

**From:** [Christine Isted](#)  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: TR020002: Application for a Non-Material Change to the Manston Airport Development Consent Order.  
**Date:** 31 July 2023 11:11:18

---

**Subject: Re: TR020002: Application for a Non-Material Change to the Manston Airport Development Consent Order.**

Dear Sir/Madam

We are writing with regard to the recent application for a Non-Material Change to the [Manston Airport](#) Development Consent Order.

To say that we are unhappy about this is a total understatement.

Firstly, how cynical it is to have a consultation period running from 12/7/2023 - 25/8/2023: slap bang in the middle of the holiday period ... to minimise objections.

- the email received from you was dated 20/7/2023 - in other words already 8 days into the consultation period thereby limiting the actual consultation period
- the documents submitted to the Secretary of State by RSP were dated 24/5/2023 according to the letter from the DfT stating: 'Thank you for your email of 24th May 2023, and attached documents which provided details of the proposed application to amend The Manston Airport Development Consent Order 2022 ("the 2022 Order") and your intended approach to consultation' - and signed by Gareth Leith.
- A further letter from RSP's lawyers was then sent on 11/7/2023 which appeared to copy the content of the initial correspondence regarding this matter.

The DfT effectively took SEVEN weeks to respond and

finally did so on 12 July - the day the consultation is supposed to have commenced.

In the context of DfT's perverse support for the Manston DCO in direct contradiction to not only the Planning Inspectorate's recommendations, but to those of a large number of aviation experts consulted (including Ove Arup contracted by the DfT itself) it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the resulting shortened/restricted consultation period can only be beneficial to both DfT and RSP.

Not only did the delay shorten the consultation period by over a week since interested parties only received the communication about this matter on 20/7, but it also conveniently ensured that the consultation took place during peak holiday period. We have also ascertained that, during this period, the relevant local authorities do not have any scheduled meetings where this matter could and should be raised and discussed.

The documents list a number of publications where the Regulation 6 Notice would appear but we and others have been unable to find ANY evidence of this in any of the online editions so we can only assume these are in printed editions with dwindling circulation. Once again another tactic from the obfuscation playbook - using the word 'consultation' in the sure knowledge that it will only be seen by a very small % of residents and business owners who read printed local newspapers.

Thirdly, in the Application for Non-Material Change, it reads as follows: 'The new figure of £6.2 million includes a revised compensation figure for compulsory acquisition (£1.1 million) but does not interfere with the amount set aside for noise mitigation measures which remains at £4.35 million. A contingency remains built into the £6.2 million figure.' When these figures were initially put forward 2019, the cost of land for compulsory acquisition was significantly lower than it is 4 years later.

This latest attempt by RSP (and by extension the DfT) to not only undermine interested parties' rights to participate meaningfully in a consultation together with the further cynical attempt by RSP to, in real terms, reduce the compensation figure for compulsory acquisition as well as the figure for noise mitigation measures is yet another example of the deplorable manner in which this company conducts its business.

We therefore object in the strongest terms to the Application for a Non-Material Change and look forward to hearing your detailed response.

Please note : Salient points made .....

We have raised multiple issues re the publishing of the consultation period and its dates.

We have also raised the indisputable fact that the price of land since 2019 will have increased enormously and therefore those who will be affected by the Compulsory Purchase Order are most unlikely to be adequately compensated by RSP for their land - based on the figure RSP quotes.

And of course when it comes to the figure for noise mitigation - that they do not propose to change and that dates back to 2019 - the costs of materials and labour have skyrocketed since 2019 and that figure is therefore even more inadequate than it already was in 2019.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Christine Isted

( member of NNF Group - residents society for Liverpool Lawns/Adelaide Gardens .  
Ramsgate Society Member - Business owner and Resident )