

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Cc: [Richard Price](#)
Subject: Objection to the RSP application for a DCO on the former Manston Airport site by a Ramsgate resident
Date: 15 February 2019 17:27:09

Dear Sirs,

You have before you a DCO application to develop a freight hub on the disused Manston Airport site. Leaving aside the fact that the applicant's credentials are dubious to say the least, could PINS be seriously considering taking away this site from the British company who legally own it, who have a proven track-record in development sympathetic to the needs of the area (housing, business use, leisure activities, a school and medical facilities), and, giving it to an offshore-registered company, with unverifiable assets, representing an American real-estate and finance concern with no aviation experience whatsoever? There are some, bluntly, who have raised eyebrows that PINS have permitted such a clearly flawed application to get even this far. Whereas Riveroak SP claim that we NEED another cargo hub and that Manston is the best location for it, reality argues quite to the contrary. Currently operating airports cargo-carrying facilities, like East Midlands, Stansted and Luton all have spare capacity, are better placed geographically and have better local infrastructure to move freight by road transport. A number of investigations were carried out (by KCC, Avia and Falcon), all of which concluded that Manston was unviable. The only investigation which found to the contrary was that commissioned by Riveroak themselves by Dr. Sally Dixon from Azimuth (of which she is the sole trader), who, herself, like her clients, have no aviation experience of this kind. I should perhaps qualify my assertion above that the applicant has no aviation experience whatsoever by adding that Mr Freudman, disbarred from practicing law on 27 counts of misappropriating client funds and now with Riveroak SP, while employed by Planestation, presided over staggering financial losses at the airport, adding to his other, numerous failed ventures.

I note that there is no Public Safety Zone in place, despite a projected 83,000 ATMs per year. I find this alarming as Ramsgate Town is closer to end of the runway at Manston than any other conurbation at any other airport.

Throughout their DCO application Riveroak SP have admitted that a cargo hub of the magnitude they propose, will have a catastrophic effect on the lives of the residents of the Isle of Thanet in terms of noise and atmospheric pollution, as well as vibration damage to buildings in an area with more Georgian architecture than the City of Bath. Classrooms will be disrupted every ten minutes by aircraft overhead making teaching and learning impossible. In each area, they agree that such a development will bring 'permanent' and 'significant adverse affect' to the occupants of Ramsgate, Manston, Pegwell, Wade and West Stourmouth. Regarding schools, they admit that their plan will bring about 'Disruption or disturbance and interference with task'. On hospitals, they admit to 'disruption or disturbance in the day and sleep disturbance at night' Businesses (some of whom have already announced their intention to relocate if the cargo hub becomes a reality), will be unable to function. The burgeoning, yet fragile, tourist industry, based as it is on the cafe and restaurant culture centred upon the picturesque Royal Harbour, can only be adversely affected. Health will suffer from the particulate pollution of aviation fuel, known to exacerbate respiratory problems; constant noise, day and night, will cause strokes and heart-attacks, affect mental health and bring about dementia. Overall, 'A perceived change in the quality of life' (day and night), of the residents of this area.

All of this, they cheerfully admit will be the result of a cargo hub at Manston on their current projections. However, their projections are inaccurate, claiming that noise levels will be no more than 58dB (average), whereas levels in excess of 90dB were recorded when the airport was last operational. Surely, these factors must come under the heading of 'Noticeable and Very Disruptive', to be 'Prevented', in accordance with the Government's Noise Policy Statement for England.

To conclude:

Riveroak SP have applied for a DCO on Manston ostensibly to start an aviation cargo hub with, at worst case scenario, a predicted 83,000 ATMs per annum - approximately one every ten minutes, day and night.

They make this proposal despite the fact that reports from all expert organisations (apart from the one they paid for), conclude that Manston is unviable as an airport for any purpose.

They insist that the site is a significant national asset which must be reserved for aviation use, specifically freight, despite the CAA predicting that the nationwide requirement for cargo hubs will decline as companies opt to send goods via the cheaper option of 'belly hold' cargo in passenger aircraft.

Their business plan is based on many 'ifs' and 'maybes', which are either unlikely or completely unverifiable. An example of which is that they appear to have no money. 'If', however, the DCO is granted, the money, through investment, will become available (well ... 'maybe').

Many believe this to be an extremely unprincipled company, with a lack of credibility very much on a par with Seaborne Freight, that it was always operating an elaborate 'land-grab' (Riveroak is, after all a property company), and that they will build the houses on the site anyway, which they effect to despise and oppose. Perhaps they will pretend to run a cargo hub for a while; perhaps not. As there is no machinery forcing them to restore Manston as an operational airport, they may elect to build the houses without going through the cargo hub charade at all.

That the level of ATMs proposed (or anything approaching it), will bring about unacceptable levels of atmospheric and noise pollution and the attendant health problems, is incontrovertable and, I believe, self-evident. Riveroak SP admit to as much in their application document. How any company could contemplate wilfully doing this to a community is beyond comprehension; that an appointed committee of enquiry, or a Secretary of State, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, should sanction it, is unthinkable.

Yours faithfully,

Christopher Warner

Ramsgate resident