

From: [anne.marie.nixey](#)
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: Reply to recent application for changes
Date: 25 August 2023 23:25:17

I am writing as a Ramsgate resident and a Ward Councillor to register my opposition to Riveroak Strategic Partner's (RSP) application to vary the Manston DCO.

Firstly, as a Councillor, I feel that this consultation has not taken into account the lack of available scheduled meetings over the Summer recess, where this subject could be raised and discussed by Thanet District Council and therefore I feel we have had little time to examine the item fully. This isn't the first time we have been disadvantaged this way and I feel it should be noted.

We are dealing with residents in my ward that will be penalised should this 'material; change come to light. The cost of compensation, not index linked at the start will be negligible in terms of affect in the long run and to create a change that would further hinder this would in our minds be ludicrous and unfair. We are dealing with compulsory purchase orders, mitigation from noise disturbance and relocation. These things are not minor issues and full weight ought to be given to the severity of this change to people's daily lives and quality of life. The proposed change could result in less security that the applicant will be able to provide the required finances to cover both the noise mitigation plan (NMP) and compulsory acquisition under Article 9. In both of the Secretary of State (SOS) decisions (9th July 2020 and 18th August 2022), this conclusion was not disputed nor was the amount altered, therefore this figure was considered appropriate by the SOS/DfT at £13.1million. With the initial sum not index linked it has already fallen in value in real terms, so to decrease it even more would deem it almost less value as the years progress. I do not understand how this could be allowed, when the price of materials and costs in general are going up?

I am also very much concerned also over the current new housing that is adjacent to the airport. When, in 2019 and the DC O was initially applied for the Planning Inspectorate looked at all on going planning applications within the area. Since then, bearing in mind it is now 2023 and the houses for the local plan have now been allocated sites, there are more developments in the area. These houses are on the outer edges of an already densely populated town and nearer the runway, I would therefore have assumed that the monies needed to put the noise mitigation plan in place be raised, not decreased?

No Night Flights at the time of the initial consultation with the Planning Inspectorate, submitted noise contour levels that were authorised by the CAA, these contours furthered the area of compensation and it is these areas that are now being newly developed. This is not a reason to make changes to an amount that was seen as inadequate by the Planning Inspectorate at the time!

These developments in the area are changing land values, prices for developmental land is not what it was four years ago. RSP's valuations are out of date and contentious even when they were submitted. To therefore suggest that the amount needed to be transferred into an Escrow account be reduced should at least be value based. A true up to date valuation of land by three different agents needs to be administered giving a true reflection of the current cost. The issue with all of this process is due to the long winded nature it makes data redundant if left too long and for the nature of a volatile asset prices are fluid not fixed, meaning only up to date information is relevant. We don't all buy our holiday currency on the price of the pound in 2019 and we don't value our homes on those figures either!

All the way through this process we have seen RSP claiming to spend money on the

project. Money of which does not shown in their year end accounts. They suggest that £500m will be invested, so to quibble over such a sum for compensation would seem bizarre. Might I suggest the obvious and say that the money promised, that is not showing in their accounts to date may not be available, this would seem the only reason that a change be asked for. And if so, where is the rest of the £500m coming from? Rather than looking into whether there ought to be a material, as I believe it to be, not a non material change, I would be asking for due diligence from the Government on obtaining data on the actual monies available and where it comes from. As a council that is exactly why we did not allow the airport to be CPO'd under two different administrations, and I expect the National Government to be as exacting as Local as a duty of care to it's residents.

On that note, I strongly object to the proposed application.

Councillor Anne-Marie Nixey

