

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: TR020002-006441-DFT-Consultation-Letter-Manston-8-Sept.pdf CONSULTATION SEEKING COMMENTS FROM THE APPLICANT and ALL INTERESTED PARTIES
Date: 08 September 2023 14:52:18

Thank you for your email of 2023, asking me for comments on the Responses the Consultation on the application for changes to the [Manston Airport](#) Development Consent Order, which has been made by the Applicant, RiverOak Strategic Partners Ltd.

My Comments are:

TR020002: Manston Airport

Comment on Responses to the Application for a non-material change to the [Manston Airport](#) Development Consent Order (Manston DCO) made by RiverOak Strategic Partners Ltd.

Response from Chris LOWE

I strongly SUPPORT the Objections which have been submitted to the proposed changes to the Manston DCO proposed by River Oak Strategic Partners.

I note that the Objections present reasoned arguments against the changes, and include local authorities, who are well placed to assess the proposals.

I was very concerned at the Response from Emma & Andrew Hargreaves, which perfectly illustrates the real problems being imposed on those whose property is subject to the proposed Compulsory Purchase Order, especially as the terms have not been provided, and the real risk that the Applicant may claim 'lack of funds', for people without strong legal representation.

Hence the absolute essential need to maintain the original Security figure.

In contrast, the Supporters of the proposed changes, are led by the Save Manston Airport association (SMA), but apart from saying the proposed amendments are 'logical', presents no evidence in support !

“Logical” is also meaningless without more evidence, and is merely a view point, and does not say for whom the proposals may be 'logical'.

The claimed 4,000 SMA supporters are noticeable by their absence, and those that support the proposed changes, include the Secretary of SMA, and four others, but none of them provide evidence for their support.

The other supporter of the proposed changes, is a general letter repeating arguments which have already been heard, and are not related to the specific detail of the proposed “non-material changes”.

Hence there is no objective reason for the Inspectorate to support the proposed “non-material changes”, and I trust you will reject the proposed changes.

I hope you will take my evidence into account in making your recommendation for Refusal.

I also hope it is all self-explanatory but would be pleased to clarify any queries.

With best wishes,

Chris Lowe

interested Party, Registration Number: 20014275

