

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: "For the attention of the Manston Airport Case Team"
Date: 09 July 2021 16:46:31

I submitted representations in 2018 which can be read here:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/manston-airport/?ipcsection=relreps&ipcsearch=Blau&ipcpagesize=10&relrep=28467>

I would now like to add the following:

The Planning inspectors noted the following in their Report of Findings and Conclusions dated 18th October 2018 when they recommended that the Secretary of State should not grant development consent for Manston Airport.

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

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

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

Clause 8.2.25 The applicant has failed to demonstrate sufficient need for the Proposed Development.

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

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

Clause 9.19.1. a) The overall need for the Proposed Development is not sufficiently established and the ExA has not found such a level of need that would meet the criteria of there being a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily; and that, therefore b) the ExA is not satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land and rights over land to be acquired compulsorily.

Clause 9.19.5. On funding, the ExA concludes that: a) There is insufficient evidence that the Applicant itself holds adequate funds to indicate how an order that contains the authorisation of CA is proposed to be funded...

Clause 9.19.6. c) the Applicant has not been pursuing alternatives to CA as seriously as it could and should have done...

Link to full report here: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-005347-TR020002%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report%20to%20DfT.pdf>

Clauses 8.2.77 through 8.2.74 start at page 562

Clauses 9.19.1 though to 9.19.6 start at page 674

I fail to see how anything has materially changed since this decision and report was issued by the Examining Authority. Most crucially The Applicant continues to fail to demonstrate sufficient need of the Proposed Development in light of recent events including, but not limited to, COVID-19 and Brexit and the effect on the amount of freight traffic both currently operating and predicated to be operating in the UK, especially when we consider that tonnage of goods using airfreight in 2020 was down 21% compared to 2019; and the Proposed Development will still have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.

Local opposition to this DCO remains fierce. One only has to look at the close of £95,000 raised in support of the original Judicial Review brought by Jenny Dawes to see the depth of feeling in Thanet that an airport development at the proposed scale is simply not needed, nor is it wanted.

<https://www.crowdjustice.com/case/support-judicial-review-of-man/>

I look forward to the independent aviation assessor's report requested by The Secretary of State being published alongside all other interested parties representations and supporting information so I can comment further then.

Regards

Emma Blau