

# Deadline 6 outstanding issues

## Funding

Deadline 5 has come and gone yet there are still many funding questions outstanding and we are wondering just how much leeway the ExA will be giving RSP before deciding enough is enough.

Please refer to my previous submission here

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-003814-Barry%20James%20-%20Response%20to%20Funding%20statement.pdf>

Further we wonder whether the ExA will provide some feedback to the submissions made as we find it extremely frustrating that all the work we have put in to our submissions is falling on deaf ears. This is especially so considering RSP are failing to honour their own promises in providing truthful answers to the questions being asked.

### **Question F.2.20 to be answered by Riveroak**

The Applicant is reminded that the *DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (DCLG (2013) Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land, April)* states that:

*“Any application for a consent order authorising compulsory acquisition must be accompanied by a statement explaining how it will be funded. This statement should provide as much information as possible about the resource implications of ... implementing the project for which the land is required.”*

You stated in F.1.11 that:

*“The Applicant will submit an updated funding statement as soon as the restructuring mentioned in the Deadline 1 cover letter (REP1-001) is complete.”*

The ExA notes that an updated Funding Statement has not been provided at Deadline 5 despite the Applicant’s statement in its Response for Deadline 1: Enclosure 1 to Main Letter re s51 Advice on Funding that:

*“...it is anticipated that [the restructuring] will be complete and that further details can be put into the public domain by Deadline 3 (8 February).”*

**Explain why you have failed to meet your anticipated deadline of 8 February, and subsequent Deadlines 4 (8 March) and 5 (29 March).**

## Public Safety Zones

Further to my earlier submission here

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-003813-Barry%20James%20-%20Response%20to%20D5.pdf>

The questions raised in the submission have never received an answer despite RSP now stating a cap on flights at 38000 so would require a PSZ immediately.

# Deadline 6 outstanding issues

## **Viability**

Despite the admission by Dr Sally Dixon that her “wish list” in the Azimuth report no meaningful business plan has been forthcoming and we wonder whether the viability of the DCO is actually going to be examined in detail.

Our submissions on the subject are here:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-003812-Barry%20James%20-%20Viability.pdf>

And the transcript of Dr. Sally Dixon examination

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-003816-Barry%20James%20-%20Sally%20Dixon%20Transcript.pdf>

## **Noise**

No explanation has been made by RSP as to how their 60db noise contour map can be justified. Our submission on noise was made here:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-003815-Barry%20James%20-%20Response%20to%20noise.pdf>

Could the ExA please respond to this anomaly and explain just how a noise map from RSP can show such a small area at 60db when noise monitors on Chatham & Clarendon School (outside this area) regularly gave readings of over 85db?

## **Conclusion**

It has been incredibly frustrating dealing with the DCO and the examination simply because there is absolutely no feedback given to members of the public taking part. It feels to us that we are superfluous to requirements and it is only the ExA and lawyers who count.