

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Manston Airport - TR020002- Oral Submission - 10.01.19 - Ian Hide.  
**Date:** 11 January 2019 09:11:09

---

Dear Planning Inspectorate

My registration identification number is 20012234.

At the open floor meeting held on the evening of Thursday 10th January, I spoke near the end of the meeting.

I understand that you require a written record of what I said.

Whilst this is not word for word what I said, as it was a unscripted response, it is basically my responding to the contributions from other speakers and is largely what I have already said in my written submission of 6th September 2018, but substantially updated in the light of what was said at this meeting.

Basically it is -

If the owners of Stone Hill Park (the new name for the Manston site) lose ownership then an opportunity to develop housing with a full range of developer funded amenities will be lost.

I believe that Riveroak Strategic Partners Ltd (RSP) have said they do not have a current Business Plan. In addition they seem so unaware of the geography of the site that they are unsure of it's height above sea level!

So suggestions from consultants that appear to be employed by them concerning aircraft taking off at 6 degrees and being 4,000 feet above Ramsgate town centre in fact are worthless when they do not even know the height and layout of the land and airport site and thus can not accurately calculate the height of a aircraft!

I said at the meeting, and I remain to be convinced otherwise regardless of what the solicitor from their legal team said in reply, that the lack of a Business Plan suggests that really there is possibly a Plan B in the background.

That is obtain the site by a DCO, thus at a reduced non open market price. Then attempt to run a freight airport 24/7 with little regard for the impact on the residents of Ramsgate.

Then after say 18 months if it is not looking like it will work as a airport announce to the local authorities that as the 5th owner of the airport they too can not make money and so no one else will ever be able too, so then press for the promised job creation by building a mass of housing but without any of the planning and amenities that the current owners of Stone Hill Park have had to offer. This would offer temporary job creation but only during construction but this would be presented as better than nothing.

In effect a "fire sale" where RSP will get the land at a knockdown price, then have a failure of the airport and proceed with I believe is possibly the real plan, a minimum amenity (thus low cost to RSP) mass housing scheme that will make RSP lots of money (RSP are a real estate developer) and as the local authorities will be desperate to salvage something from a fiasco of a 5th operator failing at the airport site, they will feel obliged to give planning permission.

Please bear in mind that RSP have said they have no airport operating experience.

They are a real estate developer.

I noticed that of all the points raised over 2.5 hours of a open floor meeting, the issue of the number of flights and my suggestion that the whole of this DCO effort by RSP may be a front for a Plan B were the only points the solicitor chose to reply to.

Have I hit upon something?

And why no Business Plan that they could present at the preliminary DCO hearings on 9th & 10th January 2019? They have known for a long time time that these hearings were coming. To me it is disrespectful of the DCO process not to have prepared a Business Plan.

The above is in further detail the additional points I raised at the hearing.

Yours faithfully

Ian Hide.

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---