



**Manston Airport Case Team
The Planning Inspectorate
Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN**

26.01.20.

Dear Secretary of State for Transport

RE: Application by Riveroak Strategic Partners Limited (the Applicant) for an Order granting Development Consent for the reopening and development of Manston Airport in Kent.

Further to your letter of 17.01.20 inviting comments from Interested Parties.

I refer to item 18. Passenger air transport departures. After a lot of initial publicity promising passenger flights that in my opinion were offered as an incentive to gather local support it now looks like in reality the true nature of the flights will be freight flights.

Freight flights typical use older more noisier aircraft and I note that nowhere does there seem to be any clear explanation of how many freight flights a day and especially at night will occur.

Item 19. High Resolution Direction Finder. I wonder if Riveroak really have the financial backing to see through to completion this requirement?

What happens if the Applicant ignores this requirement?

Item 23. The submissions from Five10Twelve Limited.

- These raise some very worrying issues regarding the applicant's lack of care or interest in the area that this development is proposed for.
- Assumptions made about the aircraft being modified to meet noise requirements but no explanation as to who pays for this and how this would be enforced.
- Issues regarding the noise modelling not being correct.
- Inaccuracies regarding local characterisation for example incorrect location of a beach !!
- Yes, the Applicant has made such fundamental and stupid mistakes like this.

- Aspirational flights used with modifications to the aircraft with no explanation who should pay for this and how it would be enforced.
- Aspirational runway use. This really shows how little idea Riveroak has about running an airport. Prevailing wind direction has a great impact on the runway use pattern.
- Huge variance in the number of Landings and take off that occur in a year. 3 an hour equals 26,280 a year yet figures of 83,220 are mentioned. This makes the accuracy and honesty of the data and presentation very questionable. Is it possible that the figures are being revised depending on the issue being discussed to give an optimistic presentation?

Below I question the National Need for this project - Five10Twelve Limited also raise this issue.

The history of Manston Airport also known for a while as Kent International Airport is one of problems.

In 1992 RAF Manston started to allow some commercial use of the airport as they ran down the military activities.

Wiggins Property Development company brought it in 1998. They have experience of running airports in other European countries.

Eventually spin it off into a new company called Planestation.

Planestation & EU Jet – Collapsed July 2005.

Infratil of New Zealand buy Manston Airport in August 2005.

Infratil have experience of running airports in New Zealand and Australia. The current Applicant seems to have no experience.

Infratil – Sell it in October 2013 to –

Lothian Shelf (710) who buy it for £1 fronted by Anne Cloag of Stagecoach fame.

On 15th May 2014 she closes it as losing £10,000 a day.

Estimates by Kent County Council and others say that £100 Million pounds has been lost by investors since 1992.

Riveroak, is apparently an American property real estate company with no real experience of running an airport? Do you really believe they can do better?

Riveroak Often sites East Midland Airport as an example of a freight airport. The thing is it is in the name East Midlands it is surrounded by land where people and industry are located.

Manston is surrounded on three sides by sea. Not in the middle of an industrial area.

Riveroak say they want to be mainly a freight airport. Most freight comes by sea, about 95%. The remainder that comes by air often comes in the baggage hold area of a passenger aircraft. This enables the costs to be reduced.

I understand that pure freight air craft movements are slowly declining.

This is part of the reason that while Heathrow will have quieter passenger aircraft Manston will have noisier older freight aircraft for it is only these cheaper noisier are craft that can make some freight activity financially viable.

Manston is far too far out from London with not particularly good communications to attract passenger traffic from London. This is why 4 operators have tried and failed to make Manston work and Wiggins, Planestaion, Infratil had direct airport experience, unlike the Applicant Riveroak.

Lothian Shelf (710) was partly owned by someone with considerable travel industry experience, and still they could not make Manston successful.

None of them could make Manston Airport work as a passenger airport or as a freight airport.

This demonstrates that there is NO National Need for this airport.

BELOW ARE FURTHER GENERAL COMMENTS THAT I AM MAKING REGARDING THIS APPLICATION -

I still believe that having successfully got what in my opinion is the most gullible and incompetent council there is, Thanet District Council, on board to oust the owners of what was to be called Stonehil Park (Manston Airport) that Riveroak will try to run this airport at minimum cost with no adequate funding for environmental actions and with little job creation.

Then the plan B will kick in when it fails, develop it as a housing estate but without any of the amenities that Stonehill Park had in their applications.

As per usual TDC will wake up too late but by then the damage to Ramsgate will be terminal. No one is going to invest in a "noise hell" town and Ramsgate which has gradually been attracting people to settle and invest and enjoy its architecture and coast and Royal Harbour will lose all that inward investment for a few minimum wage jobs moving freight at a financially unsound airport.

At its height after years of promising as many as 10,000 jobs (Wiggins) what we got was 156 jobs many of which were part time minimum wage jobs.

Ramsgate and Thanet deserve and can do better without this blot on the landscape.

COMMENTS REGARDING THE ABILITY OF THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL TO MANAGE PROJECTS –

I find it amazing that any trust in the ability of Thanet District Council (TDC) to monitor air quality, etc, is being considered.

This council has no business acumen and can only close public toilets in an area that attracts tourists and has a large elderly population that cannot easily run to the next public toilet. Also, they inherited in 1974 the sea front shelters and now have pulled a number down and in Birchington local residents are trying to buy them back to repair and maintain them. Why? Because TDC never plans for financial obligations like maintenance and repair and wastes thousands chasing dreams like Manston Airport. All this lack of care and financial planning while intending to spend a million pounds on its offices.

TDC has never understood its service area and the best thing that could happen is more powers and services given to Ramsgate Town Council and the Broadstairs and St Peters Town Council and to the Margate Trustees to set up Margate Town Council. Then major expenditure items like major highways and social services continue to be provided by Kent County Council and Thanet District Council is disbanded thereby saving money and improving services.

The idea that this council could have any ability to govern an airport operation is laughable.

Yours sincerely

Ian W B Hide.