

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Manston Airport](#)
Subject: RSP investors
Date: 18 April 2019 08:24:22

Dear sir/madam,

I am a little bemused by RSP's recent submission to the Planning Inspectorate in which they plead for the identities of their investors to be kept secret. The reason, as far as I can understand it, is that these investors are the same ones they were relying on when trying to agree a compulsory purchase order of the site with Thanet District Council, and that those investors received some unwanted correspondence during that process.

As someone who has followed this issue quite closely I feel three points need to be made:

RiverOak Strategic Partners was not involved in the attempt to persuade Thanet District Council to compulsory purchase the site of the former, failed airport. The company involved was called RiverOak Investment Corporation. RiverOak Strategic Partners is a completely separate company to RiverOak Investment Corporation. There is no connection, other than the name being similar.

As far as I'm aware, the identities of these investors were never previously known. I certainly never knew who they were or are and, having asked around on Facebook, I can't find anyone else who knew who they were either. As far as I can remember, the attempt to persuade Thanet District Council to compulsory purchase the site failed because RiverOak Investment Corporation weren't able to provide the Council with details of the investors and weren't able to produce sufficient guarantees that the bid would be fully underwritten.

If it is the case that the current investors are the same as the previous ones, and the identities of the previous ones were known, what is the point in asking for this to be kept secret? Surely, by revealing that the investors are the same, RSP has revealed their identities? Unless, of course, their identities were never known.

As, I said at the start it's all very confusing. Maybe, a way forward would be for RSP to provide the Planning Inspectorate with evidence that the identities of these investors were previously revealed and to whom they were revealed. Maybe the Planning Inspectorate should conclude that the negotiations about a compulsory purchase order were being conducted by a completely different company than the one that is now pursuing the DCO. Consequently, anything which was revealed during the course of that process has no relevance to the current process,

Kind Regards,

Peter Binding