

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: Manston DCO
Date: 02 December 2021 15:44:11

Dear Sir/Madam,

Representations on Manston DCO

The evidence provided so far has been so conclusively against the need for an airport (something that all the Qualified experts and planning inspectors agree with), I only want to highlight a few issues.

Firstly, it is in relation to political voices like Sir Roger Gale, who has long acted as the unofficial spokesperson of RSP managing local PR for them and often issuing statements that are often very misleading. He, and some other local politicians, have not even attempted to engage in the evidence and just parrot talking points given by RSP, with whom they have been joined at the hip for years. No weight can be given to views that are not evidence based. Sir Roger Gale was a leading voice that corralled council members to vote against housing plans on Manston as part of the local plan, even though he and others were aware that the housing would be moved to other places such as Westgate - because that's what the plan B local plan stated would happen. He and they said it would never happen, but guess what, we are now seeing planning applications for 2,000 homes on farmland at Westgate as a direct result of their actions. Yet Sir Roger and others show their hypocrisy by campaigning against these plans, despite supporting, and being the driving force behind the local plan decision to include additional housing at places like Westgate rather than Manston. Sir Roger has already attacked the Arup report flippantly again parroting RSP, without understanding why or what the scope of the report Arup were asked to provide.

The purpose of these comments is to show the hypocrisy and failure of many politicians to engage with the evidence and the facts, and demonstrate the lack of weight that should be given to the representations from Sir Roger.

The second point covers the weight that should be applied to the views of the experts and the applicant.

The top eminent aviation experts in the UK from Ove Arup, York Aviation, ASA, Altitude Aviation, Falcon as well as some others have been consistent in their being no Need for Manston. I would also suggest that it is very uncommon for aviation experts to be seen to talking down the prospects for an airport or aviation in general. It is very telling that they have been very robust in their views that there is no Need for Manston.

On the other side, there is RSP (no aviation experience other than through Tony Freudmann and his history of failed airports) and its "aviation adviser" Azimuth, which is a one person consultancy led by Dr Sally Dixon. It was demonstrated that Dr Dixon had no relevant experience to draw on, and as a result the evidence put forward by RSP was shown to lack credibility as eloquently stated in representations from aviation experts to the Examination and in the period since.

In the period since the examination finished, Dr Dixon has not acted for any other airports or relevant stakeholders, emphasizing the lack of recognized expertise. Instead, Dr Dixon appears to have been acting as a representative of RSP on a number of initiatives including co-ordinating an October half term kids club on behalf of RSP. [REDACTED]

Therefore, if a DfT Minister was to prefer evidence submitted by an unqualified adviser who wears many hats for RSP, over the consistent evidence from a plethora of real experts - including their own appointed expert in Ove Arup - it would be preposterous. It would be akin to preferring medical brain injury advice provided by a hospital porter over that from the top brain surgeons in the country.

Planning Policy - in the ANPS there is reference to airport development making best use of existing runways. This in no way helps the RSP case. By RSP's logic, they only have to have

something that could pass as a runway to qualify. The latest ruse is that they don't even have to demonstrate Need. By this logic any airstrip anywhere in the country, need only apply for and be granted a DCO – in RSP's world it does not matter that there is no Need, nor does it matter that their only previous involvements with airports have resulted in absolute failure.

The expert evidence is clear. There is no Need for Manston and if it returned it would only attract very modest levels of cargo no matter how much was invested in it. The very fact that it may attract some traffic from other airports round the country works against them as it would be likely to make other airports like Doncaster, East Midlands and Southend less efficient. This would be the opposite of making best use of existing runways.

Mr John Ackerman