

Manston Airport (TR020002) Reference 20014413 Susan Kennedy

Competence, Capability and Credibility

Response to ExQ4

Submission Deadline 9

Susan Kennedy

I write with an overview of one of my chief concerns regarding the Applicant. As an ordinary member of the public, my personal dealings with RSP and its employees and consultants have been characterised by a lack of honesty, lack of clarity, deliberate vagueness, varying definitions, contradictory statements, lack of evidence, use of out-of-date evidence, selective use of evidence and failure to reference accepted guidelines and scientific evidence.

During this DCO process, my personal experience has been writ large.

I have included in this submission just a very few examples from the latest questions put by the Examining Authority(ExA). There are many, many more examples in previous questions and in this latest document. My personal experience as a teacher and a lecturer mean not only that I recognise many of the tactics but also that I am forced to laugh out loud. Well, I would, were there not so much riding on this.

Throughout, the ExA has had to try and extract information, detail, definition and explanation over the period of many months. Throughout, the Applicant has employed delaying tactics and provided excuse after excuse to not provide this or that. Throughout, the Applicant has removed or changed detail in the application with no explanation offered. Throughout, the Applicant appears to have been doing its homework, set by the ExA, last minute.

Throughout, the Applicant has provided contradictory statements. Throughout, documentation provided by the Applicant has been poorly presented, lacking in accessibility and rife with typos and errors. Hilariously, in this last document, the ExA has to ask exactly who RiverOak are.

My serious point here is that the Applicant has proved time and again that no project, let alone a nationally significant project, should be committed to their oversight, organisation and implementation. They are clearly incapable. In this submission I am not even focusing on their lack of experience, the dubious track record of some of their employees, the apparent lack of funding, the lack of a proper, recognisable, industry-standard business case. No, simply on grounds of basic competence, capability and credibility, this Applicant cannot be granted this DCO.

Extracts from Examining Authority's Fourth Written Questions and Requests for Information

CA.4.15 Cogent Land LLP

- "Cogent Land does not appear to be named in the Compulsory Acquisition Status Report."

- “State why there has been little/no attempt by the Applicant to engage with Cogent to discuss this matter further to provide clarity.”

CA. 4.19 Crown Land – Secretary of State for Defence (Lands)

- Response from Applicant – “ The Applicant has not yet reached agreement and cannot guarantee that it will do so by the close of the Examination but it will keep trying.”
- “Please provide a further report on progress and state definitively whether Crown consent will be obtained by the close of the Examination.”

CA. 4.20 Crown Land – High Resolution Direction Finder (HRDF)

- “Explain the length of time it has taken to fully address this issue.”
- “Explain why Cogent Land LLP were not made aware of the potential effect of proposals for the relocation of the HRDF.”
- “Given all the above, show why the ExA should not consider that the issues related to the HRDF to constitute a potential risk or impediment to implementation of the scheme that has not been properly managed.”

F.4.12 Draft s106 Agreement

- “Justify having two sets of partial and overlapping definitions in two related documents; or provide a common set of definitions to be used in both documents.”

F.4.14 Draft s106 Agreement

- “Is RiverOak ‘RiverOak Fuels Limited’ or ‘RiverOak Strategic Partners’?”
- “If RiverOak is ‘RiverOak Strategic Partners’, it does not appear as a party in the agreement.”

HE.4.3 Military Remains

- “ Paragraph 5.4.6 of the Draft WSI states that: “there are no records of military aircraft crash site (sic) within the site boundary.”
- But “the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment states that: “ there are 14 potential military remains within the study area, 11 of which are located within the limits of the site.”
- “Are there or are there not records of military aircraft having been lost within the site boundary?”

LV.4.3 Revised Design Guide

- The revised Design Guide appears to remove: ‘Buffer planting will be provided along key boundaries to provide visual containment to the development and mitigate the impact of neighbouring properties.’
- “Explain why this important principle is no longer a principle.”

Susan Kennedy

23nd June 2019