

From: [REDACTED]
To: manstonairport@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Cc: alan.pughsley@kent.pnn.police.uk
Subject: Response to Thanet District Council submission
Date: 07 March 2019 15:54:20

Dear Inspectorate

(1) [REDACTED] in September my submission writing (and typing!) may be sub standard

(2) The advice I gave Paul Fay, who has communicated with you, a couple of years ago:

That he should report his facts to Chief constable as compliance with statutory duty to report in Money Laundering and in Terrorism Law and bearing in mind Criminal Law Act 1967

(3) [REDACTED] did this and it was Chief constable as a consequence who in effect made crime complaint for inquiry into the Manston acquisition plan by his Economic Crime Unit

(4) I have asked BDB solicitors to Riveroak what is their position, re knowledge of Kent Police inquiry, as part of the sector regulated by Solicitors Regulation Authority and never received a reply. It seems a simple issue can they explain what the Director of KCC Economic Development told [REDACTED] he had witnessed at Manston when it was last operational ? To which you are now privy.

(5) The pre existing position of Solicitor Regulation Authority relates to a firm of Thanet solicitors and Sericol history. The SRA position is that current National Crime Agency interest (Stephen Lawrence case corruption inquiry to which I am a called witness) is insufficiently specific to trigger their regulatory duty in Terrorism Law to tackle that firm of solicitors. The Chief constable in charging duties to Economic Crime Unit (3) specifically excluded inquiry into criminal and terrorist law aspects of a proper inquiry touching on Sericol. If he had done so then it seems to me inevitable that SRA would have triggered regulatory duties on the Thanet firm of solicitors and on BDB

(6) Before I [REDACTED] I had began pre-action protocol intending to seek a mandatory order by Judicial Review that Thanet District Council comply with Environmental Protection Act 1990 and Planning Law duties in cumulative impact and precautionary principle and duties to promote public health well being But after [REDACTED] I found that Environment Agency had emailed setting out that environmental tests at Manston are scheduled which to some extent overtook need for judicial review of TDC

(7) I listed in pre action the Chief constable as interested party. I am copying this submission to Chief constable and to Police and Crime Commissioner.

(8) As far as environmental hazards to health are concerned this is about sites as follows:

Westwood re GEC historical tipping of transformer oils (Toxic polychlorinated bi phenyls)

Pegwell Nature Reserve former landfill and reported GEC site for burial of toxic polychlorinated biphenyls

Same Pegwell Nature Reserve findings 1992 of toxic polychlorinated biphenyls in surface layer and why no search for buried sources for these surfacing PCBs with implication for Project Nemo and current cabling from offshore windfarm. As well as implications for Westwood retail parks built on site of unaddressed reports of GEC toxic tipping.

Thor (WMD) Mercury factory

Sericol history of leaking tonnes of cyclohexanone over 30 years into Rumfields water supply aquifer and circumstances in which the reports to TDC of GEC toxic tipping over same aquifer were not disclosed to NRA inquiry re Sericol

Manston firefighting foam toxic residue threat to water supply derived from Manston aquifer.

(9) TDC are now in submission to you changing position re Manston and firefighting foam and announcing they are reviewing their contaminated land strategy

(10) REPLY to Tim HOWES TDC in house solicitor of today

Richard Card [7 March 2019](#)

Dear Tim Howes,

The question in your duties is clear. Put it this way in your training of cllrs and preparation for statutory duty to promote public health well being were cllrs told that Dr Chandrakumar said epidemiology inquiry is required ?

You have not actually answered the FOI Are you trying to sustain the position TDC took publicly after my FOI to EA 2008.

I have explained to you that the position of 2008 was already over ten years old. The story that cyclohexanone stained chalk pink and that alerted staff to the leak that never reached aquifer,

It is mind boggling that TDC would endeavour to sustain that lie when faced with an

FOI which said the red staining was an effect of the remediation process. And when the scale of the remediation was clear 470 tonnes of cyclohexanone.

TDC were involved with police and NRA at discovery of the Sericol leak 1993 (When chalk was not stained red because the remediation had not yet started.

It is very kind of you to say the duty was with me to get the epidemiology inquiry. And your kindness extends to unsolicited advice in that regard. But as TDC solicitor you know full well my duty as a citizen was to tell TDC who have a duty in promotion of public health well being as well as environmental hazards and planning. . And one of the objectives of judicial review would as you know have been to compel you in that health well being duty.. Indeed your guidance from govt on health protection cumulative impact is to tell Public Health Authority isn't it.

I have marked your response as a refusal to disclose the requested information.

Another FOi was refused on grounds it was too expensive. But clearly if you had done your duty in health well being promotion all the information sought would have been collated for report to cllrs charged with the public health liaison duties wouldn't it If you had obeyed statutory duties the information would have been collated.

I am writing to National Planning at moment and I think I will copy this reply to you into that submission to National Planning I am copying that reply to Chief constable and PCC but have no plans to copy it in advance to you.

Your position is easily exposed on the facts and you are reluctant to acknowledge that and change position

Yet you are changing strategy on contaminated land

And yet you fail to see or acknowledge that you cannot rely on replies you made in a period that you now concede TDC were in error. And you fail to see that you cannot rely on Riveroak impact inquiry because self evidently if it was effective impact assessment TDC would have abandoned its old contaminated land strategy (Best described as do nothing keep schtum) under Riveroak study results.

You just go round and round in circles man. The staining of chalk red from chemical leak never happened did it ? The staining was a consequence of remediation and that was a consequence of leakage to aquifer undetected for 30 years is best estimate IMO>

My advice is from a retired intelligence officer whose degree is in industrial chemistry> I do not need to deploy this. But it is that cyclohexanone theft would be of interest to drugs police but not by itself of anti terrorist interest. But given the associated matter of arrest of Sericol ater site engineer 987 for paramilitary activity. Given crime complaints about forged UDR ID cards Army Service Records and

engineering qualifications given the arrests of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]) Kent Police should have called in Met lead on anti terrorism. The call to met anti terrorism was made by Cllr Sebastian 1997/98 a reserve forces officer going over kent police heads at a time he was a Cllr no doubt told by TDC officers that cyclohexanone stained the chalk red and alert staff at Sericol tackled a leak before it reached aquifer. Just ask yourself IF that were true why was Rumfields water abstraction switched off and why did it remain off. So the lie you sustain in the 2008 position is none other than the same lie with which officers misled cllrs more than ten years before.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Card

(11) You have now heard from the investor who withdrew in Manston acquisition plans 2014 and he is clear in what he has said to Chief constable. He alleges that "Covering" Environmental duties in the Manston acquisition plan are part of the fraud.

(12) For [REDACTED] there must be implications that as early as 2000 (Hansard) he concealed Sericol cs ontamination, switch off of Rumfields water abstraction and Sericol remediation from parliament in his address to common lauding the purity of effluent emerging at North Foreland sewage out flow.

(13) The Sericol site engineer arrested paramilitary of 1987 was by 1997 vice chair of Gale's North Thanet tory assn

(14) In 1987 the power of arrest was derived from Unlawful Drilling Act 1819 (since repealed) and the Chief constable refuses to answer why alternative law was avoided . In both explosives and alternative paramilitary law the prosecution path begins by application for fiat of attorney general. There appears to have been no applications to attorney general. And CPS indicate they did not take a decision not to prosecute. In 1988 with no prosecution and no further inquiries like forged qualifications being pursued the arrested paramilitary was enabled to get the sericol site safety engineer position.

(15) I hope I have strung enough together to make the point there was no compliance by Riveroak nor TDC with law requiring precautionary principle, cumulative impact assessment or protection of public health. And to make you aware of Kent Police and Solicitor Regulation Authority position.

(16) Some of the replies from TDC in house solicitor have been lamentable. For example he replied that Pegwell is owned by KCC so implied I should ask them but failed to address that Westwood retail park is not owned by KCC it is owned by companies who may have unknowingly built over buried toxic tipping by GEC.

Yours sincerely Richard Card

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