

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: Re: Preliminary Meeting/Open Hearings - Manston Airport - Complaint/Request for Support
Date: 20 December 2018 16:51:51
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Richard

Many thanks for your prompt response and clarification with regards to the decision and rationale behind the Preliminary Meeting and hearings venue. This is most helpful.

I also appreciate your assistance in passing my email to the Examining Authority to consider as an Addition Submission. I would also appreciate it if you could forward the following additional comments in consideration of the further details you have provided:

1) I note your comment regarding the Planning Inspectorate's 'strict requirements with regards to access". Please be aware that access to the venue by public transport is far from ideal, with the [nearest railway station being 15-20 minutes walk from the venue and the nearest bus stop a 5 minute walk away](#). This is a particular issue late at night - with Open Floor Hearing 1 due to commence at 7pm - given that the walking route to both the bus stop and the train station traverses some of the less desirable parts of the Margate Central area, which is in the [upper bound for both general crime and violence and sexual offences, \(1,188 reported violent and sexual offence incidents between Oct 2017 - Nov 2018; an average of 3.25 per day\)](#). Further, needless to say the weather in mid-January is unlikely to be conducive to walking to and from bus stops and train stations, particularly for elderly, infirm or disabled attendees and - again - especially late at night.

2) I further note that the Access and Parking instructions provided in the Rule 6 Letter, (Ref TR020002), seems to assume that all attendees will be driving to the venue and failed to provide any details of access by public transport. Quite apart from the practical and socio-economic implications of this omission, it is also a notable and worrying omission that shows a complete lack of consideration for the impacts as regards the environment and climate change, given that these are significant factors to be considered during the examination itself. This should be at the heart of all considerations, including arrangements for travel to and from the hearings.

Whilst I appreciate that some consideration has been taken with regards to accommodating the unusually high numbers of interested parties, it is disappointing that equal consideration has not also been taken into what this means in terms of the depth of feeling in the local environs - and in particular in Ramsgate - or the socio-economic factors relating to many of the interested parties. These factors will undoubtedly act as a barrier for many to exercising their public right to attend or speak at the hearings.

As you will be aware, both the applicant and many of the supporters of the DCO bid have gone to great lengths to paint a picture of the social deprivation in Thanet where it suits their own purposes - i.e. in presenting their bid in the context of a promise of employment and regeneration for this socially deprived community, with many supporters wrongly presenting RSP's bid as "the only hope" for Thanet.

It is notable, therefore, that no consideration has been shown whatsoever for the socio-economic factors or status of some parts of the community where it may be rather less advantageous to the applicant.

In the lack of any evidence to the contrary, it would appear that those without access to a car or the funds for private transport are being marginalised, whether for reasons of saving costs to the applicant on the DCO process or - more worryingly - as a disincentive to attend for those who have the most to lose and with the greater likelihood of wishing to speak against the proposed development.

I will therefore be taking up your suggestion of emailing both my original email and this subsequent email to the applicant in the hope that they may see fit to consider my earlier request to provide free shuttle bus transport to the venue.

I trust that the examining authority will also take these comments and any subsequent actions, (or lack thereof), on board.

Kind Regards

Jason

On Thu, Dec 20, 2018 at 3:20 PM Manston Airport <ManstonAirport@pins.gsi.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Jason

Thank you for your email.

For the avoidance of doubt, it is the Examining Authority that decides when and where the Preliminary Meeting (and any hearings) should take place.

The Winter Gardens was chosen as the venue for the January examination events following an exhaustive search of all venues in the vicinity of the Proposed Development which:

- were able to satisfy all of the Planning Inspectorate's strict requirements in respect of access, safety, event configurations etc; and
- crucially, could accommodate the potential numbers of Interested Parties that may wish to attend/ speak in this case.

The only other option that satisfied the Inspectorate's requirements, and which had availability on 9, 10 and 11 January 2019, was Discovery Park in Sandwich. However, on these dates the space available at Discovery Park was significantly under its maximum capacity, and significantly less than the Winter Gardens. Had the limited capacity option at Discovery Park been chosen, there would be a high risk that we could not accommodate all Interested Parties that wanted to attend/ speak.

There were no venues returned from our scoping exercise in Ramsgate which satisfied the Inspectorate's requirements and had adequate capacity for the numbers of Interested Parties expected to attend.

You will note from the draft Examination Timetable annexed to your invitation to the Preliminary Meeting that Deadline 2 (6 February 2019) provides an opportunity for, amongst other things, any Interested Party to request to be heard at a subsequent Open Floor Hearing (OFH). If at least one request is received, a further OFH must be held in the course of the Examination and the Examining Authority would consider alternative locations (venue permitting) in that respect, if suggested.

You should also note that the Planning Act 2008 makes express provision for Interested Parties to make representations in writing that they would have otherwise made orally at a hearing.

Finally, the Inspectorate cannot make special arrangements for transportation of Interested Parties to Examination events. You may wish to forward your request to the Applicant.

Please be aware that I have passed your email to the Examining Authority to consider as an Addition Submission in order that its content may inform the Preliminary Meeting on 9 January 2019.

Kind regards

Richard Price
National Infrastructure Planning | Case Manager



Temple Quay House, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0303 444 5654
Helpline: 0303 444 5000
Email: richard.price@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Web: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/> (National Infrastructure Planning)

Web: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate (The Planning Inspectorate)

Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

From: Impact Thanet [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 December 2018 18:49
To: Manston Airport
Subject: Preliminary Meeting/Open Hearings - Manston Airport - Complaint/Request for Support

Ref: TR020002

Dear Sir/Madam,

We have noted the contents of your letter of 11 December 2018, informing all interested parties of the dates and arrangements for the Preliminary Meeting/Open Hearings and an invitation to attend.

We note that the venue has been set for the hearings as Margate Winter Gardens. We wish to register a complaint that this venue has been confirmed as it presents a barrier to attend for the significant number of interested parties located in Ramsgate. We would therefore like to request **either** a change of venue **or** that a shuttle bus be provided at no cost for the people of Ramsgate who may wish to attend these meetings.

This is particularly significant given the following:

1) Ramsgate and surrounding areas has been rightly identified by the applicant as being the largest town where the most significant detrimental impact of the proposed development will be felt. The applicant states in its proposal that:

*"significant adverse effects have been identified as being likely as a result of an increase in noise" in **Ramsgate, Manston, Wade, West Stourmouth and Pegwell Bay**. The applicant's proposal goes on to say "aircraft noise would increase to a point where there would be a perceived change in the quality of life for occupants of buildings in these communities".*

2) As you are aware, this development proposal has attracted an uncommonly large number of public representations - approximately 10 times the national average number of submissions. Although we do not have access to any postcode data from those submissions, we are confident that your records will show that a significant proportion of those engaging with the consultation and objecting to the proposed development are Ramsgate residents - certainly a higher number than in Margate. Indeed, this raises the question of whether the Margate venue has been chosen by the applicant in a deliberate effort to avoid holding the meetings in the town most impacted where there is significant local opposition.

3) Our own analysis of the representations shows that of approximately 47 community groups, residents associations and organisations who had submitted relevant representations to the Planning Inspectorate, 37 are located in Ramsgate. (Please see attached document or link below):

[REDACTED]

These include residents and groups in wards such as Eastcliff and Newington - both directly under the proposed flight path - that are amongst the most deprived wards in Kent. As such, we do not feel that any interested parties - particularly those who will be most impacted by the proposed development - should have to bear the financial cost of doing attending the hearings.

4) As you will see from this list, there are also a significant number of community groups - in addition to the significant number of individual representations - from vulnerable members of the Ramsgate community who are elderly and/or represent those with special educational needs and/or are parents to small children, (e.g. OAPs against a 24/7 freight hub, Mums Against Manston, Special Education Needs Parents and Carers Against Manston etc.). Free transport to and from Margate for these vulnerable groups should be provided.

We look forward to your response at the earliest opportunity.

Kind Regards

Jason Jones-Hall

On behalf of Impact Thanet

Tel: [REDACTED]

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Correspondents should note that all communications to or from the Planning Inspectorate may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been scanned by Websense Email Security Gateway for the presence of computer viruses.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
