

49

**From:** Linda Burton James [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 January 2020 10:51  
**To:** TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE  
**Subject:** Manston Airport (TR020002)  
**Attachments:** letter to Pins.docx

My Reference No 20011947

Dear Susan Anderson

Please find attachment as my reply to your email dated 17<sup>th</sup> January 2020

Yours faithfully

Linda james

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

---

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.

---

To: Susan Anderson

Head of Transport Infrastructure Planning

Dear Susan Anderson

Thank you for your email and notification of the new deadline for the Application by RiverOak Strategic Partners Limited ("the Applicant) for an Order granting Development Consent for the reopening and development of Manston Airport in Kent.

I am writing to notify you of a decision announced by Nusrat Ghani (on behalf of the Secretary of State Partners for an order granting a DCO for the reopening and development of Manston Airport, Kent.

I have read all the information accompanying and I do not quite understand what is happening. I am sorry for my inability, but can you please qualify that further representations were sent to you in October 2019, November 2019, December 2019 and January 2020?

I have followed the application from the beginning reading all your literature concerning the process and have been impressed with the process and its openness and accuracy. I made representations and submitted by the due dates finalising on the 9<sup>th</sup> July 2019. I attended the very thorough inspectors' enquiries and I have all the required documentation that you have given out.

Nowhere in that documentation did it say that late representations would be accepted. If it had then I am sure there would have been. But I am sure decisions made are not based retrospectively. We have all worked with PINS framework and I now fail to understand that on the day before I was expecting a decision on the DCO you tell me that more questions are to be asked and referring to late submissions that I have 2 weeks to make comments on.

I find this totally unacceptable and what is worse fail to understand why. The whole process I was led to believe was timetable based, and strictly adhered to. I trusted this to be true and now find it a sham, feeling let down and rather shocked. I realise that my feelings play no part in this, however I would like an explanation as to why this has happened. The persons who submitted late questions had already within the time allowed given their representations. If I knew that I could have submitted a further thesis to you then I may have undertaken it too.

This delay is unfathomable as there has been more than adequate time to decide. This is a costly business to many concerned the developers, investors, those waiting for the Isle of Thanet to prosper, business, employment prospects and the residents of Kent.

Yours Very Bewildered

Linda James (PINS Reference 20011947)

61

**From:** Linda Burton James [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 January 2020 18:10  
**To:** TRANSPORTINFRASTRUCTURE  
**Attachments:** CC.docx

My Reference No 20011947

Dear Susan Anderson

I wrote to you on the 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020 in reply to your email to me dated 17<sup>th</sup> January 2020.

Please find my further comments attached to this email concerning the late submissions to TR020002 – Manston Airport

Yours faithfully

Linda james

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

---

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.

---

To: Susan Anderson

Head of Transport Infrastructure Planning

From: Linda James

**Please find the following my comments and formal complaint on the acceptance of further submissions on the 17<sup>th</sup>/27<sup>th</sup> October 2019 - 1<sup>st</sup> November 2019 - 19<sup>th</sup>/20<sup>th</sup> /23<sup>rd</sup> December 2019 – 6<sup>th</sup> January 2020 to the Planning Inspectorate for Manston Airport**

I have read through the submissions sent to you on the dates above. I fail to understand their relevance as all the points raised, were made, by the submitters during the dates permitted available to all of us who, submitted our representations. What I noticed is that during the 6 months since the close date, research and evidence has been accumulated to back up their opinions.

The statements made by these further submissions only repeat that what has already been stated in their original representations, with possibly the exception of Mr Lowes who has added to his original submission. I would have thought and was of the understanding that the PINS procedures were thorough, transparent and correct and have scrutinised all the issues mentioned. The PINS procedures guarantee that the decision to put RSP's application for a DCO forward is justified and correct.

Any unlawfulness then would have been examined. The fact that the DCO application was accepted would indicate to me there isn't any unlawfulness and that comments made can only be personal and petty which I find distasteful.

It is stated in the late representation on 17<sup>th</sup> October, that the 'need case is speculative'. It then goes on in a rather lengthy diatribe citing this opinion to be correct according to them. What I find difficult is that all that is stated has been investigated and examined in lengthy proceedings during the Pins timetabled process.

Most of the submission cites the York Aviation Report that SHP commissioned. At the very beginning there is a disclaimer that states that none of the report can be used in evidence at any legal proceedings. This must surely be because it is mainly opinion and forecasting based on a whole myriad of differing opinions. Many other consultants would look at the same issues and take a differing approach and slant. However, the submissions that I am now having to comment on quote endlessly from this report as if it is the only such document of its kind.

I object to the assertions made in these submissions, produced months after the official acceptance date, that evidence has not been examined correctly by the inspectors at the timetabled examinations and deadlines set to accumulate evidence.

This feels to me like nimbyism disguised as a load of irrelevance and a personal collective of issues and policies already examined by PINS. I do not understand why this should be accepted for further scrutiny.

I am not sure from reading the submissions what points are being made as to viability and deliverability as all the points are a regurgitation of many months and years of Fake news spread by parties interested in closing Manston. RSP have worked hard on a business plan that must have many variables as changes in political and international influences abound.

The plans and timetable have been scrutinised by PINS, and although everyone will have an opinion, these new unnecessary submissions again rely heavily on York Aviation to back their own already conceived notions.

I am one of the many people on the Isle of Thanet who realise that prosperity for the area depend on more skilled and professional work being available. We have an influx of people who have moved to the area, who have bought up houses, that many of the local population could never afford because of the low paid skill jobs they have. We have a wonderful place to live in and the expansion of the airport will not alter that. I understand the concerns, and climate change is a very huge issue that affects us all. That is why the plans for this DCO on a small neglected airport that has lain dormant for 4 years is so important. It will not only improve the Isle of Thanet and SE Kent, but countrywide, when we will become part of a network of smaller airports that can relieve the environments surrounding larger airports under pressure.

Four years ago, the Cameron Government promised to help Manston Airport reopen and set out a five-point plan, to the effect of getting the licenses reinstated, and a backing to its development. A UKIP council was voted into office because they promised to open Manston Airport. When they reneged, they were thrown out. Getting Manston Airport up and running is what most of the residents of Thanet and SE Kent want. The investment that will be put into improving Manston airport will put Manston back into full and productive operation. When the DCO is passed then the deliverability of a high-tech airport with a sympathetic attitude to all the issues raised will be achieved.

I am of the understanding that all the issues brought up by these late submissions have been examined and the DCO was passed for determination. The acceptance of submissions put into the procedure as late as early January 2020, six months after the last deadline is unacceptable.

I now submit these as my comments and formal complaint.

Linda James