

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport: Richard Price](#)  
**Subject:** Interested Party Ref - 20014440  
**Date:** 15 February 2019 22:55:46

---

I submitted a written objection to the Manston DCO in October 2018 and spoke at Margate Winter Gardens against on the 11th January this year.

There seems little point in adding to the vast documentation you will have already been provided with to demonstrate the catastrophic impact on the Ramsgate residents quality of life the RSP proposals would have. I thought it would be useful to have some scientific studies that may counter this view and indeed challenge my own views, guess what, I couldn't find any.

In my oral submission, I pointed out that RSP don't own the land, have never evidenced that they have the funds (2 CPO attempts) and have still failed to evidence the funds, moreover they have sought financial advantage through political manipulation of the planning system in an attempt to blight the land as a blackmail chip against the legal owners to sell at a reduced rate. Should RSP have the funds then they merely need to offer the owner fair value:-

***Fair value is the sale price agreed upon by a willing buyer and seller, assuming both parties enter the transaction freely and knowledgeably.***

In my written objection I highlighted a number of red flags

***Corporate structure. Offshore tax havens, closed share registers, Swiss fiduciary companies, concealed ownership. Red flag after red flag.***

I also pointed out:-

***Obfuscation, the proposer throughout this process has deliberately sought to sow confusion***

It comes as no surprise to me that at this late stage of the process RSP are morphing once more. It seems a little odd that they suddenly feel that perhaps transparency is an issue, they are after all using a Swiss Fiduciary Company, if nothing else you would expect the Swiss Fiduciary Company to be aware of the shift towards the regularization of tax affairs, this has decimated the Swiss banking industry. Why are they swimming against the tide, generally there is a reason why such extreme measures are taken to hide the identity of a UBO, not normally good ones and I think it legitimate that it should be assumed that there is something very wrong being hidden.

It strikes me that a financial scam is in play her.

At the Winter Gardens I spoke after Dr Beau Webber who claimed that SMA do not have a hot line direct to RSP. I pointed out that SMA have had more briefings in the last 2 years with RSP than I have had hot meals with my mother in the last 10. I am minded to point that since the 11th of Jan I have had no hot dinners with my mother but SMA have had yet another Barbecue, Dr B on the top table with Tony Freudmann. Also, at the Barbecue was Sir Roger Gale (as he always is), a politician who has displayed not an ounce of open mindedness as to what is best for this site. As a Politically Exposed Person I respectfully suggest that Sir Roger should be disallowed from having any input to this process:-

***Politically exposed persons (PEPs) are individuals whose prominent position in public life may make them vulnerable to corruption. The definition extends to immediate family members and known close associates.***

Given the red flags, the concealed ownership, closed share register, the use of Swiss Fiduciary companies, his known close associates with RSP and that he is a PEP, I think it reasonable to expect SRG to be kept at arms length from this DCO process.

Lastly, the business case. I am sure the examining body is aware of the global downturn, the fall

in the price of oil as less goods are transported around the globe, the announcement that Airbus are ceasing production of the A380, the move towards a greener economy (just today children in the UK have been on strike over climate change) the spare capacity at existing airports. There simply is no business case for this CPO.

To finish off I think it just listing some of the other points I made in earlier submissions:-

*Wilful misrepresentation by the proposer of local support for this proposal, at a basic level you only have to walk the streets of Ramsgate to see the thousands of posters against this proposal, I counted 2 in favour.*

*Wilful misrepresentation by local MPs of the support for this proposal. Our local MPs have closed ears in respect of this, despite the evidence they have clearly decided to promote this scheme.*

*Wilful misrepresentation of the impact of this proposal by our local MPs. Our local MPs, in the face of the evidence within the application itself, refute that there will be night flights and/or detriment to the living conditions of those that they represent.*

*An inappropriate relationship between our elected representatives and the proposer, too cosy by far, they have decided to represent the proposer (proudly) in this case rather than the local community, have not scrutinised either the DCO application and/or the current owners plans with an open mind.*

*Destruction of the quality of life for those living beneath the flight path. I had the council noise monitor on my roof, readings are in excess of 100 decibels, this is not acceptable day or night.*

*A devastating impact on the local wildlife and environment.*

*A devastating impact on the education and life chances of young people, disturbed sleep, interrupted lessons, long term health issues due to noise and pollution.*

*A devastating impact on the tourist trade and the jobs they provide.*

*A devastating impact on the built environment within Ramsgate, pollution/noise/turbulence*

*An overstatement of the jobs this proposal will create. Time and time again they project utterly ridiculous employment numbers, time and again they fail.*