Airport was run by Infratil

The following recorded instances are of aircraft over-flying St Nicholas-at-Wade between 11pm and 7am:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Aircraft</u>	<u>Operator</u>	
6-7-06	0250	MD 11	World Airways	
5-11-07	2348	B747	MK Airlines	
20-12-07	0135	B747	MK Airlines	
11-2-08	0134	B747	MK Airlines	
19-2-08	2310	?	?	No reply to complaint
sent 15-5-08				
10-3-08	0015	?	?	No reply to complaint
sent 15-5-08				
2-4-08	2312	?	?	No reply to complaint
sent 15-5-08				
14-5-08	0127	?	?	No reply to complaint
sent 15-5-08				
14-5-08	0352	?	?	No reply to complaint
sent 15-5-08				
23-12-09	2331	DC86	Air Charter	
29-1-10	0031	B744	Cargolux	
6-3-10	0013	B744	Cargolux	
28-3-10	0042	A30B	Egypt Air	
3-4-10	0414	A330	Military	
25-4-10	2319	A306	Egypt Air	
30-4-10	0035	B744	Cargolux	
5-5-10	0625	B744	Not given	
1-6-10	0917	DC86	Not given	( Flying at a dangerously
low height)				
27-6-10	0623	MD83	Not given	
27-6-10	2346	MD11	Not given	
6-9-10	0035	A300	Not given	
6-9-10	0208	MD11	Not given	
18-10-10	0052	A300	Not given	(ATC comment- Standard
departure procedure)				
17-2-11	0127	B744	Cargolux	(delayed) QC 2
17-2-11	0311	B744	Cargolux	QC4
16-6-11	0011	Not given	Egypt Air	(delayed) QC2
25-6-11	0253	Not given	Air Atlanta	(delayed) QC4
6-7-11	0030	B744	Cargolux	(suffered a delay)
6-7-11	0204	B744	Cargolux	(suffered a delay)
10-7-11	0516	B757	Iceland Air	(suffered a delay)
28-9-11	1057	MD11	World Airways	( Flying at a
dangerously low height) Also happened in August				
2-10-11	2355	B744	ACG Air Cargo	(delays at destination)
5-10-11	0304	B744	Atlas Air	



5-10-11	0434	B744	Cargolux
26-10-11	0305	B744	Cargolux
27-10-11	2332	MD11	World Airways
2-11-11	0006	B744	Cargolux
7-11-11	2336	30B	Tristar Air
1-12-11	0535	B744	ACT Airlines
9-12-11	0615	MD11	World Airways
12-12-11	0104	B744	Air Cargo Germany
27-1-12	0019	A30B	GCS Cargo

This does not represent a comprehensive list of night flights over St Nicholas-at-Wade as I have an annual holiday and spent occasional weekends away.  
All of these aircraft would have been heard by many of the villagers in St Nicholas-at -Wade

Ray May

*I do not have a record of night time disturbances from Feb 2012 to when the airport closed in May 2014.*

*“I lived in St Nicholas-at Wade throughout the period when Manston was used for freight and passenger flights. The village is directly under the western flight path at 4.4 Km from the runway. My sleep was always disturbed during any night flights that occurred. The type of aircraft made no difference, as did the decibel count. You cannot make a scientific claim that certain “low quota” aircraft will not disturb peoples’ sleep, nor can you draw lines on a map indicating certain noise levels, and then say people living outside that area will not be affected. The enjoyment of my garden was affected by day flights, particularly in the warmer months. Air pollution was evident on my white window sills; and this was the effect of a freight tonnage of between 25,000 and 35,000 tonnes, massively below the RSP economic model.”*

*(Extract from letter sent to PINS/RSP in response to DCO application to re-open Manston airport. 16-2-18))*