

M Simpson

3rd September 2023

Dear Sir or Madam

Re TR020002: Manston Airport Updates email Fri 1st September 2023 - Application by RiverOak Strategic Partners Limited (“the Applicant”) seeking a change to The Manston Airport Development Consent Order 2022 Order (“the Application”).

Having been raised, schooled and lived most of my life in Ramsgate, I can quite honestly say that there are a number of individuals who are not from these parts and who have ‘taken over’ or created various groups purporting to ‘speak for Ramsgate’. These are in the main those who are against the airport’s revival with all sorts of unsubstantiated reasons. Personally I cannot understand anyone not wanting to make proper use of such a huge piece of Thanet’s fixed infrastructure without public money being involved. It is an absolute ‘no-brainer’ for this area.

The 2 non-material changes proposed by RSP are logical. As RSP own the airport they don’t now need to set aside as much money and therefore means that they need a minor change to the DCO to reflect this.

RSP are in fact correcting only minor administrative details brought about by their purchase of the airport on the last day of the original Examination. It was an oversight at the closing stages of the DCO Examination, so is simply a tidying up of those loose ends in a proper and sensible manner and will have little or no impact on anything in real and practical terms. This is contrary to what some within Thanet District Council, and Anti-Manston groups are suggesting by way of other current submissions that try and raise matters totally irrelevant to this process.

The first change includes compensation to Stone Hill Park, where RSP has applied to amend the security figure from £13.1 million to £6.2 million at Article 9(1)(a) of the DCO. This was based on SHP being the owners and what they could have been compensated for. However, RSP bought the airport from SHP on the last day of the original Examination, so the original sum to be set aside for that compensation aspect is far too large and the requested change is now based on that fact: hence the reduction.

The second non-material change proposed by RSP is because they feel the wording of Article 21 (3) is ambiguous. It could be interpreted that RSP would have to exercise its powers of compulsory acquisition immediately after the end of any legal challenge, rather than within one year. This non-material change is designed to give clarification to avoid this potential problem.

I fully support RiverOak Strategic Partner’s (RSP) application to vary the Manston Development Consent Order (DCO) and would therefore ask that the Secretary of State for Transport grants the Applicant, RSP, permission to make them.

Yours sincerely,

