

**From:** [mieke vrijhof](#)  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** TR020002: Manston Airport Updates 20/7/2023  
**Date:** 24 July 2023 17:43:43

---

Dear Sir/Madam

In response to your email dated 20/7/2023 I wish to make a number of observations with relevance the application for a Non-Material Change to the [Manston Airport](#) Development Consent Order.

1. It is disingenuous to have a consultation period from 12/7/2023 - 25/8/2023 for a number of reasons:
  - the email received from you was dated 20/7/2023 i.e. already 8 days into the consultation period thereby limiting the actual consultation period.
  - the documents submitted 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 light of the DfT's persistent stance on the validity of 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) - I suggest that the delay to and the resulting shortened/restricted consultation period may 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 achieved that the consultation period effectively commenced when schools broke up and covered the whole of the school holiday period. This will inevitably affect the response to the issue as people have other priorities and demands during this time.

I also understand that during this period the relevant local authorities do not have any scheduled meetings where this matter could and should be raised and discussed.

2. The documents list a number of publications where the Regulation 6 Notice

would appear I have been unable to find ANY evidence of this in any of the online editions.

Considering that these days print editions are only available in very small volumes, I

suggest that this is a cynical use of the word 'consultation' as it will only be a very small

number of residents who see or read printed local newspapers.

3. 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 stated in what I believe to have been 2019, the cost of land for compulsory acquisition was inevitably very significantly lower than it is 4 years later.

The same applies to costs of noise mitigation measures that not only include materials but also labour - both of which have sky-rocketed since.

This latest attempt by RSP (and the DfT?!) to not only undermine interested parties' suggested rights to be consulted (as detailed in 1 and 2 above) 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 (as stated in 3 above) is yet again an example of the deplorable manner in which this company conducts its business.

I object in the strongest terms to the Application for a Non-Material Change.

Yours sincerely

Mieke Vrijhof

