

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Open floor hearings 18 March- Chris Welch Ref 20014239- request to speak
Date: 23 March 2019 10:51:02
Attachments: [C_Welch presentation to PINS 18 March 2019.pdf](#)

Hello

I made a presentation on 18 March- but what I wanted to say would have taken far longer than the 3 minutes available – so here is my full presentation. Please pass it on to the panel.

I think that RSP have conspicuously failed to show that they have the money to carry out this proposal .

So the process should be stopped ASAP to avoid further taxpayers money being wasted , and to avoid further burden being put on the people who are submitting information for the enquiry

It would also be a huge benefit if SHP could be left to get on with their excellent plans .

Regards
CHRIS WELCH

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 March 2019 06:48
To: 'Manston Airport' <ManstonAirport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Open floor hearings 18 March- Chris Welch Ref 20014239- request to speak

Thank you

Please put me down for the 3pm hearing

Regards
CHRIS WELCH

[REDACTED]

From: Manston Airport <ManstonAirport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 March 2019 11:38
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Open floor hearings 18 March- Chris Welch Ref 20014239- request to speak

Dear Mr Welch

Thank you for your email.

You may speak at either of the Open Floor Hearing (OFH) sessions scheduled for 18 March 2019. Please could you advise which session is more convenient to attend and speak?

Persons who have requested to speak at the OFHs will be invited sequentially by the Examining Authority to speak in the order the requests were received. I am unable to give you a specific time you will be asked to speak; I therefore recommend attending the hearing at the time it starts (either 3pm and 7pm respectively) to ensure you're present when you're invited to speak.

Kind regards

Manston Airport Case team

National Infrastructure Planning
The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN

Helpline: 0303 444 5000

Email: manstonairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Web: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/> (National Infrastructure Planning)

Web: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate (The Planning Inspectorate)

Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 March 2019 07:28

To: ManstonAirport@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Subject: Open floor hearings 18 March- Chris Welch Ref 20014239- request to speak

Hello

I would like to speak at one of the sessions scheduled for 18 March

1. Is that possible ? (My submission number (October 2018) is Ref 20014239
2. Roughly what time will I be called to speak ?

Thank you
CHRIS WELCH

[REDACTED]

Presentation to PINS 18 March

Hello

Thank you for allowing me to make a presentation today

My name is Chris Welch and my wife and I have owned a holiday home in Ramsgate for 12 years.

We rent our house out as a holiday let and use it ourselves outside the main season.

Over the last 12 years we have been quite active in the Ramsgate community, especially on projects to do with regeneration and for the last 10 years I have been on the board of Project Motor house - a significant Ramsgate charity.

When we bought our house the airport was still operating although the number of flights was very small

I'm very much against the reopening of the airport - not least because the current owners have a great plan for the site, which in my opinion would contribute far more than an airport to the regeneration of Thanet.

I have set out my views in my submission and today I just want to comment on 3 aspects of the DCO application

1) Has RSP got the money?

If RSP can't show that they have the money in place this application should be terminated forthwith - too much time and money has already been wasted on it

2) There are ethical and money laundering issues to be considered with the RSP application .

After the Seabourne / Ramsgate Ferry Fiasco – Her Majesty’s Government should not be made a laughing stock again.

This Inquiry needs to urgently satisfy itself there are no money laundering or ethical issues in awarding the DCO to RSP

3) The Regeneration of Ramsgate and the RSP bid are mutually exclusive options.

If the airport is reopened in line with the RSP proposal there is no hope for the regeneration of Ramsgate – a town of 40,000 people will be condemned to further decline.

1) Has RSP got the money?

By profession I am a Chartered Accountant – and I have 35 years of post-qualification experience .

My experience is not in projects of this size – although I did have a few years as Finance Director for a Saudi Billionaire who was investing in the UK . So I have had some exposure to larger investments

I have been struck by the way that RSP – in all its various guises- has consistently failed to show us the money. This farce has been going for about 5 years

RSP failed to satisfy the Labour administration of TDC that they had the funding behind them to justify TDC supporting a CPO of the site.

UKIP was then elected into power at TDC on a promise to reopen the airport. Even then TDC had to walk away from RSP because RSP just couldn't satisfy TDC that RSP could come up with the money. And they couldn't have had a more welcoming political leadership to satisfy.

And now, so far as I can ascertain the position, RSP have again failed to name the investors who will be funding them or to say how much money each of those investors will be putting up.

How can this be a credible proposal if RSP can't name their investors and provide firm public commitments from those investors?

There are also a number of striking parallels between RSP and Seabourne – the failed Ramsgate ferry providers who were given a mandate by Mr Grayling.

in particular

- Most of the Seabourne executives had been associated with failed enterprises rather than successful ones.

The same applies to RSP

- Both RSP and Seabourne are start ups

At first glance the Ramsgate Ferry matter was very amusing – and having a minister called 'Failing Grayling' provides comedians in the UK and internationally with endless source material.

But the whole ferry incident has also cost the UK taxpayers a

lot of money.

If RSP are awarded this DCO and then turn out to be a similar bunch of chancers the cost to the UK taxpayer and the people of Thanet is likely to be much greater than the cost for the Ramsgate ferry fiasco.

A key loss for the people of Thanet will be the excellent proposals that the current legal owner of the land – SHP – have ready for that land .

So to summarise this point :

Ramsgate has been blighted by the prospect of this airport for about 5 years. A great many people have been put to a great deal of trouble opposing this application and investment decisions are being held off because this matter is unresolved.

This is the third time over the last 5 years that RSP have been asked to show that they have the money

So far as I can see that haven't done so.

Unless the Inquiry is 100% sure that RSP do actually have the money in place it is in the best interests of the taxpayer that this process should be terminated now.

2) Money Laundering and Business Ethics issues

Again I'm looking at this from a perspective of a Chartered Accountant.

Our profession places great importance on good business ethics and I think voters in the UK are probably more

interested in this issue than ever before.

After the Seabourne/ Ramsgate ferry fiasco – which has permanently stained the reputation of the Minister of Transport and made Britain a laughing stock internationally - I think it is particularly important that the financial backing and business ethics of RSP are examined closely by this enquiry.

Speaking for myself I'm very concerned about the ethical angle.

It cannot be right for the landowner, SHP, to be stripped of its asset in favour of an entity who fails a basic standard of business ethics.

I am slightly troubled by that fact that in 1993 a key RSP executive, Tony Freedman, [REDACTED]

But that was a long time ago -and people must be given a chance to rehabilitate themselves -so I don't have an issue with the fact that over 25 years later he is associated with RSP.

The things that really trouble me are:

- 1) that RSP have been so dishonest over the issue of night flights – as I'm sure the Inquiry is well aware there has been a huge amount of misinformation over this issue.
- 2) The most unsatisfactory public consultation process that was conducted by RSP – the many failures of that process are well documented in the evidence the Inquiry

has received

- 3) The fact that many people have commented on Dr Sally Dixon's misrepresentation of the various studies she quotes in her reports - so much so that her report is considered to be positively misleading
- 4) The fact that RSP chose to make their pack of information on the bid so difficult for people to read and get to the essence of the proposal. I see this as an issue of business ethics as well as an issue of business competence. To me this appears to be a deliberate attempt to deceive the public

To be 100% clear I am not saying that that RSP is dishonest.

What I am saying is that all these factors are an indication that RSP's business ethics might not meet acceptable standards.

In my view it is the duty of the Inquiry to investigate these issues very carefully and satisfy themselves that RSP is in fact a fit and proper entity to be awarded this DCO

Money Laundering

Britain has a shameful reputation as one of the world's leading money laundering centres- and large scale capital purchases (including homes for ultra-high net worth individuals) seem to be where the UK has its USP in money laundering.

RSP is ultimately owned by opaque entities in tax havens . previously it was Belize and I understand they might now be based in Panama - which based on the leaked papers of a few

years ago is a major center for tax evasion and unethical behavior.

Other people making written submissions to this Inquiry have directed the panel's attention to the RICS check list for reviewing projects undertaken by parties like RSP for compliance with money laundering legislation

I submit that it is the duty of this Inquiry to review the RSP proposal against a check list such as the RCIS one .

While I have no reason to believe that RSP would fail such a check, given the fact that RSP operates out of an unsavoury tax haven and is so elusive about its financial structure and source of funds in my opinion it would be professional negligence on a grand scale if the Inquiry did not carry out a robust review to assure itself and the public that RSP is squeaky clean.

The Regeneration of Ramsgate and the RSP bid are mutually exclusive options.

As I am sure the Panel is aware, Ramsgate is a town of great charm and great potential. But it is in need a lot of regeneration to reach its full potential.

Ramsgate and Thanet generally are a deprived areas and good jobs are sorely lacking.

The Inquiry will be aware that the number of and quality of jobs that RSP's proposal will create is hotly disputed and many people consider that RSP's figures are not credible.

I will leave it to others to debate the credibility point.

The point I'd like to make today is that we can either have a regenerated Ramsgate or the RSP airport. We can't have both.

The flight path goes right over Ramsgate's greatest assets - its harbour and its main sands.

When we first arrived in Ramsgate the few planes that landed at Manston were hugely noisy.

They flew very low over Ramsgate. While one or two planes every now and again was not pleasant it was bearable.

A constant stream of planes day in day out, whether or not they fly between 11 pm and 6pm, will be hugely unpleasant.

I have absolutely no doubt that such flights will

- have a severe effect on property prices,
- will deter most people who might otherwise spend large amounts of money on regenerating their properties or otherwise invest in the regeneration of town
- and it will destroy Ramsgate as a tourist destination.

Can you imagine tourists choosing to spend their holiday at the end of an airport runway when there are so many other beautiful places to stay in the part of England? I certainly can't.

Blighting a town of 40,000 people is a very high price to pay for an airport - unless that airport is absolutely essential to the national interest.

Many other people will put evidence to this Inquiry to show that it is not at all essential to the national interest that RSP develop Manston in the way they propose.

Others have also that RSP has not examined alternatives to Manston to find the best site if indeed such an airport is needed.

I agree with their conclusions on this point.

So I submit that you can't have an airport of the sort RSP proposes and a regenerated Ramsgate.

In Conclusion

1) Please urgently review the financial backing of RSP. If you are not completely satisfied that they have the money in place to complete their plans – please throw out the application and stop this whole exercise now – and spare the taxpayer and other interested parties further unnecessary cost.

2) Please urgently review RSP from a business ethics and money laundering perspective.

Again unless you are completely satisfied that RSP stands up to scrutiny please throw out RSP's application and stop this whole process now

3) Ramsgate is a town with great potential ,and a town which is showing signs of pulling itself out of its downward spiral.

Please take into account that a regenerated Ramsgate and

the airport as proposed are mutually exclusive.

The price of this allegedly Nationally Important Infrastructure project is condemning a town of 40,000 people to a further slow decline – or worse.

Thank you for listening to me

Chris Welch FCA (ANZ)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]