

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: DCO of the former Manston Airport - Reference 20014733
Date: 03 December 2021 23:18:35
Attachments: [image.png](#)

Dear Manston Airport Case Team

I am writing, once again, to protest against the application by RSP to DCO the former Manston Airport site.



















A Development Consent Order (DCO) requires evidence that the development in question is a NSIP, a National Strategic Infrastructure Project. This is the linchpin of the whole DCO process and sets the bar for meeting the criteria that the project must be a national (not local) but national need for this development which must outweigh any negative impacts for example, environmental impacts and health impacts as well as whether there is a need for this airport.

At this point I would like to define the word "need" and can do no better than quote from a submission from the Ramsgate Society. "There is a world of difference between the words "want" and "need". "Want" is about desire and aspiration. "Need" is something required, where a deficiency causes a clear adverse outcome. There are those in Thanet and beyond, including politicians, whether consciously or otherwise are content to conflate the two. A "wish" is based on feeling and emotion, "need" is tangible, measurable and evidence based. The key factor in this whole case is "need". The stakes are high. If the DCO is approved and the development goes ahead it will inevitably be a business failure because fundamentally there is no market need, however much sections of the population may wish for airport jobs and cheap convenient continental air travel but that will not trump stark commercial realities. The project is being touted on a false prospectus."

I list below all expert reports drawn up to examine Manston Airport, its viability, impact on residents, whether there is a need for this airport, whether the job numbers that they say are going to be created at the airport will actually outweigh those lost in our thriving tourism industry, etc, etc. As an aside, when Manston first became a commercial airport, it promised 10,000 jobs. In the whole time it was in business the maximum number of jobs it ever created was approximately 250. When Manston closed the total number of people working there were mainly part time or zero hours contract staff totalling, at that time approximately 150! Therefore the job numbers RSP quote are likely to be no more than those that would be lost in our current thriving tourist industry. Indeed Tony Freudman himself has said that many, within the numbers quoted, will be reduced as most operations will be automated.

All but the report by Azimuth Aviation conclude that Manston is not a NSIP; it will have massive negative impacts on the local residents and the much-promised job numbers are

unproven and unlikely. These reports show there is definitely no need for Manston Airport. Incidentally Azimuth Aviation's report was written by Dr Sally Dixon, a long-time friend and colleague of Tony Freudman, the MD of RSP and it was paid for RSP; the claims in this report was purely flights of fancy.

 2010 Appendix A 2010-10-BAP-report-Night-Noise-Assessment
 2011-08-Economic-IMPACT-of-Night-Flying-Policy-York-Aviation
 2011-10-BAP-Noise
 2014-07 Appendix D falcon report
 2015-03 Appendix C KCC-Position-Statement-on-Manston-Airport
 2016-09 Appendix E Final-Report-for-TDC-Manston-Airport-Viability-Oct2017 Avia 2016
 2016-11 AviaSolutions-RiverOak-Response-TDC-Manston-Airport-Viability-Final
 2017-08 Appendix F AviaSolutions-Local-Plan-Representations-Review-FINAL
 2017-11 Appendix G SHP-York-Aviation-Summary-Report-Final
 2018-01 Appendix I Altitude_Aviation_Report
 2019-02 Appendix J Altitude_report_update_Feb2019
 2021 York Aviation Expert Evidence in Relation to The Re-Determination of DCO for__ Reopening and Development of Manston Airport
 Appendix H York_Aviation_Key_Points_of_Summary_Report
 AviaSolutions-Analysis-of-Manston-Airport-Report-by-Azimuth-Northpoint-2017a
 TR020002-005226-York Aviation LLP It Manston DfT 28.1.20
 TR020002-005347-TR020002 Final Recommendation Report to DfT
 TR020002-005842-Manston DRAFT Assessors Report - 21-10-2021
 TR020002-005842-Manston DRAFT Assessors Report - Publicationv1

In addition, the Davies Commission Report 2012 found no role for Manston.

It is clear that RSP's plans for Manston Airport will create a negative impact on residents' health and their environment. The particulates produced by aircraft using Manston will travel across the whole of the Isle of Thanet but severely affected will be the residents of Ramsgate, some of the villages of Thanet and Herne Bay. The town of Ramsgate is in fact far closer to the runway than RSP reportx, in fact Ramsgate sits just 0.8 miles from the runway at Manston and flies very low directly over thousands of period properties in the conservation area of Ramsgate town, many of these are unable to have double glazing as they are listed buildings). Even in RSPs application they state that the airport will have a negative effect on Ramsgate residents, the villages and Herne Bay.

As for the need for this airport; there is no need. The Examining Authority (ExA) who thoroughly examined the whole case for Manston from 9 January 2019 until 9 July 2019. After this in-depth examination period the ExA submitted its report in October 2019. **The ExA's recommendation was that the Secretary of State should refuse development consent.** As if this was not thorough enough, a further expert report by Ove Arup was initiated asking the precise question "is there a need for Manston Airport"? **The resounding answer from Ove Arup's report is "NO, THERE IS NO NEED FOR MANSTON AIRPORT".**

Yours sincerely

Kim Edgington
Ramsgate resident