

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** For the attention of the Manston Airport Case Team  
**Date:** 03 July 2021 15:41:18

---

MY UNIQUE REFERENCE NUMBER IS 20014168 Dear Sir, as invited, please find my further concerns re: my objections to the above case.

THE NEED AND VIABILITY - Perhaps it would be well to consider the document published by Kent County Council (KCC) in March 2015 entitled 'Manston Airport under private ownership. The story to date and the future prospects.' In the opening statement it says "for decades KCC has made great efforts to develop aviation at Manston airport. We have made substantial investments in both road and rail infrastructure to improve access to the airport at Manston and East Kent. It was disappointing and regrettable to learn that all our hard work and investment and the hard work of various companies that had tried make flying profitable at Manston had failed." In chapter 5 it states...

"over the years Manston has received more than £1 million in financial assistance from KCC. When EU jet commenced its flights in 2004 KCC bought 1.5% shareholding in EU jet ops Ltd. which we lost. When KLM expressed an interest in starting scheduled flights to Amsterdam KCC provided £100,000 to 'VISIT KENT' the tourist agency which provided marketing and tourism support." In its conclusion on page 12 it states that "RiverOak has not managed to convince Thanet District Council that there is a viable business plan." This business plan was for a Cargo Hub. Yet the outcome was that certain elected councillors ensured that the Manston site was held in the Local Plan for aviation use despite the then owners - Stonehill Park - having submitted a planning application which would have ensured future benefits and prosperity for Thanet in a realistic way. I still have that company's prospectus. On 4th February 2009 on his own website 'ROGERS VIEW' under archive, Sir Roger Gale, the stalwart supporter of the airport states that - "Heathrow is the worlds number one hub airport. Gatwick, Stansted and Luton are not hub airports and never will be, and neither will Manston." I have hard copy of that page. How then, can the need and viability of a re-opened Manston airport and the perceived benefits to the local area stand against the historical facts and hard evidential facts in the PINS report, which the Sec. of State appears to have overlooked. Regarding

THE ANPS AND ENVIRONMENT. In the recent COUNCIL FOR CLIMATE CHANGE (CCC) progress report to the government it is critical of the lack of commitment to the UK's Aviation Decarbonising Strategy. It states that "There should be no net expansion of the UK airport capacity unless the sector is on track to sufficiently out perform its net emissions trajectory, and can accommodate the additional demand." Claiming that an airport will be 'green' as RiverOak Strategic Partners (RSP) are, has nothing whatsoever to do with aircraft emissions. Airport expansion serves to attract more aircraft and that is why it should not be allowed. There is not a technology now, or in the foreseeable future, only hopes and guesses, where talk is cheap, to make aircraft en masse non polluting. The question here is why after the extensive and unbiased PINS examination, and with the now well known and published environmental issues along with the CCC's recommendations does the Sec of State still require more information before he can re-determine 'his decision?' The Government is side stepping the issue by allowing airport expansion to happen. The Sec. of State should consider this in his re-determination decision. Thankyou, with my regards, Ann.

