

## Manston Submission

To whom it may concern,

With Christmas almost upon us and requests for further representations to the Manston cargo hub, I feel like something akin to an extra in the Bill Murray film Groundhog Day. With everything that has gone before, I've become deeply cynical and I'm being forced to inexplicably relive the same events over and over again in this small town.

The SoS desired further representations on the *need* for a cargo hub as a NSIP. RSP claims that there is no requirement to demonstrate *need* for a cargo hub, but this is untrue for a NSIP. The *need* in commissioning a new cargo hub has to outweigh the damage that will be done.

It has been clearly re-emphasised that there is no *need*, now with 11 separate reports, most recently the draft Ove Arup report that agreed with the findings of the planning inspectors. It has also been pointed out that commissioning a new cargo hub at a decommissioned airport would be an additional burden on the UK's climate commitments, in spite of RSP's ridiculous statements that it will be a green or net zero facility- conveniently and perversely omitting the emissions that planes, building work and the additional road freight movements required from a cargo *hub*, that cannot possibly be considered a *hub* when at the edge of the country.

Glossing over the *hub* terminology, there may be a perception amongst some that Manston is conveniently positioned to allow planes to overfly the channel on landing and take-off. While this is true, what is conveniently forgotten is that there is the peaceful and economically-improving seaside town of Ramsgate, comprising 40k people between the proposed runway and English Channel, hence only a couple of hundred feet below. Disappointingly, many of those in support of the cargo hub do not live in Ramsgate, let alone anywhere near the town.

As a Ramsgate resident, I am one of many that continues to oppose a Manston cargo hub. It is not the 'same' as what went before, in spite of some vocal, misty-eyed Save Manston Airport Association (SMAA) advocates who reminisce about the days of the RAF & Battle of Britain. It is worth highlighting the fact that when Manston was used as a base during the Cold War, the USAF were asked to relocate due to the blight of their noisy aircraft & did so. Unfortunately, amongst supporters and RSP themselves, there unfortunately persists constant lies, disingenuous comments and ignorance of facts, including in consideration of the multiple independent assessments on the *need* and the detail of the damage to Ramsgate, it's residents, economy, jobs, environment, air & noise quality and homes.

Refreshingly, for this extra of the Groundhog Day film, I find some events have changed that lend further logic to opposing a cargo hub:

## Climate change

As of November 24 2021, climate change, pollution and environment are the greatest concerns for the UK, according to the most recent Ipsos MORI poll.

40% of people surveyed said climate change, pollution and the environment were among their top three concerns. Although likely an impact of the COP26 conference, there has been longer-term growth in concern about climate, which has been confirmed by other polls, such as YouGov:

It would surely be perverse for the Government to commission a cargo hub, with no *need* and in the face of public climate concerns. Worryingly, Manston cargo hub supporter, owner of Manston-Malaga Airlines and South Thanet MP Craig Mackinlay has come out massively against climate action and is even found to be “spreading misinformation” about the Government’s climate change

policies: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

### Employment in Thanet

Like many seaside towns, I cannot dispute that Thanet does need more job opportunities. This problem is unfortunately accentuated by the policy of London authorities 'dumping' social benefits claimants on the area.

RSP has 'tugged at these heart strings' and over-promised jobs, that will also be of low quality. Worryingly, RSP/SMAa lobbyists regularly demonstrate a lack of understanding of technological advancements in automation that will impact the already "massively overstated" jobs of the proposed air cargo hub. Amusingly, subsequently to the DCO submission, even the struck-off solicitor and RSP director Tony Freudmann has conceded that automation will eat into the massively overstated job numbers. Remember, when Manston last shut in 2014, it had only 144 staff.

Encouragingly for Thanet, employment continues to improve. I previously described how employment rates increased year-on-year since the airport closed, with a significant reliance on tourism that would be devastated by low-flying plane [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

The employment rates in Thanet seem to be so positive that even the other Manston-supporting MP, Sir Roger Gale recently spoke out in parliament of the desperate need for employees at the food producing Planet Thanet, yet he cannot see the hypocrisy in claiming that employees will all apparently come flocking to the zero hours contracts jobs at an air cargo hub: zero hours contracts because they'll be trying to compete financially with existing and better-located cargo hubs. No matter how much RSP dresses them up as *highly skilled* jobs, they will not be [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

### Impartiality of SoS

We are at this stage as SoS ruled against the planning inspectors recommendations. All viable reports say that Manston should not happen. I remain concerned about the impartiality of SoS, that of his department and of the two local MPs. Added to this is that I recently discovered that RSP were awarded compensation amounting to half the cost of the site purchase for delays to development of their cargo hub (there were no permissions for it to open as an airport!), the SoS offered his 'moral support' to Manston in 2014 [REDACTED] and SoS has more recently been questioned about his lobbying body to protect airfields.

### Conclusion

Yet again, it has been made clear in another report from another experienced source that there is sufficient cargo capacity at existing airports and no *need* to add to the UK's carbon commitments and to detrimentally damage Ramsgate.

RSP continues to show its disdain for Ramsgate residents, with the noise compensation offered being far smaller than normal- indicating RSP are trying to cut financial corners, while also showing a total disregard for the economy of Ramsgate. They display their amateurish behaviour by not even being able to deliver against the required CAA processes correctly and cannot demonstrate funding streams.

Climate change is a *thing*, Thanet's jobs have increased since the airport closed and Thanet residents will not involve themselves in low skilled, zero hours jobs, particularly not at the detriment of the tourism economy.

SoS, don't be Chris Grayling and Seaborne Freight. Make the right decision that is based on science and facts to give us a good ending to all this, just like Bill Murray had.

Kind regards,  
Matthew