

29th November 2021


Ref 20014211

FAO: MANSTON CASE TEAM REDETERMINATION OF THE APPLICATION BY RSP LTD FOR AN ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE REOPENING AND DEVELOPMENT OF MANSTON CARGO AIRPORT IN KENT

Dear Sirs

This is a continuation from all my previous submissions where I am asked to state why I feel there is no need for Manston to be required by the DCO process to become a cargo hub.

As I have said before, I am a Councillor and a resident in Ramsgate, where the Town Council has already voted to write in and agree with the findings of the Draft report by Ove Arup, that there is no need for Manston airport to become a cargo hub.





In previous submissions I have mentioned real life experiences from my constituents, how physical damage was done to homes, through low flying aircraft, the disturbance, a highly inadequate word from the noise of aircraft, and the effects of pollution and aviation fuel leaks on people's property. I have mentioned the detrimental effects that the constant barrage of cargo planes on a town, less than a mile from the runway, not as stated in the DCO documents over 4 miles away, every ten minutes, from early morning to late at night would have on businesses, tourism and people's health.

I have referred to the use of night time flying and the prospect of planes being allowed in on the quota system suggested. As well as the complete lack of need, as clearly backed up by the Secretary of State in letter conceding the need case earlier in the year.

What I want to emphasize very strongly in this submission is the complete lack of evidence to suggest anything other than there is no need for Manston to be a cargo hub, as not only does the need case not add up but the whole foundation behind the venture does not either.

The business case is independent from any other finding for Manston. It is not backed up by reports, One of the many being this independent report commissioned by Thanet District Council



or evidence and yet is being used as the reason that this venture passed the NSIP test to be taken down the DCO route. Something that I still don't agree with as a full due diligence test has never

been done of RSP and a concrete assurance of where monies would be coming from has yet to manifest itself.

This isn't a government body suggesting the venture, it is a private company, with undisclosed backers or funds and yet here we are, as tax payers deciding whether this company ought to be given the go ahead to open up something that they have not yet proved that they can bring to fruition! I would have thought that aspect be one that needed total clarity before we even got to the case of need. Need we remind ourselves of Seabourne Freight and the then Secretary of State for Transport? What did we learn from that episode? Due diligence is there to protect people from entering into contracts with a party that cannot fulfill its duty, I am grateful to say Thanet District Council did this twice, under both a Labour and UKIP administration

[REDACTED]

and both times told RSP that working alongside them to open the airport was not an option.

[REDACTED]

The Planning Inspectorate, in the open hearings asked again and again for proof of monies and company backers, it never materialized. Yet here we are being asked to explain, again, I first started writing submissions in early 2019, as to why we are opposed to the venture and what evidence do we have regards need!

The current Secretary of State did not make the initial decision to go against the Planning Inspectorate's advice, Andrew Stephenson's name was against it. I ask, especially as the Secretary was recently in the news regarding his bias towards aviation ventures, whether he will be making the next decision, as to whether to up hold that decision or to back track and go against it? What has changed where he does not need to declare his interest in a site that he has visited and publicly supported before?

[REDACTED]

There are a myriad of unanswered questions and doubts behind the whole proposal that I would have thought that these need to be investigated fully long before we even look at need. Yet we are, and as Ove Arup, yet another independent body reported, there is none.

I would therefore agree with that finding and hope that finally we can accept what the experts are saying and spare anyone the embarrassment of having to explain why they are ignoring that advice. I look forward to hearing the outcome of this long drawn out saga once and for all.

Regards

Cllr Anne-Marie Nixey

Chair of Ramsgate Town Council