

**From:**   
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Manston Airport Consultation Response to ARUP report  
**Date:** 03 December 2021 16:17:23

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

My main take away from the ARUP report is that producing an inaccurate and negative report on what is effectively a new start up company is an attempt to kill the baby at birth.

Stifling innovation on such a major project that's promising to inject £300m - £400m of Foreign Direct Investment into a impoverished part of Kent is wilfully negligent at best and potentially criminally negligent at worst. It is transparent that the report is not accurate, objective or meaningful. Other, cleverer people at SMA have crunched the stats and figures and your analysis does not stack up! It could almost be a bank's advertisement about living in a "Little Britain" closed off to competition, the world and its opportunities! It really is that awful.

The ARUP report is a sad attempt to negate the good work that has been achieved to date and to stifle innovation in the aviation sector by selectively choosing quotes from respondents that match the desired outcome. It is not a good methodology. I have sadly seen this type of behaviour before by the company formerly known as Stone Hill Park who now have zero financial interest in the airport.

It was deeply worrying that both PINS and ARUP were not looking at Manston independently but rather comparing and contrasting existing airports like there isn't a place for Manston or in fact net zero emissions airport in the South East of England. This "X Factor" mentality really isn't helpful when we are at the start of a new era of aviation in the UK. Not only will airports have to be green they will have to service aircraft that will be green. Hydrogen storage tanks, ground source energy and smart airspace management around residential areas are just a few of the innovations that will set Manston Airport apart from the rest.

The report ignores the significant investment already made by RSP by purchasing the airport land and significant land around it and the fact it was accepted as a DCO and signed off by the SoS. The attempts to kick this project into the long grass have been appalling. The DCO process promised to be a time-lined way of achieving the objective of the owners to re-establish the airport. Instead it has become a protracted battle (it would seem for vested interests) between those who do not want real competition in the Cargo industry and those pointing at environmental reasons to back up their poorly spun arguments!

The Manston Cargo Hub is not an either/or to East Midlands Airport or in fact any other airport. The airport itself is (in line with the Government's All Party Working Group on Aviation) a national asset and part of a regional network of airports in the UK. We as a country cannot constantly be building over virgin land each time we need a new piece of transport infrastructure. This includes airports. **We must utilise what we have.** Anything else would be a dereliction of our responsibility to the environment. Manston must be part of the Green Industrial Revolution. The DCO submission and further submissions since comfortably prove the need for Manston.

RSP did their homework and it should at least should be read, understood and

acknowledged. PINS and ARUP need to up their game and accept what the Secretary of State for Transport saw - a world beating, zero carbon emitting cargo hub with passenger facilities serving the South East that builds in both capacity and resilience to air transport in the UK at no cost to the tax payer. Reconfirm the DCO now!

Yours Sincerely,

Ian L Connor.