



The Planning Inspectorate
National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol BS1 6PN
BY EMAIL

Your reference: TR020002

Dear Sirs

I write to submit to the panel a statement (and a question) I was unable to ask on the Wednesday preliminary meeting at the Winter Gardens in Margate, at which we were registered to speak.

Although we were there for the start of business on that day and for the greater part of the morning, we were unable to stay due to family illness.

My planned statement and question to the panel concerned the poor quality of evidential support for some of the assertions contained in RSP's application for a Development Consent Order.

This lack has made our work in responding to this application that much more difficult.

Some of the statements made by the panel to that preliminary meeting have served to enhance my concerns.

There seems to be a significant disparity between the evidential burden laid on the applicant and that laid on those making submissions as registered interested parties.

Whilst the DCO application contains missing or non-working hyperlinks, apparently redacted sources and other obfuscations, we are expected to supply fully documented evidence.

We are furthermore informed that without this our submissions will be deemed inadmissible and possibly vexatious, and disregarded accordingly.

I note from the annexes to the Agenda for the preliminary meeting that RSP have been given further opportunity to update their evidential submissions.

Can we, in accordance with all of the principles of natural justice, expect those interested parties who make submissions to the panel to be given the same assistance, viz to be informed of a specified shortfall and given the opportunity to remedy it?

I look forward with interest to your reply.

Yours faithfully

Deborah Shotton LLB