

To: Secretary of State for Transport  
% Planning Inspectorate,  
National Infrastructure Planning

Date: 15 November 2021

Our Ref: SoS/R/011

Email: [manstonairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:manstonairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

---

**For the attention of the Manston Airport Case Team**

- A. This submission is in response to the SoSFT's letter of 21 October 2021 and specifically paragraph 6.
- B. We submit our comment to the First Round of Consultation herewith as a formal consultation response to the Second Round of Consultation.
- C. Our comment is in response to the submission [\[TR020002-005769\]](#).
- D. In **response to ANNEX 1 - The status of the Need in the Decision**. (For ease of reference we will be following the Applicant's numbering).

**Page 4, Paragraph 1.**

**Need is Important and Relevant**

- In deciding the application s105(2) of the Planning Act 2008 ("**PA 2008**") requires the Secretary of State to have regard to: (a)...(c)) any other matters which the Secretary of State thinks are both important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision.
- The Secretary of State's Statement of Matters of 11 June 2021 stated at paragraph 9 that "*the Secretary of State has appointed an independent aviation assessor to advise him on matters relating to the need for the Development and to produce a report summarising those findings*".
- The award of the contract is publicly available on the Government's

Contracts Finder website<sup>1</sup>.

- A reasonable person would conclude that the Secretary of State thinks the Quantitative Need for Development is an *"important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision"*.
- On 21 October 2021 the independent aviation assessor's draft report ("**Independent Aviation Assessor Report**") was published.
- The Independent Aviation Assessor Report was limited in scope to the Quantitative Need for Development and specifically changes to demand for air freight, changes to capacity at other airports and locational factors.
- A reasonable person would conclude that the Secretary of State thinks Quantitative Need for Development and specifically changes to demand for air freight, changes to capacity at other airports and locational factors are *"important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision"*.
- Whether (or not) there is a Need for Development is important and relevant.
- Since the examination a further 4 independent experts agree that there is **no** Need for Development as evidenced in:
  - [ExA recommendation Report](#).
  - [Independent Aviation Assessor Report](#)
  - [Ramsgate Town Council's independent aviation expert's report](#)
  - [Jenny Dawes' independent aviation expert's report](#)

## **Page 1, Paragraph 2.**

### **Airport NSIP has Prescribed Criteria Under PA 2008**

- A Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project ("**NSIP**") requires consideration at a national level. Sections 15-30 of the PA 2008 prescribe the criteria for NSIPs. There is an obligation to meet the criteria as set out in Sections 15-30 of the PA 2008<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> TTW00129 Manston Airport Development Consent Order Review available online at:

(accessed on 11 November 2021)

<sup>2</sup> The Applicant cites the example of the London Resort as a comparative development. The London Resort is not comparative to the Proposed Development. The London Resort is not a proposed airport

- Section 23 of the PA 2008 sets the criteria for an airport-related development to constitute an NSIP<sup>3</sup>.
- In its application to the Planning Inspectorate the Applicant specifically refers to and relies upon Section 14(1) of the PA 2008 which states that an NSIP, for which development consent under the Planning Act 2008 is required, includes 'airport related development' and the prescribed criteria is set out in Section 23 of the PA 2008<sup>4</sup> and specifically s.23(3)(b), s.23(4) and s.23(5) of the PA 2008.
- The threshold criteria is set out in Section 23(4) taken together with 23(5)(b), by which an alteration to an airport is to be treated as an NSIP if it is "expected" to "increase by at least 10,000 per year the number of air transport movements of cargo aircraft for which the airport is capable of providing air cargo transport services"<sup>5</sup>.
- The threshold criteria was tested in *R (Ross and Saunders (acting on behalf of Stop Stansted Expansion)) v. Secretary of State for Transport* [2020] EWHC 226. The Secretary of State had looked at this question on the basis that it should be determined by reference to the maximum number of passengers the airport was realistically capable of achieving, as opposed to the maximum hypothetical capacity of the airport assuming that all passenger flights would be using the largest aircraft and at full loads, on a 24/7 basis. Dove J. held that this was the correct interpretation of s.23(4)-(5)<sup>6</sup>.
- It follows that the cargo threshold criteria should be determined by

development and the London Resort falls outside the prescribed criteria for NSIPs and is therefore not relevant to this application.

<sup>3</sup> DfT Ministerial Statement specifically paragraph 10 Available online at:

[REDACTED] (Accessed on 11 November)

<sup>4</sup> TR020002-002376-1.2 Application Form: Available online at:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-002376-1.2%20-%20Application%20Form.pdf> (Accessed on 11 November 2021)

<sup>5</sup> Section 23 PA of the 2008 Available online at:

[REDACTED] (accessed on 11 November 2021)

<sup>6</sup> [REDACTED] (Accessed on 11 November 2021)

reference to the maximum number of air transport movements of cargo aircraft the airport is realistically capable of achieving, as opposed to the maximum hypothetical number of air transport movements of cargo aircraft.

- The Quantitative Need for Development determines what is realistically capable of being achieved.

**Page 4, Paragraphs 3-5.**

**Proposed Development is a Development Consent Order Scheme, Involving an Unused Airfield and is Cargo-led**

- We respectfully draw the Secretary of State's attention to paragraph 55 of the Closing Submissions on behalf of Stansted Airport Limited ("STAL"):  
*"The Manston ExA was faced with a full DCO application to re-open the airport and was obliged to examine in detail the question of "sufficient need" for those freight/cargo-led proposals. They noted the MBU Policy Paper<sup>7</sup>, but observed, correctly, that "freight or cargo flights are not mentioned within this paper"<sup>8</sup> and do not return to consider it again. Manston was, of course, a DCO scale proposal and the ExA undertook a thorough UK-wide review of freight capacity, demand and forecasts, before concluding that the promoters had failed to establish sufficient need. Of course, the Secretary of State ultimately took a different view, although his reasoning has been quashed and the decision has been remitted to him for reconsideration".*

**Page 4, Paragraph 5.**

- The Applicant is inaccurate. The Applicant has not accurately quoted Paragraph 17 of the [Stansted Decision Letter](#).
- Paragraph 17 specifically makes reference to Manston Airport and specifically differentiates Manston Airport from MBU airports.

---

<sup>7</sup> CD14.59, para.5.5.20 & 5.5.21 Available online at:

2021)

<sup>8</sup>Para. 5.5.21 *Ibid*

(Accessed on 11 November

- Paragraph 17 in its entirety states:

*"17. MBU builds upon the APF, again referencing work undertaken by the Airports Commission which recognised the need for an additional runway in the South East by 2030 but also noted that there would be a need for other airports to make more intensive use of their existing infrastructure. On this basis, MBU states that the Government is supportive of airports beyond Heathrow making best use of their existing runways. There is no requirement flowing from national aviation policy for individual planning applications for development at MBU airports, such as Stansted, to demonstrate need [Notwithstanding conclusions in relation to Manston Airport, which is not comparable to the current proposal (being a Development Consent Order scheme, involved an unused airfield and was a cargo-led proposal rather than passenger)] for their Proposed Development or for associated additional flights and passenger movements. This was not disputed by the Council and whilst SSE took a contrary view, even its witness accepted that there was a need for additional capacity within the London airport network, beyond any new runway at Heathrow" .*

#### **Page 4, Paragraph 6.**

##### **No Need No Jobs**

- The Applicant agrees that if there is no need this will directly impact the number of jobs created during the operation of the Proposed Development (ie: if there is no need there are no jobs).
- Since the examination a further 4 independent experts agree that there is **no** Need for Development as evidenced in:
  - [ExA recommendation Report.](#)
  - [Independent Aviation Assessor Report](#)
  - [Ramsgate Town Council's independent aviation expert's report](#)
  - [Jenny Dawes' independent aviation expert's report](#)
- It therefore follows that as there is no need there will be no jobs.
- Perhaps because of this fact, the Applicant now seeks to rely upon

alleged benefits such as construction jobs, and highway, ecological and 'other' unidentified improvements in and to the local area.

- As you will be aware, the Proposed Development is a Development Consent Order Scheme and caught by the Prescribed Criteria Under PA 2008.
- An Airport NSIP therefore requires matters of national significance.

**Page 4, Paragraph 6.**

**Local Construction Jobs**

- The Applicant's states in [TR020002-005769] that there will be an unquantified number of construction jobs in the local area.
- Following recent case-law<sup>9</sup>, the Applicant cannot rely on a local benefit.
- Further, we respectfully highlight to the Secretary of State the following:
  - These alleged local jobs are temporary<sup>10</sup>.
  - These alleged local jobs are on a phase by phase conditional basis ie: contingent on the success of a prior phase<sup>11</sup>. If there is no need (as evidenced by 4 experts since the examination including the expert commissioned by the DfT), local construction jobs will simply not materialise.
  - There has not been a breakdown of numbers by phase provided by the Applicant. The Applicant has merely stated that the average number of workers on site at any time would be 210<sup>12</sup>. This is around the same number of jobs that Wetherspoons currently employs annually<sup>13</sup>. The largest Wetherspoons in the UK, opened in

---

<sup>9</sup> Paras 50 and 119 of [REDACTED]

<sup>10</sup> Para 6.10.103

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-05347-TR020002%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report%20to%20DfT.pdf>  
(accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>12</sup> Para 6.10.104

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-05347-TR020002%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report%20to%20DfT.pdf>  
(accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>13</sup> [TR020002-003300] (accessed on 15 November 2021)

Ramsgate by the Royal Harbour after the airport closed, is situated directly under the proposed flightpath. A single cargo freight plane flying over this employment site at the altitude of less than 700 feet will put these jobs at risk<sup>14</sup>. The altitude is determined by the orientation of the runway and distance of the runway from the town centre and Royal Harbour documents submitted to the CAA by the Applicant and to the examination have shown the altitude of planes over Ramsgate, its town centre and the Royal Harbour will be at an altitude of between 250 to less than 1,000 feet<sup>15</sup>. This one example alone highlights the risk of loss to existing jobs.

- As you will be aware, housing delivery has been slow historically in Thanet District Council and the Housing Delivery test was introduced to speed up the delivery of housing. The Thanet District Council Housing Delivery Test Action Plan Update December 2020 states that - *"the availability of a suitably qualified and skilled workforce is likely to be a significant constraint to accelerating local delivery and will be reflected in costs"*<sup>16</sup>. Therefore not only are construction jobs critical to housing delivery, competing demand for this workforce will increase costs for and to Thanet District Council.
- The adopted Thanet District Council Local Plan seeks to remedy the construction skills gap by applying a clause in various economic development policies expecting developments to contribute towards the Local Employment and Training Fund (Policies SP05 and E01)<sup>17</sup>.
- Policy SP05 of the adopted Thanet District Council Local Plan specifically refers to 4 site areas of land allocated for Economic

---

<sup>14</sup> [\[TR020002-003300\]](#) (accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>15</sup> [\[REP4-087\]](#), [\[REP4-088\]](#), [\[REP4-089\]](#), [\[REP4-090\]](#) and Airspace Change Portal Civil Aviation Authority: [REDACTED] (accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>16</sup> Available online at: [REDACTED]

(accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid*

Development. The Proposed Development is **not** listed as a site area allocated in the local plan for business and employment generating purposes<sup>18</sup>.

- Policy E01 of the adopted Thanet District Council Local Plan refers to 20+ existing employment sites and **does not** include the Proposed Development<sup>19</sup>.
- Therefore unlike the 20+ identified existing employment sites and/or the 126 hectares total site area<sup>20</sup> allocated for business and employment generating purposes in the Thanet District Council Local Plan the Applicant **will not** contribute to the Local Employment and Training Fund to support construction skills. This will negatively impact existing identified employment sites and/or sites allocated for business and employment generating purposes in the local plan<sup>21</sup>.

#### **Page 4, Paragraph 6**

#### **Matters Related to Traffic and Transport Weigh Substantially Against the Case for Development Consent Being Given**

- Kent County Council (as the Local Highway Authority) has submitted evidence that the Proposed Development will lead to an increased likelihood and/or risk of road traffic collisions and vehicular conflict, to the detriment of highway safety<sup>22</sup>. It is unclear how the Applicant can

---

<sup>18</sup> Policy SP05 adopted Thanet District Council Available online at:

[REDACTED] (accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>19</sup> Policy E01 adopted Thanet District Council Available online at:

[REDACTED] accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>20</sup> Policy SP05 adopted Thanet District Council Available online at:

[REDACTED] (accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>21</sup> Policies SP05 and E01 adopted Thanet District Council Available online at:

[REDACTED] (accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>22</sup> Pages 2/3 [TR020002-005259] Kent County Council's penultimate submission Available online at:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-005259-Kent%20County%20Council%20response%20to%20request%20for%20further%20information.pdf>  
(accessed on 15 November 2021)



attribute evidence of risk to life as benefits.

- We respectfully remind the Secretary of State that the ExA concluded that matters related to traffic and transport weigh substantially against the case for development consent being given<sup>23</sup>.
- We, also, specifically refer to the most recent submission by Kent County Council<sup>24</sup> (“**KCC**”) in which it states that it would refer to full comments provided in response to the deadlines associated with the Development Consent Order, which remain relevant to the consideration of this DCO. It, also, at the last paragraph, requests that the [Secretary of State] has due consideration of KCC's submission throughout this Examination process when assessing the proposal<sup>25</sup>.
- As you will be aware, KCC (as the Local Highway Authority) submitted a response to the Department for Transport for Comments and Further Information (letter dated 17 January 2020) which states at paragraph 5<sup>26</sup> that:

*“5...KCC would like to highlight the following specific concerns (bold added for emphasis):*

*Junction 1 (A256 / Sandwich Road): The position of KCC is set out in the County Council's Local Impact Report (LIR). KCC's assessment is that it is unlikely that the proposed mitigation scheme will deliver any practical benefits to junction capacity/operation of the junction and **so it would not mitigate the impact of the proposed development**. As such, KCC does not*

---

<sup>23</sup> Para 8.2.218

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-05347-TR020002%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report%20to%20DfT.pdf> (accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>24</sup> [TR020002-005741]

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-05741-Kent%20County%20Council.pdf> (accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>26</sup> [TR020002-005259]

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-05259-Kent%20County%20Council%20response%20to%20request%20for%20further%20information.pdf> (accessed 15 November 2021)

consider the proposed scheme to meet the regulation 122 CIL Regulations 2010 tests. Therefore, KCC does not consider the proposed mitigation to be an acceptable basis for a financial contribution within the UU.

Junction 2 (A299 / A256 / Cottingham Link Road): KCC's position is outlined in the response to the Fourth Written Questions (TR.4.23). The proposed scheme is not considered to appropriately mitigate the impact from the development **as it would lead to an increased likelihood of road traffic collisions and vehicular conflict in this location.**

Junction 4 (A299 / B2190): KCC's position is outlined in its response to Fourth Written Questions (TR.4.24). The proposed scheme is not considered to appropriately mitigate the impact from the development **as it would lead to an increased likelihood of road traffic collisions and vehicle conflict.**

Junction 6 (A299 / Seamark Road / A253 / Willetts Hill): KCC's position is outlined in the response to the Fourth Written Questions (TR.4.25). The proposed scheme is not considered to appropriately mitigate the impact from the development, **as it would lead to increased likelihood of road traffic collisions and vehicle conflict in this location.**

Junction 7 (A299 / A28): The position of KCC is set out in the responses to the Third Written Questions (TR.3.27) and the Fourth Written Questions (TR.4.26). The proposed mitigation is not considered to appropriately mitigate the impact from the development. In particular, KCC considers that the proposed layout changes **are likely to increase the likelihood of side swipe**

**road traffic collisions, to the detriment of highway safety<sup>27</sup>".**

"Junction 13 (Manston Court Road / B2050): The position of KCC is set out in response to the Fourth Written Questions (TR.4.28) and the LIR. This mitigation scheme would not be deliverable within the extent of existing highway boundary. As **neither KCC or the applicant has legal rights over the land required to implement the proposed mitigation (and the land is not included within areas of land identified for compulsory purchase in relation to the DCO), this scheme is not deliverable without further investment.**

Junction 15 (Manston Road / Hartsdown Road / Tivoli Road / College Road / Nash Road): The views of KCC are outlined in the response to the Fifth Written Questions (TR 5.4), the Second Written Questions (TR.2.42) and the KCC LIR. **The concerns previously set out in the aforementioned documents remain KCC's position. The applicant has failed to respond and address those concerns in a satisfactory manner.**

Junction 16 (Ramsgate Road / College Road / A254 / Beatrice Road): The views of KCC are outlined in the response to the Fourth Written Questions (TR.4.32) and the Second Written Questions (TR.2.43). The proposed mitigation is not considered to effectively address the impact of the development. **It will disadvantage pedestrians (of particular concern is that this junction is located close to a primary school and several local shops). It will also lead to an increased risk of road traffic collisions** as the proposed reconfiguration will lead to blocking back of the junction by queuing traffic and restricted intervisibility between the signal

---

<sup>27</sup> [TR020002-005259]

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-005259-Kent%20County%20Council%20response%20to%20request%20for%20further%20information.pdf> (accessed 15 November 2021)

stop lines in this location.

Junction 17 (Ramsgate Road / Poorhole Lane / Margate Road / Star Lane): The position of KCC is outlined in the response to the Fourth Written Questions (TR.4.33) and the KCC LIR. The proposed scheme of mitigation **is not considered to deliver any practical benefits to the capacity of this junction.**

Mitigation to junctions not offered in the UU (Schedule 6) The Secretary of State's attention is drawn to the following mitigation that KCC considers to be necessary, but is not being offered by the applicant in the UU:

Junction of A256/Ash Road (A257): The Secretary of State is referred to KCC's response to the Fifth Written Questions (TR.5.15), in respect of the fact that no off-site mitigation has been identified by the applicant for the junction of A256/Ash Road (A257), despite the fact that KCC considers it necessary. KCC (as the Local Highway Authority) has **identified that traffic impacts from the proposed development would be severe in this location** and appropriate mitigation should have been offered as a planning obligation provided as part of the UU.

Junction of Alland Grange Lane/Spitfire Way: As outlined by KCC in its response to the Fifth Written Questions (TR.5.5), junction improvements at Alland Grange Lane/Spitfire Way are required. The applicant has **not adequately justified the failure to provide this identified mitigation.** It is accepted that the delivery of this mitigation would either require the acquisition of third-party land or a redesign of the Spitfire Way road widening scheme to avoid encroachment onto third party land and realignment of the existing road into the airport site.

Junction 26 (Newington Road / Manston Road) & Junction 27 (Newington Road / High Street). As set out by KCC in its response to the Fourth Written Questions (TR.4.37), the applicant has not addressed the **residual impacts in these traffic sensitive locations and the UU does not offer any mitigation**<sup>28</sup>.

- Further, KCC (as the Local Highway Authority) makes specific reference to Policy SP47 of the adopted Thanet District Council Local Plan:

*“...The following strategic routes are sufficient in their existing form to provide for the growth envisaged in the Plan)(subject to the Local Plan review process set out in Policy SP03). However, if further development is permitted, including **further development at Manston Airport, which has a material impact on the capacity or operation of these routes**, the Council will require alternative on-site highway provision where appropriate and/or proportionate contributions towards any improvements or changes to the existing routes which is thereby necessitated:...”<sup>29</sup>*  
(bold added for emphasis).

#### **Page 4, Paragraph 6**

##### **Lesser Forecasts Just Means Harm**

- The Applicant has asserted that if such forecasts were not to be achieved then lesser harm would be caused but an examination of ‘tipping points’ has not taken place by either the Applicant or the ExA<sup>30</sup> or the Secretary of State; ie: At what point does the cost and/or harm of the Proposed Development at any stage from initial construction onwards become

---

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>29</sup> [TR020002-005741]

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-005741-Kent%20County%20Council.pdf> (accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>30</sup> Paras 6.3.212; and 8.2.94

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-005347-TR020002%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report%20to%20DfT.pdf> (accessed on 15 November 2021)

outweighed by the alleged benefits it may (or may not) deliver?

- Typically the environmental costs of construction are mitigated across the whole operational life cycle of the infrastructure project. In this case there is no need for the airport therefore the operational lifecycle will be at best significantly curtailed if not completely non-existent.
- The Applicant assumes that costs and/or harm only starts when (or if) the airport comes into operation. This is an inaccurate and unevidenced assumption. By way of example the Applicant, ExA or the Secretary of State has not examined the cost and/or harm associated with the following issues:
  - The Revised Construction Environment Management Plan<sup>31</sup> does not quantify the environmental impact.
  - Harm to local area and/or residents and/or business including but not limited to tourism in terms of construction noise impacts, air quality impacts etc.
  - Environmental cost of embodied carbon of construction materials.
  - Construction works, not completed due to insufficient funds and/or a lack of demand.
  - Only some construction works, completed due to insufficient funds and/or a lack of demand.
  - Highway works, not completed due to insufficient funds and/or a lack of demand.
  - Only some highway works, completed due to insufficient funds and/or a lack of demand.
  - Impact of infrastructure changes made for the Proposed Development that are no longer of use and may not fit with the Local Authority Highways and Transport plans but still require ongoing maintenance which must be met by the public purse.
  - Cost to the Thanet District Council which has stated that the Proposed Development will significantly impact the Local Plan.

---

<sup>31</sup> Available online at:

[https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004429-CEMP%20\(Clean\).pdf](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-004429-CEMP%20(Clean).pdf) (Accessed on 12 November 2021)

- The opportunity cost of the loss of a brownfield site as works are not completed due to insufficient funds and/or a lack of demand;
  - The sterilisation of a brownfield site as works are not completed due to insufficient funds and/or a lack of demand; and/or
  - The Airport not coming into operation due to insufficient funds and/or a lack of demand or due to identified operational risks (HRDF, no airspace or aerodrome certificate). It is of note that the ExA concluded that operational matters weigh moderately against the case for development consent being given<sup>32</sup>.
- The Applicant assumes that costs and/or harm only starts when (or if) the airport comes into operation. This is an inaccurate and unevidenced assumption. By way of example the ExA did examine the cost and/or harm associated with the following construction and destruction issues:
    - Harm to non-designated assets such as the T2 Hangar and WWII Dispersal Bay. At para 6.3.188 of the ExA Recommendation Report it states that: *"...however, it was of the view that due to the inadequate surveying it was not possible to decide whether buildings have such importance and note that **the ANPS states that impact of development on heritage assets should be avoided or minimised and that once lost heritage assets cannot be replaced**"*; and
    - That Thanet District Council confirmed its view in the examination that: *"...whilst the proposed development may bring further tourists to the area, the **amenity impacts from the construction and operation of the proposed development may adversely affect the tourism industry in Ramsgate and the wider Thanet area and weigh against any proposed benefit***<sup>33</sup>." (bold added for emphasis)

---

<sup>32</sup> Para 8.2.176

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-05347-TR020002%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report%20to%20DfT.pdf> (accessed on 15 November 2021)

<sup>33</sup> Para 6.10.121

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-05347-TR020002%20Final%20Recommendation%20Report%20to%20DfT.pdf>

**Page 5, Paragraphs 7-8.**

**Experts Unanimously Agree No Need**

- We disagree with the Applicant. Since the examination a further 4 independent experts agree that there is **no** Need for Development as evidenced in:
  - [ExA recommendation Report.](#)
  - [Independent Aviation Assessor Report](#)
  - [Ramsgate Town Council's independent aviation expert's report](#)
  - [Jenny Dawes' independent aviation expert's report](#)
  
- As you will be aware, the Proposed Development is a Development Consent Order Scheme and caught by the Prescribed Criteria Under PA 2008. An Airport NSIP requires matters of **national** significance under statutory law.