

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: For the attention of the Manston Airport Case Team
Date: 09 July 2021 23:49:52

Dear Secretary of State

We understand you will be concentrating on if there is a 'need' for a DCO to be awarded to RSP to open Manston Airport as a 24/7 cargo hub. Here are just some of the overwhelming points that scream there is no need and that this DCO should not be awarded:

Since Manston closed some seven years ago there have been four detailed reports by aviation experts including Falcon Consultancy, Avia Solutions, Altitude Aviation and York Aviation all overwhelmingly saying that Manston Airport is not viable and unnecessary.

Most recently our Government set the task for the Examining Authority to investigate whether RSP should be awarded a DCO to open Manston Airport. The Examiners were made up of three very experienced senior Planning Inspectors. They took over six months to thoroughly examine all the evidence and arguments for and against awarding the DCO to RSP. With regard to the 'need' question we can do no better than quote from the Planning Inspectors conclusion:

'Given all the above evidence, the ExA concludes that the levels of freight that the Proposed Development could expect to handle are modest and could be catered for at existing airports (Heathrow, Stansted, EMA and others if the demand existed). The ExA considers that Manston appears to offer no obvious advantages to outweigh the strong competition that such airports offer. The ExA therefore concludes that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate sufficient need for the Proposed Development, additional to (or different from) the need which is met by the provision of existing airports.'

We would also like to quote from the ExA some of the other conclusions which resulted in them recommending NOT to award the DCO to RSP:

Clause 8.2.74 the Proposed Development will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.

Clause 8.2.180 the ExA has significant doubts over the calculation of direct, indirect/induced and catalytic job numbers.

Clause 8.2.177 Direct jobs at the airport would be 19% lower than forecast.

Clause 8.2.184 The proposed Development would adversely affect the tourism industry in Ramsgate.

Clause 8.2.143 The proposed interference with the Human Rights of individuals is not justified.

Environment

Quoted from the Local Government Chronicle:

'If the Government is serious about greening the economy and ensuring local

government is financially sustainable it should offer support to help the most airport reliant councils wean themselves off aviation. No council should be contemplating airport expansion and all councils should be rethinking their economic plans to reduce dependency on aviation. While the environmental credentials of HS2 are doubtful, its construction needs to open the way to rail replacement of flights for short-haul journeys and councils would be better advised to focus on this, rather than air travel. A climate emergency declaration amounts to nothing more than weasel words unless bold action is taken to prevent environmental catastrophe.'

Finally and obviously, geographically, the site at Manston is unsuitable for a major new international cargo hub compared to EMA, Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted all of which have the capacity to take on or undercut anything offered to Manston. Also to be considered is the significant heritage assets we have at Ramsgate and our important protected natural habitats for wildlife all of which will be destroyed by air and noise pollution.

Regardless of all of these points the most overwhelming fact is the proximity of 40,000 people living in Ramsgate which, may we remind you, is just 0.8 miles from the runway at Manston.

We hope common sense prevails and you finally take the advice of the Examining Authority and deny this DCO to RSP.

Yours sincerely

Guildford Lawn Residents against the DCO.
Ramsgate