



**Defence
Infrastructure
Organisation**

Ministry of Defence
Graham Boulden B Sc (Hons) FRICS FAAV
RASC Lines
West Road
Shorncliffe FOLKESTONE
Kent
CT20 3EZ

Telephone: (+44) 01303 228070
E-mail: Graham.Boulden100@mod.gov.uk

The Planning Inspectorate
National Infrastructure Planning
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

6th February 2019

Dear Sirs

Your reference: TR02002

Application by River Oak Strategic Partners for an Order granting Development Consent

I am writing to submit written representations in regard to the above and in particular to the “Summary of Applicant’s Oral Submissions at January 2019 Hearings” dated 18th January 2019, reference TR02002/D1/Sub, Examination Document. These representations specifically relate to comments made by the Applicant under paragraph 2.7. of the document concerning the Ministry of Defence’s High Resolution Direction Finder (HRDF) Apparatus.

By way of background information, the freehold of the site on which the HRDF stands (which is located within the boundary of the former airfield) is still owned by the Ministry of Defence. In addition to owning the site itself the Ministry of Defence has the benefit of a covenant that “no building or structure of any kind above ground level shall at any time be erected or permitted to stand on any part of the property which lies within 120m of the nearest part of the boundary of the DRDF.” The DRDF is defined within the relevant documentation as the “Diagonal Resolution Direction Finding System”. This equipment is also known as the HRDF.

Therefore, it is suggested that the relocation of this apparatus cannot simply be achieved under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as stated by the Applicant. For a number of reasons it is, and has to be, an integral and significant part of the Development Consent Application. The Applicant has considered a number of possible alternative locations for the HRDF with its preferred option being a site at the eastern end of the former airfield. Whilst the Ministry of Defence (through the Defence Infrastructure Organisation) is, in principle, prepared to consider the re-location of the apparatus, it has to be completely satisfied that there would be no degradation of the capability of the equipment. As yet, the Applicant has not provided any technical information whatsoever in relation to the proposed alternative site to enable this judgement to be made. It is the Ministry of Defence that is waiting to hear from the applicant and it is incorrect to suggest that it is the other way round. In addition, even if the technical capability is not degraded, the Applicant has provided no documentary evidence to the Ministry of Defence as to whether the landowner on whose land it would be sited has consented to the equipment being placed there.

To summarise, it appears that the applicant has rather glossed over the issues surrounding the possible relocation of the HRDF with the information that it has provided to the Planning Inspectorate and this is a substantive and significant matter which remains unresolved.

Yours faithfully

Graham Boulden B.Sc. (Hons) Est. Man. FRICS FAAV

Estate Surveyor