

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Cc: [Richard Price](#)
Subject: Manson DCO Deadline 12
Date: 09 July 2019 18:11:47

Manston DCO Deadline 12

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

With growing disbelief and incredulity, the people of Ramsgate have watched a DCO application process unfold, threatening a 24/7 cargo hub which, to succeed, must have around 83,000 ATMs per annum, anybody with a half a brain will realise that this will render Ramsgate somewhere the current population will not want to live and nor will anybody else. Even those who might be persuaded to follow the SMA suggestion that objectors should move house will be unable to do so, as their property values will have nose-dived.

Only the stupid and the deluded want this airport at all. Stupid, because they seem to think it'll be just like old times, carrying on from the point where the airport closed in 2013, refusing to face the reality of the projected cargo hub, with an aircraft overhead, at 300 feet, every ten minutes; deluded, because some seem convinced that they will be able to get on a plane at the end of their back garden which will convey them to Benidorm, when nothing of the kind is on offer. A carrot has been dangled in front of the gullible that there MAY be passenger flights at some unspecified time in the future, IF the cargo operation is successful but these will be short-haul only.

It has been a matter of some concern that a DCO application has been accepted at all by a very dubious organisation with deliberately shady origins, fronted by a disgraced ex-solicitor, disbarred from practice, for 'misappropriation of client funds' [REDACTED]. If those factors alone were not enough to be the cause of grave reservation, surely, the fact that EVERY aviation project with which this person has been connected, has signally failed, leaving everybody involved (bar him), with huge financial losses, should be.

P.I.N.S. has received numerous very well-researched, erudite submissions from private citizens, few of whom would claim any expertise in aviation matters, who have taken the trouble to spend hours and hours, familiarising themselves with the information available as to the likely devastating effects on our beloved community. These submissions are in direct response to the applicant's data and projections, which range from, plain wrong and wildly inaccurate, to deliberately misleading.

From the paltry consultation onwards, the applicant has prevaricated, obfuscated and sought to muddy the water with regard to their actual intentions and the manner in which they are to be implemented. Admitting that many of their proposals will have 'serious adverse effects' on the people of Ramsgate, they, with the connivance of our woeful MPs and District Council, are perfectly sanguine about conferring this blight upon us. They are stating, as volubly as they can, that our health and well-being are of no concern to them whatsoever. As their proposals fly somewhat in the face of H.M. Government's recently adopted stance regarding Climate Change and air pollution, are they of concern to you?

While the applicant has insisted there will be no night flights and that they are unnecessary, their representative has constantly held the lack of night flights to have been the cause of all failures to set up a successful operation at Manston. Both stances can't be true. They now ask us, and you, to believe that night flights will be restricted to late arrivals, emergency and humanitarian. If this is agreed to, the applicant has total carte blanche over how many night flights Ramsgate is subjected to, in the full knowledge that the community will have no means of verifying their necessity.

In addition to personal submissions, there have been a number of documents available to P.I.N.S., prepared by organisations with considerable knowledge and experience of aviation matters, roundly

refuting the claim by the applicant that Manston was a N.S.I.P., and that there was a need for a cargo-hub there, when all the evidence points to the fact that, on the contrary, there is considerable under-use of cargo-handling facilities at a number of existing airports, all of whom have far better infrastructure than Manston and its' environs. Industry trends, furthermore, indicate a trend for cargo to be flown in the belly- holds of passenger aircraft rather than dedicated freight aircraft, because it's cheaper. The applicant has no immediate plans to fly passenger planes out of Manston. The reliability of these documents contrasts dramatically, with the report commissioned by the applicant, written by a Dr Sally Dixon, supporting the airport reopening, the content of which has been shown to be flawed, at best. How could it be otherwise with no experience and precious little knowledge of the aviation industry? N.S.I.P. status has NOT been proved; why, therefore, has this application been allowed to proceed?

In the recent council elections, all those wards in the direct flight – path of this obscenity voted for opponents of the airport reopening, not its' supporters. This, surely, must stand as a strong indicator of the depth of feeling against this proposal and the misery it will bring.

Yours,

C. T. Warner

)