

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: Arup report comments.
Date: 05 November 2021 12:00:28
Attachments: [EXA report.pdf](#)
[TDC air report..pdf](#)
[local comments a.pdf](#)

Further comments on a proposed freight terminal at the closed Manston airport

Good day, I am once again writing for my group OAPs against a 24/7 freight terminal as more comments were requested, I have included a PDF of Arups independent report that clearly points out that yet another freight terminal is not needed and would not be a success. What has been totally ignored in all the long exhausting and expensive enquiries is that this threat to the health and quality of life of 40.000 residents from excessive noise and tiny particles called particulates that aircraft emit and are a very serious source of many deaths. So I am drawing your attention to the fact that this is NOT NEEDED BY YOUNG AND OLD IN OUR TOWN I hope my concern will also be your concern for any suffering from a 24/7 freight terminal that nobody needs. I have included PDFs of earlier comments from affected residents.

The ExA Report recommended that there was no need case for the Proposed Development, summarised in their Report of Findings and Conclusions: "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." (E.R 5.7.28) Overall, the Independent Assessor concludes that there have not been any significant or material changes to policy or the quantitative need case for the Proposed Development since July 2019 that would lead to different conclusions being reached (compared with the previous ExA conclusions) with respect to the need for the Manston development. In particular:

- The changes to policy, notably the withdrawal and reinstatement of the ANPS and adoption of the Thanet Local Plan, do not significantly change the policy context that was in place at the time of the Examination;
- The recent growth in e-commerce sales is not driving a demand for additional runway capacity for dedicated air freighters in the South East;
- Although there have been short term changes in the balance between bellyhold freight and dedicated freighter activity during the Covid-19 pandemic, these changes are not expected to be permanent, notwithstanding growth in ecommerce and changes to the UK's trading patterns post-Brexit;
- There is unlikely to be a significant reduction in bellyhold freight capacity (once the passenger market recovers) due to the introduction of narrow-bodied twin-engine aircraft;
- Despite the uncertainty concerning the timescale for the Heathrow Airport Third Runway, changes since July 2019 as described do not lead the Independent Assessor to reach a different conclusion on the need case for Manston Airport. East Midlands Airport has sufficient capacity to handle additional dedicated freighter services should the market demand them, while the planning determination at Stansted confirms that significant freight capacity remains available; and
- There is no new evidence to suggest a different conclusion should be drawn in respect of the locational performance of Manston compared to East Midlands Airport, and to a lesser extent Stansted, to that of the ExA Report.

Firstly the pollution threat back in 2010 {when the airport was open to traffic } the air monitors went off the scale with Nitrogen dioxide readings, this was at St Laurence high Street Ramsgate and monitored by Thanet District Council, The readings in 2017 from the same monitor showed the air quality to be back to a safe normal {This is after the airport had been shut three years} this indicates that despite an increase in lorries and cars using this main thoroughfare the pollution has not risen to the very high readings of 2010 when the airport was being used . This is proof that Manston reopened as a 24/7 freight hub will threaten the health and well being of all residents that live close too the airport.

VIEW COMMENTS • Christabel Bradley says: February 18, 2021 at 12:09 pm Thank you for reporting on this important story. The quashing of the DCO by the High Court is an excellent step in the right direction for the rebuilding of post-Covid Britain with climate change at the heart of all decisions made. Even before the pandemic, the opening of a cargo hub in an inaccessible corner of East Kent made no sense. After extensive investigation, the Govt's own Planning Inspectors advised that the new incarnation of the airport should not go ahead. The environmental effect and pollution of those a few hundred feet under the flight path would have been catastrophic. The cargo operation would have borne no relation to the small airport of before and even that repeatedly went bust. No need for a freight airport at Manston, no benefit, no good for the planet, no sense - no brainer! • James Dwyer says: February 18, 2021 at 12:27 pm Yet another example of this government trying to ignore expert advice. 4 experienced planning experts took many months to consider evidence submitted from thousands of interested parties and having held a detailed examination concluded there was no need proven for an airport at Manston as supported by the governments own aviation consultants York Aviation amongst others. In addition the inspectors concluded that the development would also prevent the UK from achieving climate change targets. It's a complete mystery as to why, given all the evidence and the examiners conclusion that the DCO should be refused that the Secretary of State ignored it all. Let's hope that the SoS now respects the examiners decision and refuses the DCO. • Dr Philip Shotton says: February 18, 2021 at 1:23 pm Kent International Airport closed in 2014 after repeated failures to achieve profitability. Its isolated position, lack of piped aviation fuel, small customer base and proximity to nearby population all rendered it unfeasible. None of these fundamentals has changed. Instead a vanity project supported by the two local MPs and supposedly funded by unknown investors has divided the community, on the one hand promising many thousands of jobs (the number regularly downgraded and the catchment widened) and on the other promising the destruction of the burgeoning leisure industries, health and welfare of Thanet. The Planning Inspectorate, after detailed consideration of a huge volume of submissions, correctly decided the airport was not viable, not necessary and should not be approved. For reasons known only to himself the Secretary of State ignored this advice and gave the go-ahead. This has been rightly quashed by the court, and 7 years of wasted opportunity to turn Manston into something better than a polluting and unwelcome airport continues. The MPs involved should hang their heads in shame. • Emmeline Wharnsby says: February 18, 2021 at 1:39 pm Nowhere in the world is there a town of 40,000 1 mile from the end of a runway, long since required for military defense purposes. Ramsgate has been held hostage to the threat of RSP for too long, and thousands of people remember the misery of night flights and training flights and are now horrified at the prospect of a DCO application requiring flight movements hugely in excess of the old low numbers which were bad enough. What we cannot understand is the ongoing obsessive support of Roger Gale MP and how he is allowed to be the self confessed PR Marketing department for RSP. Between Roger and Craig Mackinlay, the MP for Thanet South and the owner of his own airline, there is nothing but contempt for those with legitimate concerns about horrific noise and pollution. In fact, their anti outsider anti development rhetoric drives a stake through community relations and creates a backward looking and offensive environment for those choosing to move to the sea. We are sick of being bullied into somehow this cargo hub misery being our own fault, we're told to move, we're told we're stupid for moving to an area with a knackered up old closed airport run repeatedly bust by a struck off solicitor. Somehow, a small minority of plane spotters are allowed to ride roughshod over a community of people forced to pay for their own flight path analytics because RSP continued to submit poor quality content. We were grateful and impressed by the thorough examination which concluded the cargo hub was a very bad idea, especially impact on Ramsgate and that no proven need was documented or found. And yet what? The SoS for Transport said yes. Shocking treatment of a wonderful community torn apart by a failed aviator and his small merry band of followers claiming amateur unsubstantiated local enthusiast polls as a mandate. • Ronald Blay says: February 18, 2021 at 1:53 pm RSP plus our two MPs are trying to inflict on forty thousand residents a severe health threat from the particulates produced by the burning of a gallon of kerosene a second plus the horrendous noise that large low aircraft bring to heavily populated areas. These bad threats have been highlighted by qualified medical experts who have undertaken many investigations world wide. The residents do not want this, and will not put up with it.