

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Richard Price](#)
Subject: Manston - re email from BDB Pitmans dated 5 April 2019
Date: 17 April 2019 19:01:03

Dear Richard,

Please accept my apologies for writing so soon after my previous email, however we have only just had sight of the email from Angus Walker of BDB Pitmans, which was published on the Planning Inspectorate's website yesterday (16 April 2019).

We trust that the Mr Walker's email will be considered and responded to in a manner consistent with the fundamental values of the Planning Inspectorate and its commitment to openness, transparency and impartiality. We also take comfort from the express commitments provided by the Examining Authority in the Rule 6 and Rule 8 letters dated 11 December 2018 and 18 January 2019, respectively, which both confirm;

"The Planning Inspectorate has a commitment to transparency. Therefore all information submitted for this project (if accepted by the Panel) and a record of any advice which has been provided by the Planning Inspectorate, is published at <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/manston-airport/>"

Whilst the questions that have been asked of RSP by the Examining Authority support our ongoing trust in the process, we do wish to place on the record our considered view that the nature of this application and Applicant has presented unique challenges for the Examining Authority, Planning Inspectorate and affected parties.

We are now over half way through the examination phase and the Applicant has consistently failed to furnish the examination with the required information in accordance with the Deadlines set by the Examining Authority or the commitments it has given, with the Applicant seemingly either unwilling or unable to provide such information.

As explained in SHP's submissions to the examination, many of the Applicant's answers to questions posed by the Examining Authority are incomplete, lack veracity, evidence and context, or were wholly misleading. Where the Applicant's submissions have been tested through written and oral questions, the contradictions, inconsistencies and lack of credibility of the Applicant's case become clear. Accordingly, we are concerned that the Applicant is seeking to withhold as much information from the examination as it can in order to avoid adequate and fair testing of its application.

The Applicant's willingness to overstate the significance of its evidence, also reinforces the need for transparency. For example, the Applicant's claims about the "PWC letter", which simply confirms that certain levels of funds are held in a bank account that Helix operate on behalf of certain clients, defies logic but also highlights the very real risk that redacted evidence, which cannot be properly tested, could be misrepresented by the Applicant.

Funding and concerns regarding RSP's ability to raise it continues to infect every aspect of this DCO application. This fact was recognised at the outset in the section 51 letter of 14 August

2018. The examination is now over half way through its timetable and no clarity on funding arrangements has been provided that would allow the Examining Authority or other interested parties to begin to test the proposals or form a view on RSP ever being able to raise the necessary development funding. This is despite the Applicant's acknowledgement that its aviation consultant, Azimuth Associates, on whose report the whole need case is predicated, had no relevant air freight forecasting experience and did not consider costs or viability in arriving at her forecasts.

We are increasingly concerned about the volume of public and private time and money that is being expended in the consideration of a DCO examination where it is now apparent that the submissions being provided by RSP are not up to the standard that is required to deliver an efficient and effective examination process. Unfortunately, the email from Mr Walker seems to be preparing the ground for more of the same.

For the reasons we set out above, we believe there could be no justification for deviating from the Examining Authority's previous commitment to openness and transparency and consider that RSP can no longer be given the "benefit of the doubt".

Best regards
Jamie

Jamie Macnamara
Stone Hill Park Limited