

Personal Submission by Dr. R. John Pritchard to Deadline 4.

1. Entirely in my personal capacity I offer these remarks in response to Written Submissions, Local Impact Reports (including that of Thanet District Council which is far from well-disposed to RiverOak's DCO Application), and Responses to the first Written Questions, all as received to Deadline 3.

2. I wish to begin by deploring the cool response, at best, that TDC has given to RiverOak in the Thanet Local Impact Report, TR020002/TR020002-003135-

3. I do not feel that para 2.3.6 of that LIR even begins to deal with the history of Thanet District Council in relation to the relationship between Thanet District Council and RiverOak. At the present time I am not persuaded it will be necessary to add much to what I have previously said about that in my submission to Deadline 3, but I have touched upon that and alluded to the dolorous history of TDC's handling of other major infrastructure projects at para. 9, below.

4. I take note that "TDC has considered the purpose of the LIR as set out in Section 60(3) of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended), DCLG's Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent and PINS Advice Note One, Local Impact Reports, in preparing this LIR." I agree that this is the correct framework within which TDC needed to carry out that Report.

5. I do not accept that TDC did so sufficiently or at some points at all, I do not regard that document as fair, just or reasonable, I regard it as unfit for purpose, and I believe it cannot be relied upon by the ExA or by the Secretary of State. I expect that s. 104 of the Planning Act 2008 will be the basis on which this Application will be decided, and in that case the Local Impact Report will not carry much weight. However, I fully understand that to the extent that in the alternative where ss. 105 (1) and (2)(a) of the Planning Act 2008 may be deemed to apply, the merits or otherwise of Thanet District Council's Local Impact Report may assume particular importance, and it is to that question that I wish to devote most of my Response to the Written Submissions to Deadline 3 now.

6. For the avoidance of doubt, I believe it is clear that TDC had more than enough opportunity to be fully familiar with RiverOak's Application and its importance. It is unsurprising that they required no extension of time to produce it, and I am aware that RiverOak and TDC have been engaged for some time in efforts to reach a Statement of Common Ground. It may be that Thanet District Council hopes to submit another Representation in respect of the merits of the Application, but that is not clear within this document. But as per the DCLG Guidance and PINS Advice Note 1: Local Impact Reports, "it is important to include ... local social or economic issues or local knowledge of travel patterns to community facilities. This should ensure that local issues which might not otherwise come to the attention of the Examination are properly taken into account." Article 73, "Local Impact Reports," (Hereward Phillpot QC and Michael Humphries QC), in Michael Humphries *et al.*, *National Infrastructure Planning Handbook*, 2018, at 392.

7. Hereward and Humphries observe, at 393, paraphrasing the Advice Note, that "PINS Advice Note 1 suggests that the LIR should consist of a statement of positive, neutral and negative local impacts, but it does not need to contain a balancing exercise between positives and negatives, as that is a matter for the Examining Authority", and the Advice Note itself clearly says that "Parish councils, organisations and members of the public may have made representations to the local authority or directly to the applicant about the

scheme (prompted, for example, by the applicant's consultation). The LIR could include reference to these representations, *but only where they are relevant to a particular local impact which the local authority itself wants to highlight*" [emphasis added], and so there is no duty to appear to be impartial, nor any duty for the Local Authority to undertake its own independent consultation, but nevertheless it necessarily follows that the contents of the LIR should be sufficient for the Examining Authority to undertake the balancing act safely or in the alternative the Examining Authority must take into account evidence that the LIR is in that respect and to that degree not fit to be regarded as impartial or even, colloquially "fit for purpose".

8. Within the current edition of PINS Advice Note 1 (version 2, April 2012)

[<https://infrastructure.>], local authorities are advised "In practice, local authorities will know about the application some time before it is submitted, through the pre-application consultation carried out by the applicant. At this stage they should ensure that they gather sufficient information about the scheme to enable them to commence work on their evaluation of the proposal. This will have the added benefit of enabling them to focus their responses to the applicant's consultation when the application is being prepared. Local authorities should ensure any necessary internal authorisation processes are in place to meet the timetable. It is entirely a matter for local authorities to determine whether or not an LIR requires approval by Members and in what form."

9. However, Thanet District Council was for a very long time highly resistant to engaging with the Applicant at all, resisted many efforts by the Applicant to engage with members of the Senior Management Team, the Planning Department or Elected Members, and the present LIR provides evidence that Thanet District Council on this as in other infrastructure projects did not exercise due diligence and has failed to appreciate how important and positive its impacts will be within the Local Authority and in relation to neighbouring local authorities with whom it has shared services arrangements. Indeed, as I have previously submitted, the hostility of the senior management team of the local authority towards the RiverOak throughout its evolution has been notable within Thanet throughout the past five years notwithstanding the fact that the overwhelming consensus of public and business opinion within Thanet has been favourable to the reopening of the airport for commercial flights and to the Applicant's endeavour to achieve that.

10. Among the issues which TDC's Local Impact Report slights or ignores, are the historic relations between local industrial firms, and the scope for a symbiotic relationship between newer enterprises that have cropped up in recent years since the airport closed, and the airport when it re-opens. It ignores the scale of those industrial parks, the number of the establishments that have come to be located there, the scope for their further development in harmony with the airport. It does emphasise the fact that Ramsgate's visitor economy (including tourism) will be affected by the Applicant's proposed development at the airport, but it does so in a highly prejudicial way, ignoring, for instance, that the main centre of gravity for tourists in Thanet does not lie in Ramsgate but in the adjacent towns of Margate and Broadstairs, and that the airport will undoubtedly bring very considerable benefits without any or any significant detriments not only there but to adjacent visitor magnets including Canterbury, Herne Bay, Whitstable, Sandwich and Deal. Indeed the scope for positive developments that will flow from the airport's redevelopment both as a cargo hub and in its associated passenger services in all of those localities is exceptionally significant, as examples I shall offer will show. These are matters which I believe the Examining Authority should take fully into account.

11. In illustration of this, I would instance the LIR reference to the proximity of a golf course near the airport but in truth the LIR is silent on the extent to which there are a cluster of golf courses in this area and chief amongst those is one is the Royal St. George's Golf Club in Sandwich which is a world renown magnet for golfers of the highest distinction, and from that and from the lift to the economy that the airport will bring through higher levels of jobs and value added, Sandwich and its neighbouring districts will gain greatly by the re-opening of Manston.

12. At one time, there was no shortage of hotel accommodation in Thanet and Margate was frequently the location at which national party conferences were held, but now many of the hotels and venues have closed or are struggling. There are at present only a fraction of the number of rooms for visitors that there once were. Yet many of the buildings remain and might well be re-converted to productive use as hotels again if the opportunities to do so were there: that would produce a very large increase in jobs. The reopening of the airport offers opportunities to catalyse such changes, not least to the benefit of the local authority. Failure to do so would simply mean that much of the benefits from visitors would pass to other nearby local authority districts.

13. On 25 February, at my request, Cllr. Sam Bambridge, a Thanet District Council, sought information from Louise Askew, Strategic Partnerships Manager at Thanet District Council. I believe that the questions and answers bear upon the adequacy of Thanet's Local Impact Report on the Manston DCO Project. The questions I asked, through her, were:

1. What are the number of day trippers we are getting to Thanet?
2. How many stay one night?
3. How many stay more than one night but less than a week?
4. How many language school students are there?
5. How many stay one to two weeks? Longer than one month? Longer than two months, or for a full academic year or longer?
6. What are the economic benefits of overseas visitors to Thanet?
7. How much did language schools contribute in commercial rates over the past ten years, year on year?
8. Did growth in visitors add to the valuation of commercial business properties over ten years?
9. What is the rateable value of the airport? Over the past ten years, year on year?
10. Does TDC know what the rateable value of the airport will be if the infrastructure developments RiverOak have applied for are consented?

14. The response to the foregoing was obtained from Louise Askew on 27 February as follows:

"We invest in a tourism model through Visit Kent called the Cambridge Model, currently the research is carried out every two years. It looks at day trips, staying visitors, where visitor spend is made, the jobs created and economic impact. It splits visits by day trips and night visits, it doesn't have detail of the number of nights particularly.

"You will find the 2013, 2015 and 2017 reports on the Visit Thanet Business website - <https://www.>

"Also available on the Visit Thanet Business website is a report the Council commissioned in 2013 on the Economic Impact of the Language Schools sector, the Council does not regularly research the value of this sector.

"You can also find a link to the Visit Kent Business Barometer that gives a snap shot of the tourism sector across Kent.

"I am unable to comment on whether the growth in tourism has impacted the valuation of commercial premises and I do not know what the value of the business rates was/is/could be for the airport. The Valuation Office Agency website might have the information you are looking for, it is not something that I hold."

15. It is worth bearing in mind that it is a strategic policy of Thanet District Council to increase the number of visitors who stay at least one night. From what Louise Askew wrote, it might appear that the Council have not clearly recognised in the LIR (as Azimuth and RiverOak have) that language schools and, for that matter, enterprises such as the Ramsgate Divine Retreat Centre run by the Vincentians, ALL add to the number of visitors and for periods much longer than a single night. This would dramatically undercast the impact of staying visitors that come to Thanet and stay for a period of time. Day trippers bring in far less benefit to the town than staying visitors, and the longer our visitors stay the more it helps our economy.

16. Properly measuring that, and reporting it in the LIR, would have been welcome, but failure to do so in my submission diminishes the weight that should be attached to Thanet's LIR. The various special events like the Margate Gay Pride celebrations, Margate Soul Festival, Margate Winter Gala, Margate Meltdown (run in conjunction with the AceCafe), Broadstairs Folk Week, Broadstairs Dickens Festival, Broadstairs Food Festival, Broadstairs Food Festival all matter, too. With help from the airport, some of these events may have a trans-European appeal. It is certainly clear that none of that has been recognised in TDC's Local Impact Report, and indeed there has been an obvious tendency by TDC, Ramsgate Town Council, the Ramsgate Society and No Night Flights to conflate Ramsgate's tourists (principally day trippers, apart from Tall Ships events and similar visitors) with the whole of the tourist economy of Thanet. In doing so, these parties appear to me to imply, quite incorrectly, that the Examining Authority should conclude that any negative impacts from aircraft movements on the flight path over Ramsgate will badly affect the whole of Thanet and its diverse and emergent "cafe culture".

17. The truth of the matter is that while there were 4.2 million visitors to Thanet in 2017, contributing £3.19 million to our local economy in Thanet, and 64,970,000 visitors came to the county of Kent throughout 2017 with the county's tourism industry accounting for 76,828 jobs, the part that Ramsgate contributes to that is relatively small in comparison. The growth in the cafe culture in Ramsgate is part of a county-wide trend.

18. Contrary to what the LIR suggests and critics of the airport say, there is no evidence whatever that the burgeoning of the Isle's cafe culture is due to the closure of the airport:

indeed, the opposite is clearly true, for the present expansion was to a great extent the product of a five year plan developed over a period of time and published in 2013.

19. If the airport had been in use, it is highly likely that Thanet's share would have been even more than the recorded 345,000 domestic trips and 145,000 overseas trips; 1,040,000 domestic nights and 1,120,000 overseas nights; £54 million domestic spend and £70 million overseas spend in 2017, as recorded in Visit Kent Economic Benefit from Tourism: Thanet 2017 Results, published in November 2018 [<https://www.visitthanetbusiness.co.uk/media/3014/1-economic-impact-of-tourism-thanet-2017-1.pdf>].

20. The cafe culture of Ramsgate IS iconic and IS worth preserving. So is that in each of the other towns. These towns won't collapse when the airport re-opens: quite the contrary, in fact. Although the cafe culture of Ramsgate is a comparatively small player in the real local economy, it does have high visibility, close to people's hearts, and is always seen as an important part of Thanet's culture. It will continue to be so when the airport returns. I have never seen an airport near a tourist destination that did not enhance the attractions and visitor numbers of its resort areas. I have already referred to the Ramsgate Divine Retreat Centre and the Vincentians' track record elsewhere: I regard that as a potential game changer when the airport's provision of passenger services returns as part of RiverOak's infrastructure development. Thanet District Council's Local Impact Report completely ignores it, and in doing so it demonstrates once more than the LIR is misleading or inadequate.

21. There's further evidence for my suggestion that the airport will likely attract more visitors to Thanet, not fewer, should the Application before the Examining Authority be granted development consent. A clear sign of that can be found on p. 11 of that same November 2018 document cited in para. 19, supra. In that document it is recorded that nearly half of all visitor nights are attributable to study visitors: 551,000 of those overseas nights, 49% of the total of overseas visitors. A considerable number of those come to Ramsgate and always have: institutions like Churchill House School of English have had an outstanding reputation, but Broadstairs has Kent School of English and a number of sister institutions, as does Margate, and those matter, too. In terms of the effect of those upon employment, the last page of the above document shows "Thanet Language Schools – Figures for 2017 compared to 2015 show an 11% increase in volume. Southeastern - Comparison stats for 2015 and 2017 - For travel to Margate, Broadstairs and Ramsgate only, journeys on Off-Peak products increased by 33% from April 2016 to March 2017 compared to the previous year."

22. And the same study reports, too, tellingly, on the "Number of Actual Jobs", on p. 22, "The model generates estimates of full time equivalent jobs based on visitor spending. However, the total number of actual jobs will be higher when part time and seasonal working is taken into account. The full time equivalent jobs arising directly from visitor spending are converted into actual jobs using information from business surveys in the sectors receiving visitor spending (principally accommodation, food and drink, retail, attractions, transport). In general, the conversion factor between full time equivalent jobs and actual jobs varies around 1.5 in those sectors. The indirect and induced jobs arise across a much wider range of employment

sectors. Therefore, the average 1.16 for all sectors based on Census of Employment data has been used to convert full time equivalent jobs in this sector to actual jobs. The employment estimates generated by the model include both self-employed and employed people supported by visitor expenditure. The model also includes an estimate of the additional jobs arising in the attractions sector, which are not related to visitor expenditure. *However, the numbers do not include other tourism-related employment such as jobs in local authorities arising from their tourism functions, e.g. tourist information staff, additional public health, parks and gardens, public conveniences, maintenance sections and jobs arising from capital investment in tourism facilities.*" [Emphasis added].

23. One would think that Thanet District Council would have been mindful of the effect that the Airport's return coupled with the revaluation of its business rates contribution (which during the relevant time will come to Thanet District Council, not to Central Government) would dramatically affect the level of employment and public services that the local authority itself could provide as a result not only for the benefit of visitors but for all of the businesses and residents of Thanet and those for whom TDC contributes shared services through East Kent Shared Services.

24. Is it right and proper that TDC should take no account of this in their Local Impact Report? That's really up to the Senior Management Team, but I believe that the views of local residents and the whole picture, too, do matter, and that those should be taken into account by the Examining Authority.

25. Further, I hope that the Examining Authority will

25.1. **DIRECT** Thanet District Council to provide statistics on the number and spending of domestic and overseas visitors and staying visitors who come to **each one** of the Thanet towns so that they can be properly assessed in context, and

25.2. **DIRECT** Thanet District Council to estimate how much the rateable value of the whole of the airport (and its several parts) following development consent would generate for TDC to collect each year upon the completion of **each one** of its projected phases of infrastructure development across the next twenty years.

25.3. Should Thanet District Council continue to fail to provide that information, it is my submission that the Local Impact Report should be regarded by the Examining Authority as unfit for purpose and deficient in these key regards.

26. I also wish to submit further evidence regarding the role that **business rates** have in providing enhanced public services that Thanet District Council provided to all of us in Thanet and in Thanet's share of East Kent Shared Services. It is through *lack of sufficient revenue* that Thanet District Council is divesting itself of prime real estate including the Council's own headquarters, public toilets throughout tourist areas, historic buildings that the Local Authority owns and which have been scandalously neglected and some of which, like the Ramsgate Motor Museum, risk catastrophic collapse, all while the local authority has been failing to maintain public gardens, fountains, cliff-top lifts, and raising parking charges to levels that appear to surpass those of all our neighbouring authorities, all to the despair of local traders, visitors and residents. It is also this

which has led to failures to maintain verges, reductions in 'care in the community' and therefore of vulnerable local residents, failures to provide sufficient social housing to meet local needs, failures to maintain public footpaths, failures to provide the individual towns with the level of public funding that the towns require to carry out their own programmes for maintenance of local amenities including Ramsgate Harbour itself, its inner basin, the harbour arms and their inner spaces, similar failures in respect to the Margate Harbour arm, disrepair of the Margate Winter Gardens, the Margate Town Hall, threats to close the Margate Museum and the Ramsgate Maritime Museum, and neglect of graffiti which desecrates our towns to the despair of residents and visitors alike.

27. Thanet District Council does not publish ward-level data on how much is raised in council tax and in business rates within each one of the wards in the District. I hope that the Examining Authority will **DIRECT** Thanet District Council to provide such information so as to put the complaints of a relatively small number of local residents in three or four Ramsgate wards into a proper perspective. The systemic failures of Thanet District Council, whether due to bad luck, bad management, poor staffing levels and morale, or inadequate funding, **COULD** be addressed if a great deal more money could be brought into the towns and into the District Council's financial accounts.

28. I offer in evidence a commented and highlighted spreadsheet that uses FOI data that has been published on the Thanet District Council web portal. Through this spreadsheet, last updated in December 2018, we can see what revenue the Council derives from commercial rates, from which establishments, at what rateable values, whether at full rates or at a reduced rates, and how many of those premises are exempt from business rates by reason of having an RV of less than £15,000. It is my belief that this suggests that after the revaluation of the airport upon completion of each successive phase of its infrastructure redevelopment, the income produced from the airport, if properly revalued, will not only have a huge effect upon the services and employment that Thanet District Council can provide for the benefit of the district and its visitors but also will enable the local authority to keep future business rates everywhere in the district, and council tax rises, to a minimum or even reduce them. Once more, I believe, the information conveyed in this spreadsheet shows significant issues that are not addressed in TDC's Local Impact Report submitted to the Examining Authority, and to that degree, too, I believe that the LIR is unfit for purpose. The Airport and its direct, indirect, induced and catalytic job impacts, and its contributions to business rates that can revitalise our local public services are key issues, but the sources of much of the power from our local economy have not been properly addressed in the LIR either, as the FOI spreadsheet on business rates shows: the airport can multiply the potential for economic growth in Thanet that at present can be found more in the industrial estates of Thanet than in the cafe culture of Ramsgate. That is a dimension that whoever has overseen the preparation of Thanet District Council's Local Impact Report has apparently airbrushed out of the picture. the FOI data, and my indicative efforts to show how meaningful it is, may redress that balance, and it is in that spirit that I offer it to the Examining Authority for consideration.

29. Although the Council's Senior Management Team continues to believe that Stone Hill Park's plans for the redevelopment of the disused Manston Airport site offer the District best value for money, that is predicated in large measure on the expectation of windfall sums to Thanet Council from the Central Government that are given out to support public services for a period of four years

after the construction of new houses. I understand that the relevant sums amount to £6000 per annum for a period of four years in respect to each new dwelling. But in truth, that won't be sustainable in the long run. It won't produce significant new levels of permanent employment and certainly not at the scale that RiverOak's plans are likely to produce. And Stone Hill Park's proposed development is highly unlikely to be approved by the Planning Committee because that project is highly speculative, doesn't conform to existing permitted uses, hasn't satisfied statutory authorities and is unlikely ever to be able to do so in large part because of the aquifer, and because the DCO project has already been confirmed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project which the Stone Hill Park development can never become, has far more benefits than the housing plan can ever produce, and because there are any number of alternative sites available in East Kent, not just in Thanet but in neighbouring districts, whereas the airport's location is fixed, long-standing and well-supported by not only the overwhelming majority of residents and businesses but also by their District Council's elected Members.

30. Further, it is clear that the Stone Hill Park plan will not produce a rapid enough rise in the number of new homes in Thanet, even if granted planning and building consent, to resolve TDC's critical shortages of revenue. They will only be able to commit to a small number of new houses each year because selling off larger plots for development will expose their builders or themselves to much higher infrastructure costs in terms of roads, schools and public utility provisions. In case of RiverOak, all of that will be paid for by the developer. Stone Hill Park does not appear to be in a position to match that within the same time scale, nor will it attract the same level of revenue for the Council, and its gridlocking of Thanet, at the centre of the island, would be disastrous for all of us who live in Thanet. In any case, it is clear that the speculative Stone Hill Park plans for the site are not relevant to the evaluation of the merits of RiverOak's plans, and I would expect the Examining Authority to give Stone Hill Park's speculative plans for the site little or no weight.

31. Having regard for the new Directions issued in a Rule 8(3) Letter by the ExA on 6 March 2019, I shall at this time defer any retailed response to the No Night Flights submissions that pertain to documentation accepted after Deadline 3 that now will be accepted by Deadline 5 on 29 March. As for much of the rest of the No Night Flights Submissions, I note that a lot of it merely repeats very old evidence submitted by them that remains wildly out of date and irrelevant, even had it once been true in foregone years but which I have never regarded as persuasive or valid.

32. I also will defer my responses to No Night Flights' submissions on the adequacy of the Azimuth Report and to Funding issues until Deadline 5 when I will have seen RiverOak's reply submitted to Deadline 4.

33. I am aware that in social media opponents of the airport and its reopening have responded derisively to videos that have been submitted on behalf of SMAa. These include Videos A and C that have now appeared as Late Submissions accepted for Deadline 3. Speaking as an individual I strongly feel that those videos, and any number of other videos and photographs showing events that occurred during that period, should be regarded as compelling evidence of the passions that were unleashed after the airport closure occurred. These videos spoke for the vast majority of residents of Thanet, and the aerial video of a flight over the airfield and the immediately surrounding area demonstrates

compellingly that the greater part of the landscape is not a built-up area but has had a rural character, and so it continues to be, apart from the creation of several industrial estates with several hundred units, the occupants of which must all have known of RiverOak's plans and the fact that no other viable plan has been tabled for the creation of any different kind of airport project. The majority of the occupants of the units of those estates are covered at present by small business exemptions from payment of any business rates, but after all business rates are collected and retained by the local authority, it is not at all clear that increases in business rates will not occur without the massive revaluations of the airport's business rates that will flow from successive stages of the RiverOak's construction programme that forms part of the draft Development Consent Order that we expect to be recommended for approval by the Examining Authority and then consented by the Secretary of State for Transport. What it also shows is that there are comparatively few dwellings within the area covered by that flight and off into the distance. While it is true that the village of Manston and a few houses that were formerly used as married officers' quarters near the top of Manston Court Road are very near the airport, no-one would live there who was not more than willing to live next to an airport. I know several persons who do live there, and they are passionately in favour of Manston Airport's return to use as a commercially successful airport. As for residents in wards under the flight path in Ramsgate, opinion may be somewhat divided but the electoral and other poll data is conclusive.

34. Having referred to the following documents, I have submitted or will submit them separately to be considered as attachments to this submission for reference:

34.1. My submission to Deadline 3 (including its enclosures, namely two photographs relating to the Ramsgate Divine Retreat Centre, and the Response to the Draft Local Plan that I believe remain pertinent to the question of whether TDC's Local Impact Report on the ROIC/RSP DCO Project is unfit for purpose);

34.2. My own contribution to the collective SMAa submission to Deadline 3, namely my Review of Multiple Chains of Evidence of Support for Manston Airport across All Wards of Thanet District Council and their Parliamentary Constituencies, 2014-2019, spreadsheeted evidence with attached notes and ward-level polling data, demonstrating the overwhelming percentages of support that the return of the airport to use has had consistently over the past years and which I believe continues to the present time notwithstanding highly emotive submissions made by No Night Flights.

34.3. A source document from TDC's portal at <https://www.thanet.gov.uk/info-pages/business-rates-data-report/> from which I have prepared a commented and analysed version.

34.4. My Commented and Analysed version of the same.

34.5. The Thanet Destination Management Plan 2013 produced before the closure of the airport, a five-year plan that led to much of the present-day's growth in tourist culture within Thanet: <https://www.visitthanetbusiness.co.uk/destination-management-plan/thanet-destination-management-plan-september-2013/>

34.6. The Cambridge Economic Impact Model 2017 for Thanet (introduction) <https://www.visitthanetbusiness.co.uk/business-support/research/cambridge-economic-impact-model-2017/>

34.7. The Cambridge Economic Impact Model for Thanet (Results for 2017), November 2018 <https://www.visitthanetbusiness.co.uk/media/3014/1-economic-impact-of-tourism-thanet-2017-1.pdf>

35. As I have indicated above, I will refrain at this juncture from offering further evidence that bears upon what I believe to be the highly biased way in which the Senior Management Team and certain other responsible officers at Thanet District Council have conducted themselves in relations with the present Application from the time ROIC sought to work with TDC as an indemnity partner with a view to acquiring the airport to run as a cargo hub alongside other airport services, to its development by as an NISP by RSP as ROIC's successor in time. At the present time, I am not persuaded that it will be necessary to "go there", but I am fully prepared to do so if need be.

Dr. R. John Pritchard



Code	Description
3MTHS	3 Months Exemption
ADMIN	Company in Administration
BANKRU	Owner Bankrupt
CHAR	Charity Exempt from EPR
CROWN	Property Kept Vacant by Crown Exemption
DECD	Pers Reps Entitled to Possession Exemption
INDUST	Industrial Exemption
LAND	Exempt from EPR
LIQUID	Liquidator Entitled to Possession
LISTED	Listed Building Exemption
MINRV	Minimum RV Exemption
PROHIB	Occupation Prohibited Exemption
TOR	To be taken out of Rating
TRUSTE	Trustee Entitled to Possession Exemption
WINDUP	Company Subject to Winding Up Order
ZERO	Zero Rated Property

Code	Description
CASCM	Sports Mandatory
DISC	Discretionary Relief
LNEWS	Local News
LOCAL	Local Discretionary Fund
MAND	Mandatory Relief
NEWBLD	New Build Relief
PUBRLF	Pub Relief
RURDGS	Discretionary RR General Stores
RURDPH	Discretionary RR Public Houses
RURDPO	Discretionary RR Post Offices
RURDPS	Discretionary RR Petrol Filling Stations
RURMGS	Mandatory RR General Stores
RURMPH	Mandatory RR Public Houses
RURMPO	Mandatory RR Post Offices
RURMPS	Mandatory RR Petrol Filling Stations
TOPUP	Top-Up Relief

Company	Unit	Address	City	State	Zip	Acres	Year Built	Value	Assessed Value	Market Value	Market Value	Market Value	Market Value									
Petco Lane Emporium Limited	Unit M1	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881000	Unit M1	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881000	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80
	Unit M2	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881100	Unit M2	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881100	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80
	Unit M3	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881200	Unit M3	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881200	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80
	Unit M4	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881300	Unit M4	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881300	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80
	Unit M5	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881400	Unit M5	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881400	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80
	Unit M6	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881500	Unit M6	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881500	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80
	Unit M7	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881600	Unit M7	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881600	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80
	Unit M8	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881700	Unit M8	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881700	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80
	Unit M9	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881800	Unit M9	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881800	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80
	Unit M10	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881900	Unit M10	47 Dumpton Park Drive	Ramsgate	Kent	CT11 8AD	4247881900	Occupied	yes	Sales Pch	£4,200.00	£4,200.00	£0.00	£2,032.80	1	£2,032.80	£2,032.80

Table with 16 columns: Client Name, Address, Postcode, Property Type, Status, Valuation Date, and various financial metrics including Market Value, Net Value, and various percentages.

Table with 12 columns: Company Name, Address, Property Ref, Date, Status, Description, Valuation, etc. Lists various real estate listings and company details across multiple categories.

Code	Description
CASCM	Sports Mandatory
DISC	Discretionary Relief
LNEWS	Local News
LOCAL	Local Discretionary Fund
MAND	Mandatory Relief
NEWBLD	New Build Relief
PUBRLF	Pub Relief
RURDGS	Discretionary RR General Stores
RURDPH	Discretionary RR Public Houses
RURDPO	Discretionary RR Post Offices
RURDPS	Discretionary RR Petrol Filling Stations
RURMGS	Mandatory RR General Stores
RURMPH	Mandatory RR Public Houses
RURMPO	Mandatory RR Post Offices
RURMPS	Mandatory RR Petrol Filling Stations
TOPUP	Top-Up Relief

Code	Description
3MTHS	3 Months Exemption
ADMIN	Company in Administration
BANKRU	Owner Bankrupt
CHAR	Charity Exempt from EPR
CROWN	Property Kept Vacant by Crown Exemption
DECD	Pers Reps Entitled to Possession Exemption
INDUST	Industrial Exemption
LAND	Exempt from EPR
LIQUID	Liquidator Entitled to Possession
LISTED	Listed Building Exemption
MINRV	Minimum RV Exemption
PROHIB	Occupation Prohibited Exemption
TOR	To be taken out of Rating
TRUSTE	Trustee Entitled to Possession Exemption
WINDUP	Company Subject to Winding Up Order
ZERO	Zero Rated Property