

Response for Deadline 4 concerning the use of the Hoverport part 2

Planning Inspectorate ref: EN020026

My ID: [REDACTED]

Change 1 Order Limits

The Applicant has applied for an increase in the order limits for the Hoverport under Change 1 and the deadline for responses has passed. However, new evidence has come to light during the ISH 2 hearing. The Applicant made clear that the area around the Manston Outfall would not be used but when questioned about why this area was included in the order limits the response from the applicant was that *“the order limits have been set in order to allow the identification of the most suitable route with a certain amount of flexibility to work around areas where there has been degradation”*. I fail to see how an area that is clearly not suitable for use gives any flexibility. Under the Change 1 request I would urge the Ex-A to refuse to allow these unsuitable areas on the northern edge of the apron to be included within the order limits.



The diagram to the left shows the possible access routes and the position where the following two photographs were taken.



01



02

Original Order Limits

Under the original plans the Applicant intended to access the intertidal area from the southern edge of the apron. Despite showing that the access routes are now on the eastern edge of the apron, the southern part of the apron is still included in the order limits.

This southern access route is totally unsuitable because a) there is the real risk of damaging the saltmarsh in this area b) the apron shows the greatest deterioration in this area.



The diagram to the left shows the position where the following photographs were taken.



03



04



05



06



07

It can be clearly seen from the photographs that this area of the apron is totally unsuitable and there is no reason why it should still be included within the order limits.

Photographs courtesy of Nik Mitchell.

David Stevens