

Contents

1	Contents.....	1
2	Introduction	1
3	The consultation events	1
4	Residents' concerns.....	2
5	The use of active pro-airport campaigners at the events	3
6	The use of a pro-airport campaigner in a security role.....	5
7	RiverOak and their consultants could not answer the majority of questions and/or gave inaccurate or misleading responses	7
8	Implications for the formal consultations later this year.....	13

Introduction

- 9 In July RiverOak held a number of public events about their plan to apply for a Development Consent Order to enable them to develop a cargo airport on the site of the old Manston Airport. They called these “pre-consultation” events. As far as we know, RiverOak did not advertise these events in the Press. The events were trailed on the Save Manston Airport (SMA) Facebook group. This is a group for pro-airport campaigners. The general public has no access to this group.
- 10 Local residents who attended one or more of these events have been sharing with us their experience of them and raising concerns. A number of No Night Flights’ members also attended one or more of these events. Previously, RiverOak has failed to respond to any attempt that our members have made to contact them and so we saw these public events as an ideal opportunity, finally, to ask some questions and to receive some factual answers.

The consultation events

- 11 There were six events, held in Broadstairs, Margate, Herne Bay, Canterbury, Sandwich and Canterbury between 12th and 23rd July. The first five events were held on a weekday between 1400 and 2000. No provision was made for people who work away from their home town and who might not be able to get back in time for 2000. The Ramsgate event was held on a Saturday.
- 12 The choice of locations meant that over half of the events were held in towns that are either a long way from the flight path at Manston (Broadstairs, Margate and Sandwich),

or that enjoy an overflying exclusion zone (Sandwich), or both. One event was at a location (Canterbury) that was very minimally overflowed during the airport's commercial existence. The two towns that experience what it is like to live under the flight path - Ramsgate and Herne Bay – had just one consultation event each.

- 13 No provision was made for the villages that are close to the airport to have a consultation event.
- 14 At each event, there was just one display board available (or the same board, repeated twice), showing a representation of the old airport site, coloured in to suggest where RiverOak might place different blocks of activity should the DCO application be successful. There was also a brochure available as a takeaway.
- 15 The consultation events were staffed by a combination of RiverOak representatives and active pro-airport campaigners who are members of SMA. Some SMA members were wearing RiverOak badges.
- 16 There were few representatives available from either RiverOak or their professional advisory team. At any one time RiverOak was represented by Mr Tony Freudmann and/or Mr Niall Lawlor. Mr George Yerrall appeared intermittently. Mr Tony Gibb of Amec attended to answer environmental questions. This sparse representation meant that residents who wished to ask questions had to gather around a representative, waiting for some time for a chance to ask those questions.
- 17 The form provided on which people can submit their consultation feedback makes it clear that, unless residents provide RiverOak with their postal address, the response may not be taken into account.

Residents' concerns

- 18 Residents raised a number of issues with us about the way in which these events were set up and run. Their concerns, and ours, fall broadly into these categories:
 - The use by RiverOak of active pro-airport campaigners to gather in attendees' personal information; to answer residents' questions; and to weigh in on a number of discussions
 - The use by RiverOak of an active airport campaigner in an unclear and unexplained security role
 - The fact that RiverOak and their representatives (and we include in this the pro-airport campaigners who were acting in RiverOak's stead) were not able to answer the majority of questions put to them and/or gave inaccurate or misleading responses to some of the questions that they did answer
 - The limited resource in time, people and information made available to residents
 - The limited opportunity given to those residents whose life will actually be impacted by cargo planes flying over their home town or village to attend an event at all.

The use of active pro-airport campaigners at the events

- 19 The pro-airport campaign conducted by SMA is an unpleasant one, characterised by the insulting, threatening and intimidating behaviour of many of the group's members - and some of the campaign's leading lights - towards anybody who doubts that a cargo airport would be good for the area. We do not intend to go into that behaviour in depth in this document. However, if anyone reading this document has any doubt as to the veracity of what we are saying, please do contact us and we will furnish you with a significant amount of written evidence of online threats, libel and character assassination, as well as statements from individuals who have experienced intimidating behaviour from the airport campaigners.
- 20 Given this background of intimidation, many residents and some businesses choose not to voice in public their opposition to RiverOak's aspiration to develop a cargo hub on the site of the old airport.
- 21 It was therefore wholly inappropriate of RiverOak to use pro-airport campaigners to:
 - “meet and greet” residents as they came into the various consultation events
 - collect from residents the feedback forms on which they had written their comments and, in some cases, their contact details
 - ask people to sign in with their address and other contact details
 - act as part of the RiverOak team, answering residents' questions
 - weigh in on any conversation in which residents were expressing concerns, shutting down debate and minimising the chance for people to ask questions of the actual RiverOak representatives
 - stand around at various events, glaring at any residents who are not wholly in favour of a cargo airport.
- 22 Not only did the presence of untrained pro-airport campaigners produce an environment in which it was difficult for residents to raise concerns, it also meant that residents were given ill-informed and inaccurate answers to their questions. As examples, residents have reported back to us that they were told by SMA campaigners that:
 - there would only be 14 flights per day
 - there is no need for night flights
 - the site's owners have plans for 10,000 houses on the site
 - the housing that the owners want to put on the site will be marketed at £1m and above
 - Manston has the longest runway in the UK
 - RiverOak have owned and/or run Alliance Fort Worth Airport in the USA
 - There will be passenger flights within the first couple of months of the airport re-opening
 - There is no problem with the fuel farm – the existing one will be used.

23 It was wholly inappropriate of RiverOak to allow active pro-airport campaigners access to the personal details of residents so that they could read individual feedback forms and note the addresses and other contact details of anyone who expressed a dissenting view. We have seen debate on the SMA Facebook group about the private feedback forms that some residents submitted. It is clear from this that pro-airport campaigners are reading and discussing these private feedback forms.

24 It was wholly inappropriate of RiverOak to use active pro-airport campaigners as the first contact that residents had as they entered the consultation. The decision to use SMA members in this role made it quite clear to attendees that this was not a neutral consultation event, but one that was intended to push hard the idea of a cargo airport on that site.

- “At Broadstairs the SMA woman who asked us to sign in was asked by a couple if they had had many objections to the airport. The SMA woman replied saying: "Hahaha only one! A woman went around with a dictaphone trying to record people's objections and couldn't find anybody!" She continued in peals of laughter saying that this woman had “left in floods of tears”. If this couple had had objections themselves they would not have voiced them. Those of us who have concerns and who heard this were made to feel ridiculous and part of a tiny minority.”
- “Having been to the Herne Bay meeting, I had more questions to ask. At the Ramsgate meeting I was greeted by another helper/airport supporter with the words: “Are you going to sign in this time?””
- “My overall impression was one of intimidation from helpers and from Tony Freudmann especially if you were asking difficult questions, which they could not answer and did not want others in the room to hear.”
- “They clearly wanted to know who I was, which was very worrying.”
- “Margate was awash with people from SMA who appeared to be running the show and who responded to the questions with a clear bias. In Margate and Ramsgate there was an emphasis on passenger flights, with no evidence to back up the reality.”
- “A man I know to be a leading light in SMA introduced himself to me as a RiverOak rep.”
- “No one welcomed us at the door. The SMA members on the door were busy bragging up the airport to attendees as we walked in. No RiverOak people approached us either. Lawlor was with some typical airport supporters and wasn't interested in converting others, so although he didn't know me, he could see I wasn't about to start drooling over the crayoned attempt they'd put up, and although I tried to catch his eye, he avoided both me and my partner.”
- “I filled out my form and went to pop it into the box, only to find that there was no box, when two SMA members tried to get it off me. I asked if I could put my form in the box and was told no they would do it. They took it from me but I didn't see where it went. The SMA woman of the pair asked me to sign in and I said no.”
- “On the way out I mentioned to both of the SMA people on the door that not everyone wanted a cargo hub in Ramsgate, only to be told by one of them that she lived under the flight path – I think that meant that that's all right then. There were some other

SMA members at the table when I mentioned this and they all started muttering under their breath and being typically intimidating and hostile.”

- “I saw that SMA members were reading the feedback forms as they collected them. I declined to leave one. I don’t want them knowing who I am and that I think RiverOak’s plans lack any credibility and that a cargo airport would be a disaster for us locally.”
- 25 Some residents have told us that they will not attend a future RiverOak consultation event as the one that they did attend was either of no use or it was an unpleasant experience.

The use of a pro-airport campaigner in a security role

- 26 A tall, broad, SMA campaigner was acting in some sort of unexplained “security” role. His brief appeared to be to ensure that no RiverOak representative would have to spend long listening to concerns from residents and/or answering any questions that the representative might find challenging. We have a number of reports of this gentleman intervening to stop residents from asking questions and either telling them to “shut up” or trying to move them away from the RiverOak team member concerned.
- “At this point a very large man, another “helper” and local airport supporter, came over and asked me to move away and sit down! I felt intimidated but stood my ground...”
 - “I witnessed one SMA campaigner telling local residents to shut up and preventing them from putting their questions to Mr Freudmann. He described himself as security working for RiverOak...”
 - “As I awaited my turn to speak to the environmental consultant, a large man in a yellow shirt stood with his back to the wall and glared at me. He kept this up for the 15 minutes or so for which I was waiting my turn and then finally speaking to the consultant. I later saw him wade into a debate that a group of residents was having with Tony Freudmann, preventing them from asking him questions.”
 - “Again the large man “helping” came and asked me to move or sit down. I said I would not and told him he was very intimidating, at which point he moved away from me.”
- 27 The man that RiverOak had appointed as their “security” man clearly took pleasure in preventing residents from having their say and from asking questions. He later described his activities on the SMA Facebook group thus:

David Davidge 10 hrs

Today was what I expected loads of antis had to bring tony away went back had couple of words with them couple of gobby twits later on rescued george but they said glad they got me there great day for it

Like Comment

23

Liam Coyle In your element David ... Done yourself no harm

Like · Reply · 1 · 10 hrs

David Davidge Thought there would be reports that I was a thug

Like · Reply · 1 · 10 hrs

Write a reply...

Chris Wood I'm a bit confused mate (being exiled up here in Lincolnshire). You and your side are arguing for Manston to remain an airport right? So what are the 'antis' arguing for, yet more houses to be built on Manston?

Like · Reply · 3 · 10 hrs · Edited

Ray Ellis Not necessarily Chris. They just don't want the airport.

Like · Reply · 1 hr

Write a reply...

James Bartlett Was there many for the airport at all?

Like · Reply · 10 hrs

David Stevens It is hard to be certain but I spoke to most people that came today and I would say that out of the 313 that came to the Herne Bay Consultation at least 280 were in favour of the airport reopening.

Like · Reply · 13 · 10 hrs

David Davidge About 15..20 the rest was all for the, airport

Like · Reply · 7 · 10 hrs

Angela Stevens Interesting that many of the anti-airport brigade won't put their faces on Facebook, or refuse to sign in. They have certainly been hugely outnumbered at every RO event so far. The support for the airport is overwhelming.

Like · Reply · 11 · 10 hrs

Sue McCartney Strange they all turned up about the same time yesterday!!!

Like · Reply · 30 mins

Write a reply...

David Davidge Some pros wanted to slap the antis down they were old boys .lol

Like · Reply · 2 · 10 hrs

Nick Toy Who are old boys? ...the antis or pros?

Like · Reply · 1 hr

Write a reply...

James Bartlett Yes Angela Stevens they all hide there faces and never have a picture of themselves! I've not got my face on me profile picture at moment because me great grandad was in the battle of the Somme.

Like · Reply · 2 · 10 hrs

Angela Stevens Some younger couples heard them too and wondered what their problem was and why they live where they live if they don't like it.

Like · Reply · 5 · 10 hrs

Spencer Brooks So out of the whole of Herne Bay the antis cound manage 15 to 20 and out of them did you manage to get one sensible answer, LOL, always the same, dimwits at dawn

Like · Reply · 3 · 9 hrs

Scotty Flemo Slime Ball Antis..Always hiding..Show your faces you yellow cowards...😂

Like · Reply · 1 · 3 hrs

David Davidge Loved telling them to shut the f...up .lol

Like · Reply · 3 · 3 hrs

Scotty Flemo Good on ya David 😂😂🍺

Like · Reply · 1 · 3 hrs

Jill Goldfinch David especially Mr Phil Rose , 'who are you ? David . i'm security, can you prove it ? yes . who do you work for ? me ... River Oak , that shut the plonkers mouth up , i still think Mr Straw hat was the worst , 'rent a gob '

Like · Reply · 3 · 2 hrs

Write a reply...

RiverOak and their consultants could not answer the majority of questions and/or gave inaccurate or misleading responses

- 28 RiverOak provided very little information to tell people about their plans and nothing at all to tell them what the impact of a cargo airport might be on the area. Most questions were answered with: “We are not at that point yet”. With so little written information available and a lack of informed representatives attending, a number of residents told us that they were puzzled as to what these consultation events were intended to achieve.
- 29 There was a lack of clarity about the roles in the RiverOak team. Mr Freudmann described himself as the project lead. An SMA “helper” told residents that Mr Freudmann is merely a “go-between”. It is particularly important that the public know who they are dealing with for this project as Mr Freudmann already has a track record of failure at Manston Airport and at other airports.
- 30 We quote below from a series of emails sent to us by residents and conversations that we have had with residents who were dissatisfied by the lack of knowledge that the RiverOak representatives appeared to have:
 - “I asked where does 600000t freight volume come from? No definitive answer. There is apparently a forecast shortfall in air freight capacity of 1.6mt by 2050 and RO assume they will get a slice. No definitive means of ensuring that they get this volume.”
 - “Aquifer protection - the balance ponds are far too small given the extent of hard standing. So I asked about this. Yes they probably are, was the answer, but it's only an indicative design. It was clear that a site drainage plan has yet to be produced.”
 - “Conservation – I asked whether off site mitigation measures have been identified. Not yet. I also asked whether the impact on Pegwell Bay been assessed, and mitigation measures identified. Not yet, but RiverOak have been in touch with Natural England.”
 - “I asked whether the old control tower is remaining. They said that they weren't sure, but that it would be nice wouldn't it?”
 - “There was no designated location for fuel storage as far as we could see. They say that the fuel farm will be where Jentex was but there is planning permission for a retirement home at the Jentex site. I wonder if the residents of Cliffsend fancy 100,000 litres of aromatic jet A1 outside their back gardens?”
 - “I went on to ask questions about how they would deal with the noise and need for double and triple glazing in many 1000s of homes in Ramsgate and Herne Bay, including many which are listed and he said “we are not at that point yet”, which seemed to be his answer for all my questions.”
 - “I spoke to Toby Gibb, RiverOak's environmental representative. I asked him about the metric that RiverOak has suggested to the Planning Inspectorate for assessing night noise (para 11.7.23 of their Scoping Report). He said that the claim that the impact of night flights on residents would only be significant if there were 18 or more 90dB flights a night comes from a Swiss study which says that we wake up 18 times

a night anyway. I've since identified that study (it's German and refers to Leipzig airport) but cannot get hold of a copy. I've asked him for one and have heard nothing back. Residents should be able to access information this critical to their future life under the flight path, or how can we possibly give informed answers to the consultation?"

- "The gentleman covering the environmental issues said that RO would look at flight paths to see if they could be altered to trouble fewer people. If he is repeating this to others, he is giving people false hope. We've been here with the airport and the CAA before and achieved nothing. He accepted that the big cargo planes would probably have to stay on the current path which is a ten mile straight line approach to whichever end of the runway is relevant, but only when I pressed him."
- "I spoke to Tony Freudmann and asked him where the 500-600,000 tonnes of freight was going to come from. He told me that it was not 500,000 tonnes, but 10,000 flights. RiverOak are on written record as saying that they want to shift 500,000-600,000 tonnes of freight. Either Mr Freudmann is ill-informed or he is misleading the public."
- "We asked Tony Freudmann what made him think that Manston would get the amount of business that they say they'll get. He had no facts or evidence to offer, citing one Turkish airline out of Luton that had shown an interest."
- "Mr Freudmann said that a report by Oxford Economics says that millions of tonnes of freight are being lost by the UK to Europe because London airports are squeezed for capacity. He is misquoting the report which is actually focussed on the future business that might be lost to London airports and which says in several places that this is not to say that that business will be lost to the UK."
- "Mr Yerrall had nothing to say really."
- "Tony Freudmann came in as we were questioning the environment bloke trying the hard sell but an old bloke next to me was having none of it. Another bloke listened in then walked off laughing at Tony who retorted something but I can't remember what, he wasn't impressed."
- "He could not answer any of my questions about environment and would not say night flights would not happen. The document says 14 planes a day but it actually means 28 plane movements."
- "Mr Yerrall seemed out of his depth and kept saying we have not got to that point yet! Because I was asking difficult questions the big helper tried to get me to sit down and take me to one side away from Mr Yerrall. I have more questions to ask, like are KLM coming back seeing as RiverOak have their image in the document! I wonder if they have their permission to use it!"
- "Tony Freudmann told me that the plan was to focus on cargo and that passenger flights had been the undoing of Planestation when it owned the airport. He told my partner that Ryanair would be flying out of Manston quite soon. Niall Lawlor said that there were no plans for passenger flights. It looks as if they're saying whatever they think people want to hear."

- “The environmental consultant was talking to a couple about passenger flights. There was no mention of cargo. All the couple were concerned about was the impact on passengers of the limited local road system and the idea that thousands of holidaymakers flocking to Manston from the other side of Maidstone would be caught in traffic and miss their flight. At no time did the consultant point out to them that the DCO is not for a passenger airport. No wonder they were so positive about the idea of the airport reopening.”
- “Mr Freudmann told me that passenger flights could start “quite soon” after re-opening but that the driving factor would be the stability and profitability of their freight operation.”
- “I had read RiverOak’s brochure and wanted to focus on the plane tear down facility as I had done some of my own research. I explained to Tony Freudmann that only 50% of a 747 and 95% of an A380 can be recycled, asking where the rest of this waste, which is likely to be very nasty, would go. He did not initially answer this question and went on about a 'deal' with a company in Germany that they were working on. I suggested this would be very difficult given we are leaving Europe. He went on to say that this waste would be sent back to Germany and that the tear down work would all be done inside - something I find difficult to believe.”
- “Tony Freudmann suggested that they also have a good chance of Ryanair flying 6 planes each day out of Manston, but Niall Lawlor told local Councillors that RiverOak had no interest in passenger flights”
- “There was a general lack of clarity - something I find extremely worrying given they quote spending £4 million on the process so far. They did not seem to be able to answer questions and would default to: “we are not there yet” as a reply.”
- “I attended the Margate and Ramsgate presentations. At both of them I enquired of those whom I presumed were representing RiverOak into the environmental implications of their plans on the populations of Herne Bay and Ramsgate to no avail. I was told in one instance that they were investigating the methodology.”
- “I spoke to Tony Freudmann in Ramsgate who was impatient and rude to myself and friends.”
- “RiverOak’s representatives were intimidating and they could not answer the questions on recycling either about which I had done some research. The whole experience seemed to be a marketing exercise for the converted, not a pre-consultation. The members of SMA appeared more in evidence in Ramsgate and any questions that were not pro-airport were regarded with hostility and disinterest.”
- “My wife and I went. We didn't sign in. We each got a brochure. We looked at the map. We looked at the row of women sitting by the wall, looking like sisters of Mme Guillotine on the day the executioner forgot to turn up. We couldn't actually identify anyone who looked remotely like an expert. We slipped out past the bouncy castle. We're concerned that RO is using SMA to steward/police the events, and is clearly playing fast and loose with the personal data on the feedback forms.”
- “There was an SMA chap who was speaking to him after me who was pro-airport but anti night flights who said that he had been in contact with the Planning Inspectorate direct and was informed that night flights was on the insistence of RiverOak not the

Planning Inspectorate. The RiverOak reps were telling people that they only put night flights in their document because the Planning Inspectorate made them do it.”

- “Niall Lawlor said that the Leader of TDC is in bed with the two guys who own the site who want to build 2500-3000 houses. He said: “Why do you think we went to the Planning inspectorate? I took it away from Thanet Council.”
- “I talked to Niall Lawlor about the tear down operation as he had said in the local paper that this would create 200-400 jobs. As I said that, another man said: “he just told me 600 jobs”. I said that the biggest company in the UK is Air Salvage International at Kemble. When I phoned them they told me they only employ 40-50 people and they’re the biggest company in the UK. Niall Lawlor said that ASI had no ability to dismantle an aircraft fully. I said to him: “So they’ve been doing it for years, they are the market leaders and you’re going to do it better without any experience?” and he said “yes”. He said he was dealing with Airbus, McDonnell Douglas and Goldstream. I said that so were ASI.”
- “I asked Tony Freudmann about his history at Manston. I pointed out that his plan right from the start at Manston was cargo as well as developing the unneeded land. I pointed out that his plan had failed spectacularly and asked him why he thought that the same plan would succeed this time around. He told me that he hadn’t been in charge of the airport at Manston, but he was its MD!”
- “Niall Lawlor said that the airport had been run by cowboys before. He kept telling me to stop talking before I could finish my sentence. He said that Wiggins bet the entire airport on EUJet which let out at least 30 Fokker 100 aircraft that were unbelievably inefficient huge gas guzzlers and they lost money hand over fist. I’m pretty sure that actually they only had four or five planes.”
- “Niall Lawlor said that Wiggins’ big mistake was EUJet. So I reminded him that, when Planestation got into trouble and Martin May took over from Oliver Iny, Mr May blamed Wiggins’ downfall on Tony Freudmann having bought or leased or entered into JVs with lots of airports all around the world. I said that on Tony Freudmann’s watch the airport went into liquidation and now he’s advising RiverOak. Niall Lawlor said that that did not happen.”
- “Niall Lawlor was telling a small crowd that all the previous airport owners were cowboys. He said that Ann Gloag did her first deal with Infratil in 1993 and that there was a collaboration that looked at Manston as a redevelopment opportunity many years ago. He said he thought that Infratil as a publicly traded company didn’t want to be seen to be the ones who closed Manston down, so they “brought in their very good friend to whom they sold Glasgow Prestwick.” He means Mrs Gloag. This ignores the fact that Infratil had their airports on the open market for nearly two years before Mrs Gloag bought Manston – they clearly didn’t “bring in” anyone to close them down. Mr Lawlor then said that he’d tried to bid on the airports directly but that PwC wouldn’t allow “us” in and that it was “a nicely orchestrated little deal.” He said that he had bid £7 million. I asked him if he was really saying that Infratil sold their shareholders down the river to the tune of £7m given that they sold the airport to Mrs Gloag for £1. He said “yes”.”
- “I asked Tony Freudmann about night flights. He said that they might need them but had no plans as yet. I asked him whether or not a lot of cargo operators say they

need night flights. He agreed that they did. He also agreed that cargo operators pretty much determine the flying schedule that they want from an airport. I'm conscious that this is the man who managed to negotiate TDC into accepting unlimited, unscheduled night flights of planes as big as a 747-400. He knows he'll need night flights if RiverOak get hold of this airport."

- "Niall Lawlor talked about Infratil, Ann Gloag and the sale of Glasgow Prestwick. He said that about two months prior to the transaction taking place she withdrew and her brother gave a million to the Scottish National Party and the Government then bought Prestwick because they thought that job losses in Glasgow would lose them support for the referendum on independence. He's full of conspiracy theories."
- "Mr Lawlor agreed that his aim was for a cargo airport the size of East Midlands. He then said that that's not a lucrative proposition. The lucrative proposition is a mechanised assembly line doing aircraft recycling. So it looks as if the cargo idea is just an excuse to get hold of the site. I reminded him that the application to the Planning Inspectorate is on the basis of a cargo hub airport and that a recycling unit for planes is not a national asset."
- "While I was talking to Mr Lawlor an older gentleman said that when Cargolux had brought in cargo, they had about 28 lorries to transport away the cargo for each plane. He asked where all the transport was going to go. Niall Lawlor said that from the roundabout it's a four lane road to London. It isn't."
- "Mr Lawlor said that Thanet Council was "duplicitous" and that they had been supposed to be backing RiverOak. He said that he had told them that to their faces and that he was gladly saying it here as well."
- "I asked about night flights. RiverOak say they want to emulate East Midlands Airport and they have dozens of night flights every night. He said that he wasn't saying that RiverOak needed night flights but that the Planning Inspectorate had asked RiverOak what they were going to say in their consultation about night flights. He said that they had to include night flights because the Planning Inspectorate said that they were mandating Heathrow, Gatwick, Stanstead, Luton and every other major airport in the South East to come up with a policy for potential night flight traffic. The Inspectorate had said: "We cannot have you involved in the DCO when we are seeking to potentially do a DCO on Heathrow and we have not asked you to do a review on night flights." What on earth does this mean?"
- "He made it clear that the airport would purely cater to the South East. He had no interest in shifting cargo beyond that."
- "I said that the airport is 0.8 miles from Ramsgate residents. I asked him how he thought any environmental assessment would agree to that. I said that it was bad enough when we had a little tin pot airport with fuel being dumped and with tiles being ripped off roofs as the planes came in. I asked about the damage to the main economy in the whole of Thanet which is tourism and which is growing. Lawlor said it would expand if he was bringing in Ryanair flights. I asked him if Ryanair had signed up and he said "no." He said that they were only 75% of the way through their environmental assessment and that there was "plenty of technology out there today that has not ever been implemented at Manston that can bring aircraft in on different flight paths and at different angles."

- “Mr Lawlor told me that the Department for Transport has hired a consultant to do a full-blown study on opening Heathrow 24 hours a day. It’s the same consultant that RiverOak is using.”
- “Someone in the crowd said that he had been to the first meeting at the Marlow Academy regarding getting Manston up again. There was a team of experts on the panel. RiverOak weren't involved at that stage. And all of the experts said in order to have a successful airport running cargo we must have night flights. Tony Freudmann said “we'll have to agree to differ.” He said they'd have 14 or 15 freighters a day coming in during daylight hours because they can't come into any of the other London airports. He wouldn't listen to our previous experience of night flights, nor would he give us any facts, He just kept saying that we would have to agree to differ.”
- “Mr Freudmann said that the plan is to get the airport breaking even as quickly as possible, once it's breaking even you move it upwards and you get more traffic in. He said that in the first 18 months you lose money because you're starting with zero base. And you aim to break even within 18 months; you continue to progress; and once you reach years three, four and five you're into serious profit. We asked if he had a proper forecast for how the business would look in ten years. He hadn't.”
- “Tony Freudmann said that this was an informal pre-consultation, not a statutory consultation. But I was told on the desk that the results of this consultation will be going to the inspectors. If it's going to the Planning Inspectors, RiverOak should be showing residents the downsides of their plans, and they're not.”
- “I asked him why RiverOak didn't buy one of the airports that are actually for sale. He asked if there is one with a 2800 metre runway. I didn't know but I know now that there are runways for sale in the South East – actually up for sale – and that they are as long as Manston's.”
- “Tony Freudmann said that Planestation under a successor decided to bet the company on EUJet. I said that things were going wrong way before EUJet and that while he had said in the Select Committee "I was long gone" by the time that Planestation went under, he had actually left Planestation in February and that the whole thing collapsed in July – so he was hardly “long gone”.”
- “A gentleman asked how many planes they needed a day to break even. Mr Freudmann said maybe three or four. The man asked how many jobs it takes to service three or four planes a day. Tony Freudmann said: “probably about 50”. The man said: “So that's what we're talking about. The virtual destruction of Ramsgate for 50 jobs.”
- “I asked why they were consulting us given they were providing no detail. Mr Freudmann said: “This is a progress report no more no less. It's designed to educate people on how the DCO process works. That's it.””
- “Niall Lawlor was very rude. He kept telling me to stop talking before I had put my question. He rolled his eyes as I was saying what I wanted to ask and, when I finished one question, he said: “finally.” This is no way to encourage people to ask questions and raise concerns.”

Implications for the formal consultations later this year

- 31 RiverOak will have to undertake a formal public consultation if they want to pursue a DCO application. If the formal consultation is to be accepted by **anyone** as professional and appropriate, it is imperative that:
- Pro-airport campaigners have no role whatsoever to play in any consultation activity beyond their role as individual local residents and consultees
 - There are a number of consultation events, at different times of the day and week, for those areas that will be most impacted by the resurrection of an airport – i.e. Ramsgate, the villages around the old airport, and Herne Bay
 - Detailed information is also made available (online, in libraries etc.) for people who cannot attend a consultation event
 - The consultation is well publicised in those areas that will be affected by the outcome
 - Any consultation event is adequately staffed by people who are properly briefed so that residents actually have access to someone who can answer their questions
 - Any supporting studies or documents are made available to the public before the consultation begins
 - Canterbury City Council, as the body representing Herne Bay residents, be given an opportunity to comment about the impact on its residents who live under the flight path
 - Full information is provided about likely flight numbers; number of night flights; environmental impacts; freight lorry numbers and social impacts such as jobs. RiverOak must spell out for residents what their various aspirations (10,000 to 20,000 cargo flights and 500,000 to 600,000 tonnes of freight) will mean in day-to-day terms
 - Residents are provided with a mechanism that enables them to have confidence that any dissenting view that they may express will be counted and taken into account. At the moment, mistrust of RiverOak is high and many residents believe that any negative feedback that they give will simply be shredded. Perhaps an option would be for everything to go to TDC as well?
- 32 As a footnote, we understand that on 19th July the Planning Inspectorate raised with RiverOak concerns about the RiverOak consultations that had been shared with the Planning Inspectorate. Given that, it is particularly disappointing that RiverOak made no change to its approach for the consultation events that post-dated that meeting.