

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Unique Reference: 20012106 - FAO The Manston Airport Team  
**Date:** 07 July 2021 18:22:12  
**Importance:** High

---

Dear Sirs,

Further to my earlier submissions you have requested further submissions around the subject of 'What is new' since 2019.

**My initial concerns were broadly as follows:**

A DCO is not necessary and it also seeks to ride rough-shod over the local Planning system. The reasons for the DCO were SOLELY to ride rough-shod over the local Planning System. The local consultations were limited, especially in Ramsgate where the most significant damage and reduction in quality of life will occur.

The airport has been a serial failure and the main proponent has been at the helm for two of them and has a trail of failed airport investments behind him when with Wiggins PLC / Planestation PLC. The serial attempts to bring this airport to life have cost various shareholders over £100,000,000.

No need for the new capacity (Agreed with in PINS report).

Proximity to the coast may allow older, more polluting aircraft to overfly Ramsgate and Herne Bay.

Poorly located logistically. Main distribution corridors are down the centre of the UK, A1 and M1 corridors.

Night Flights by the back door. No 'scheduled' night flights. Cargo as an ad-hoc operation often needs to take quiet slots late at night. There MUST be a wholesale BAN on arrivals and departures between 11pm and 7am except where humanitarian aid or emergency landings are concerned.

Many schools on the flightpath where education will be disadvantaged by constant interruption. Pollution levels will increase exponentially with the number of ATM's requested.

The applicants estimate of jobs created was completely pie in the sky and included the most tenuous of 'trickle-down' jobs. It would almost double the entire UK workforce related to air freight.

Ramsgate has 700 Listed Buildings, quite a few of which are directly on the Flight path. There have been no proposals for noise mitigation put forward where buildings cannot have UPVC or Aluminium Double Glazing fitted.

There is not enough room for a proper Public Safety Zone.

The loss of Manston as a possible Brown Field site for housing, education, health, leisure and industry will result in the loss of Grade A farm-land in the surrounding area to enable the Local Authority to reach its' targets on house-building. This at a time when food security is an important issue.

**What's new since 2019.**

Since then the Planning Inspectorate considered all of the evidence and ruled, quite rightly, that the application did not meet the criteria set for a DCO. The Secretary of State ignored the inspectorate's advice and granted it anyway on the most flimsy basis with NO REASONS GIVEN

for this shocking decision.

The local community in Ramsgate crowd-funded a Judicial Review and the lack of any good reason for the PINS decision being overturned resulted in the Secretary of State withdrawing the decision which is why we are here now. Actually, this is unprecedented. The PINS decision should stand, full stop.

The two local MP's refuse to engage with ANYONE who is against the airport returning as a Freight Hub and, indeed, they have now got the nicknames, The Honourable Members for Riveroak. They certainly do not reflect ALL of the public opinion. This matter in itself leaves one wondering what vested interests are in play? There is definitely a feeling that the applicants are going through this whole process on a 'nod and a wink'

The Government and the Local Authority have declared a climate emergency. The additional pollution caused by a) the planes landing and taking off b) the ridiculously long onward road-transport necessitated by the ludicrous location on the Eastern tip of Kent and the associated commutes for the 'Thousands' of workers (say 350 in reality) mean that both the Government's and the Local Authority's Carbon Emission targets will be wrecked.

Ramsgate has enjoyed a tourism renaissance with far more jobs secured in this burgeoning trade than would ever be supported by this airport development.

Ramsgate is now a Heritage Action Zone in recognition of the rich architectural heritage in the town. It has also been the subject of regeneration bids focussed on tourism. This would be killed by planes flying overhead all the time.

I now quote from a letter sent to the CAA by a local community group concerning the applicant's application to the CAA regarding the airspace:

**One thing we have noticed during this time is that RSP have tried their very best not to include any group who are opposed to the airport reopening in any consultation. This seems to be an issue that is continuing with their CAA CAP1616 application. As a community group that has been heavily involved with the DCO process & stakeholders we would have expected to be invited to one of the two CAP1616 consultations that took place in Ramsgate. There is a video of Mr Freudmann stating "people who oppose the airport would not be invited", so we can only assume this is the reason. The CAA Gunning Principles state: "The airspace change sponsor [RSP] must enter the consultation with an open mind and take all views into consideration." This is obviously something RSP are failing to do in their CAA application consultations.**

The principles of proper local consultation have never been properly adhered to whenever they could be sidestepped. Even at the original consultations in Ramsgate there was a febrile atmosphere and one of RSP's Directors at the time was almost coming to blows with people daring to question their plans.

It has come to my attention that the only noise monitoring planned will be 6.5 miles out to sea where only the gulls will be disturbed. Noise monitoring should take place in the BUILT environment. Furthermore the decibel level chosen by the applicant as it's limit is way above the

decibel levels normally tolerated. Why should Manston be different?

BA is moving out of Gatwick which will, in a stroke, give Gatwick additional capacity far exceeding the capacity requested by the applicants. Gatwick is also located far closer to the M25 orbital motorway.

East Midlands airport continues to expand with SEGRO creating an adjacent logistics hub with a Rail Head allowing cargo to be put on trains rather than being transported by road. The impressive development can be seen here <https://www.slp-emg.com/c/rft.php>

Stansted has a clear path to expansion as the Local Authority there had its' objections over-ruled. This gives enough additional capacity to make this application pointless.

Despite a 'parkway' station being built this is still ¾ mile from the airport and about 50' below it in elevation. It is hard to see how it could be linked in any meaningful way.

Basically, the overriding facts of the matter are that there continues to be NO PROVEN NEED for this facility. It is devastating for the local environment, quality of life and education of the people of Ramsgate. The 'limbo' we have been left in has resulted in applications for large housing developments on green-field sites where Grade A farm-land HAS now been lost and we risk losing even more. The local area needs INDUSTRIAL investment and a mixed-use scheme on the site would create more long term benefit and no environmental downsides.

Kind regards.

Jonathan Dahms

*Jon Dahms*



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)