



LATE SCOPING CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Consultation bodies have 28 days to respond with any comments, stating either the information that they consider should be included in the ES or that they do not have any comments.

Any responses received after the deadline are not considered within the scoping opinion but are forwarded to the Applicant for consideration in accordance with the policy set out in Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment, Screening and Scoping.

The following EIA scoping consultation responses were received after the consultation deadline specified under legislation and therefore did not form part of the Secretary of State's scoping opinion:

- Historic England
- Kent Police
- Minster Parish Council (second response)
- Network Rail

Due to an administrative error by the Planning Inspectorate, the following bodies were not notified of the formal scoping consultation:

- Natural England
- The Health and Safety Executive
- Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group

These organisations did not have the opportunity to send a response prior to the issue of the scoping opinion. They were notified subsequently and asked to provide any response by 11 October 2016. Responses have been received to-date from the organisations below:

- Natural England
- The Health and Safety Executive

1 August 2017

Response to Consultation on the Scoping Document for Manston Airport

Minster Council appreciates being consulted at an early stage upon this proposal for Manston Airport site. The future of the site has long been a contentious issue, while there is sympathy for the view that an operational airport may have economic benefits for the local population, there is strong concern, particularly from those residents in close proximity to the airport and flight paths, which includes the whole of the Parish of Minster, that the environmental impacts of a large airport would significantly outweigh those benefits, particularly if the number of overall flights significantly increases and any proposal relies upon night flying.

The scoping report for the proposal confirms that the DCO application is at a very early stage, but that the following description summarised from the Scoping document forms the basis of the proposal:

The stated aim of the project is to revive Manston Airport as a successful airfreight hub capable of handling in excess of 10,000 air traffic movements of air freight cargo per year

Two new areas of apron covering approximately 208,000m² to provide sufficient areas for the parking of up to 18 aircraft including the larger types of aircraft, classified as Codes E & F, which many air freight operators currently use.

Mast lights 25m high located around the aprons

Facilities for secondary supporting aviation uses, including aircraft maintenance repair and overhaul (MRO) and limited passenger services will also be provided

A new fuel farm facility will be constructed

A new airport access for the cargo/aircraft maintenance facility is proposed on the B2190 (Spitfire Way) to the west of the existing access

The area north of Manston Road, referred to as the 'Northern Grass' will be utilised for other aviation related purposes such as warehousing, hangars, offices and airport related business units with an approximate total floor space of 1,400,000m² with no direct access for aircraft.

The major concern of local residents will relate to the predicted number and timing of air traffic movements and their environmental impacts. The report comments that

The forecasting of the air traffic is currently being undertaken as part of the preparation of the application for development consent and the business and needs case for the project.

Manston Airport, with a focus on air freight and cargo, could capture in the region of 500,000 to 600,000 tonnes of air freight by 2035. 500,000 tonnes would equate to 10,000 to 20,000 air traffic movements per year. The timings of the flights (including the spread of flights per day or week) and the types of cargo (which will dictate the type of freight handling facilities) are not fully known at this stage of the assessment.

Without any more specific knowledge of the scale of the aircraft movement proposals it is difficult to comprehend the environmental impact. It is essential that the Environmental Impact Assessment

assumes a worst case scenario, relating to the maximum number of flights envisaged, the noisiest permissible aeroplanes and the greatest anticipated number of night flights. The report will need to identify the predicted frequency and timing of flights and the worst possible level of noise related to each take-off and landing incident and other ground operations associated with the operation of the airport, rather than relying upon the provision of an assessment of average noise levels.

The report comments that:

As part of stage 1 of undertaking a CEA a draft ZOI (zone of influence) for each of the EIA topics has been established and will be agreed through consultation with statutory stakeholders

Topics to be covered assume a zone of influence of 5km or, in the case of the road network, the local impact.

The potential for the impact of operational development to exceed this distance seems clear, particularly with regard to noise impact upon the resident population beneath and adjacent to flight paths and the impact upon the nearby SPA and Ramsar site in terms of ecology.

In terms of traffic impact upon roads the report refers to the impact upon the local Road network. A better definition of the local road network is required to determine the real zone of influence, particularly upon the villages immediately adjacent to the site.

On the basis of the large scale of the project it is questioned whether ZOI's could be better established by learning from other airport EIA'S with examples provided, for example work carried out for Southend and Lydd and the work associated with potential expansion of either Heathrow or Gatwick.

In terms of noise the report makes specific comments in relation to night time noise:

During the night, operational noise will be considered to give rise to significant adverse effects at residential receptors with no specific form of noise insulation where the development results in:

Absolute average free-field noise levels exceeding 55 dB LAeq, 8hr45;

Or an absolute noise level of at least 80 dB LASmax (approximately 90 dB SEL46) where the average number of events during the night above this level is at least 18 (based one additional awakening due to aircraft noise).

This paragraph refers to a level of at least 18 night time movements, presumably on the basis of no definitive number of aircraft movements the statement will need to assess the impact of this large number of night time movements and demonstrate whether mitigation will be able to sufficiently reduce the level of the significant adverse effects of such a level of flying.

In general terms it is difficult to make more definitive comments at this stage as the scoping report is more an assessment of how to measure potential impacts rather than what to measure. When it is more clear what the worst case scenario is the Parish Council would wish to have the opportunity to comment further. We would also wish to be informed of any reports or statements for Riveroak to enable parishioners to be kept informed.

From: [Toni Slater 46055272](mailto:Toni.Slater@46055272)
To: [Environmental Services](#)
Subject: TR020002 – Manston Airport – EIA Scoping Notification and Consultation
Date: 08 August 2016 13:51:13

Email sent on behalf of ACC Tony Blaker for the attention of Dr Richard Hunt

Dear Dr Hunt

With reference to your communication on the above, please accept our apologies due to the lateness of our reply which was due to operational demands within our team regarding the congestion issues at the Port of Dover.

However, please see below our comments which we trust will be of use:

1. The existing road infrastructure leading to and in the vicinity of this location would require significant investment to allow for increased traffic volume and growth. Local roads can become congested, particularly those to the North and East of the site and detailed road strategy and infrastructure plan would be required.
2. Traffic count references are made but these are limited by location and may not present a reliable baseline at this time. They do not appear to include routes likely to be affected by this proposed development. Other references for scoping include a bus map and Google maps which our opinion needs to be broadened in order to get a more accurate picture of what is required in this case.
3. There is reference to good transport links. In the main the road to the south of this site is of suitable construction however the roads to the west and east would require significant work. The roads to the north of the site are wholly inappropriate for use in conjunction with a cargo hub. Whilst it is noted that at 13.6.1 a traffic/transport assessment is to be commissioned, we would flag this as a concern. This assessment should include construction through to completion and daily business.
4. In line with the above comment we would ask that future road infrastructure projects such as the proposed Lower Thames Crossing are considered and that a broader, county view is taken. This would include the A2 and M2 routes are taken into consideration along with other potential connectors such as the A256 and the A28.
5. Comment at 13.6.21/22 – our view would be that a Transport Assessment, a Travel Plan and a Traffic Management plan are essentials for this project. A traffic management plan for this site should allow for growth and should take advantage of existing links available through the relevant Highway Authorities.
6. Whilst direct comment has not been made surrounding airport operations and environment issues, the increase of traffic volumes connected to construction and then daily operation and the link to environmental issues should be made.
7. One last point to make is that the current use of the Manston Site is as a contingency to Operation Stack and therefore could be considered as a critical national structure at this

time. Assurances would be required that until the time comes that Manston is no longer required for Operation Stack then no development would occur.

Once again, apologies for the delay in responding and we will participate in the full consultation.

Regards.

Tony Blaker
Assistant Chief Constable
Central Operations

From: Environmental Services [<mailto:environmentalservices@pins.gsi.gov.uk>]
Sent: 01 July 2016 16:52
Subject: TR020002 – Manston Airport – EIA Scoping Notification and Consultation

Dear Sir/Madam

Please see the attached correspondence about the proposed Manston Airport project.

Please note the deadline for consultation responses is 29 July 2016 and is a statutory requirement that cannot be extended.

Kind regards,

Dr Richard Hunt
Senior EIA Advisor
Major Applications and Plans, The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay
House, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN
Direct Line: 0303 444 5149

Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)
Helpline: 0303 444 5000
Email: EnvironmentalServices@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Web: <http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk> (National Infrastructure Planning website)

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our [Information Charter](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

This email and any files transmitted with it are private and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient the E-mail and any files have been transmitted to you in error and any copying, distribution or other use of the information contained in them is strictly prohibited.

Nothing in this E-mail message amounts to a contractual or other legal commitment on the part of the Government unless confirmed by a communication signed on behalf of the Secretary of State.

The Department's computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

Correspondents should note that all communications from Department for Communities and Local Government may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

This email and any other accompanying document(s) contain information from Kent Police and/or Essex Police, which is confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or bodies to whom it is addressed. The content, including any subsequent replies, could be disclosable if relating to a criminal investigation or civil proceedings. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by contacting the sender or telephoning Kent Police on 01622 690690 or Essex Police on 01245 491491, as appropriate.



Historic England

SOUTH EAST OFFICE

Mr Richard Hunt
The Planning Inspectorate

Direct Dial: 01483 252032

Our ref: PA00434639
16 August 2016

Dear Mr Hunt

Request for Advice

MANSTON AIRPORT, MANSTON

Thank you for contacting us on 9 July 2016 regarding an EIA screening/scoping opinion in relation to the above site. Whilst no designated heritage asset lies within the possible application site, we nevertheless agree that it is correct for historic environment issues to be included in the scope of an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The proposed development site has potential to contain very significant archaeological remains, and is itself significant as a historic site, containing a group of associated historic buildings within an historic landscape. There are also heritage assets outside the site that may be affected by the application as a result of changes to their settings.

A comprehensive understanding of the baseline conditions is necessary in order to design proposals that will minimise harm to the historic environment and maximise and opportunities for enhancement that may exist. Once that work has been carried out, we recommend that the applicant should reassess their Master Plan in order to identify ways in which careful design could improve the outcome for the historic environment.

Historic England is the statutory consultee regarding heritage assets of the highest designations, including Scheduled Monuments, and Grade 1 and 2* Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens. Historic England may also comment therefore on other heritage assets and the historic environment in general, and in this case we propose to do so because of the size of the proposed development and the potential degree of harm to potentially nationally important heritage assets. However, we anticipate that the primary source of your advice will be Kent County Council's heritage team.

The proposed development lies within a very rich archaeological landscape, in which numerous designated and non-designated archaeological sites of national importance



EASTGATE COURT 195-205 HIGH STREET GUILDFORD SURREY GU1 3EH

Telephone 01483 252020
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). All information held by the organisation will be accessible in response to an information request, unless one of the exemptions in the FOIA or EIR applies.

Historic England will use the information provided by you to evaluate any applications you make for statutory or quasi-statutory consent, or for grant or other funding. Information provided by you and any information obtained from other sources will be retained in all cases in hard copy form and/or on computer for administration purposes and future consideration where applicable.

SOUTH EAST OFFICE

have been located. Prehistoric remains include ritual monuments, for example Bronze Age barrows and Roman and Saxon cemeteries. There are also Iron Age, Roman and medieval settlements and their associated landscapes present. Typically, these sites exist as buried rather than upstanding remains. The historic landscape character that we see today is derived largely from the post-medieval period, including irregular fields, small settlements and scattered properties, many of which are of heritage significance and some of which are designated. The airfield itself has its origins in the First World War, although it expanded in the Second World War, and once occupied a greater area than the present airfield. There are significant historic buildings relating to aviation both on the proposed development site and near to it, in areas that have since changed use. The Second World War has also left a network of pillboxes and anti-invasion defences across the landscape.

In general, the non-designated heritage assets that could be affected by the proposed development are of lower significance than designated assets, although some might have greater significance than has been hitherto attributed to them. Archaeological remains may be present within the proposed development site that are of similar character and significance to Scheduled Monuments located around it. In addition, it is possible that one or more of the historic buildings present may be of Listable quality. The historic buildings on the site might also have greater cumulative significance as an associated group, and the airfield has considerable communal value because it commemorates the struggles of the two World Wars, in which it had a particular and important role.

The Scoping Report states that site investigation works will be carried out in order to inform the assessment of effect, although no details are given of the type of assessment proposed. We would be pleased to engage with the applicant when designing the appropriate form, scope and methodology of fieldwork to best understand the significance of buried archaeological remains.

Effects on the settings of designated and non-designated heritage assets both within and outside the site boundary should be assessed. We would expect published guidance on the setting of heritage assets (*Historic England Good Practice in Planning Note 3*) to be consulted. We would be pleased to provide further advice as to the adequate application of the guidance, including the selection of assets to be the subject of detailed assessment.

If necessary, accurate visual representations of the levels of possible harm should be presented; this relates to designated assets, and also non-designated built heritage assets related to the former airfield. We suggest that the applicant should confirm their approach to use of photomontages with regard to the historic environment.



EASTGATE COURT 195-205 HIGH STREET GUILDFORD SURREY GU1 3EH

Telephone 01483 252020
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). All information held by the organisation will be accessible in response to an information request, unless one of the exemptions in the FOIA or EIR applies.

Historic England will use the information provided by you to evaluate any applications you make for statutory or quasi-statutory consent, or for grant or other funding. Information provided by you and any information obtained from other sources will be retained in all cases in hard copy form and/or on computer for administration purposes and future consideration where applicable.

SOUTH EAST OFFICE

A Master Plan for the development should be informed by a good understanding of the heritage significance of the place. An optimum balance between development and conservation, which meets the criteria of the NPPF and has credible costed provision for appropriate mitigation, can only be achieved with the benefit of a good understanding of heritage significance.

The results of archaeological field assessment should be used to inform the Master Plan. The applicant should seek to reduce the harm to archaeological remains through careful placement of buildings, services and other sub-surface intrusions. Following the completion of field assessment it may be necessary to amend the development proposals in order to provide for the conservation of heritage assets.

The Master Plan should seek to conserve some character of the airfield and the significance and interrelationships of heritage assets within it. For example, there may be opportunities to retain the settings, views and sight-lines between associated assets such as the Control Tower and runways; the location and orientation of the smaller runways might be incorporated into the design; and there might be opportunities to add elements of interpretation, such as heritage information boards or in the nomenclature of new features.

There are a number of other airfields that have been developed in recent years, as the applicant mentions in the Planning Statement, but they have had varying degrees of success in achieving sustainable development that appropriately conserves their historic origins. Consideration of the success in this respect of other comparable developments would also usefully inform this application. This fundamental heritage assessment and design work should take place before the quantum of development or the Master Plan is approved, or planning permission granted.

While Historic England would anticipate complementing and not duplicating the advice of the KCC heritage team, we will be pleased to advise further in relation to the points we have made in this letter, and can provide further advice about the issues raised, if requested, in due course.

While Historic England would anticipate complementing and not duplicating the advice of the KCC heritage team, we will be pleased to advise further in relation to the points we have made in this letter, and can provide further advice about the issues raised, if requested, in due course.

Yours sincerely



EASTGATE COURT 195-205 HIGH STREET GUILDFORD SURREY GU1 3EH

Telephone 01483 252020
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). All information held by the organisation will be accessible in response to an information request, unless one of the exemptions in the FOIA or EIR applies.

Historic England will use the information provided by you to evaluate any applications you make for statutory or quasi-statutory consent, or for grant or other funding. Information provided by you and any information obtained from other sources will be retained in all cases in hard copy form and/or on computer for administration purposes and future consideration where applicable.



Historic England

SOUTH EAST OFFICE



Paul Roberts MCIfA
Inspector of Ancient Monuments
E-mail: Paul.roberts@HistoricEngland.org.uk

**MANSTON AIRPORT, MANSTON
Request for Pre-application Advice**



EASTGATE COURT 195-205 HIGH STREET GUILDFORD SURREY GU1 3EH

Telephone 01483 252020
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). All information held by the organisation will be accessible in response to an information request, unless one of the exemptions in the FOIA or EIR applies.

Historic England will use the information provided by you to evaluate any applications you make for statutory or quasi-statutory consent, or for grant or other funding. Information provided by you and any information obtained from other sources will be retained in all cases in hard copy form and/or on computer for administration purposes and future consideration where applicable.

Date: 03 September 2016
Our ref: 192711
Your ref: 160701_TR020002_16746180



Dr Richard Hunt
Senior EIA Advisor
The Planning Inspectorate

Customer Services
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Dr Hunt

Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (as amended) – Regulations 8 and 9

Scoping Opinion - Application by RiverOak Investment Corp LLC for an Order Granting Development Consent for Manston Airport, Kent.

Thank you for consulting Natural England on the scoping opinion prepared for the DCO application to be made for Manston Airport. Unfortunately Natural England did not receive the original consultation from The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) and we were therefore unable to issue a response prior to the statutory deadline of 29 July 2016. Given the lateness of this response we have been able to review not only the Scoping Report prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler, dated June 2016, but also your formal Scoping Opinion issued in August 2016. We note that paragraph 1.13 of your Scoping Opinion states '*Late responses will be forwarded to the Applicant and will be made available on the Planning Inspectorate's website. The Applicant should also give due consideration to those comments in carrying out the EIA.*'

For ease of reference our comments below are structured under the chapter headings used in the applicant's Scoping Report.

Chapter 5 - Air Quality

Natural England welcomes the recognition in this chapter that there is the potential for air quality impacts on vegetation and ecosystems as well as human health. We are generally satisfied with the methodology proposed where it relates to the assessment of impacts on the natural environment and we would be happy to work with the applicant to identify and agree appropriate, sensitive non-human receptors as recommended in paragraph 3.46 of your Scoping Opinion.

We are pleased to see that air quality impacts will be assessed not only from the aircraft themselves but also from the additional traffic that will be associated with the airport during both the construction and operational phases of the development. Paragraph 5.6.2 of the Scoping Report provides criteria from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance on when a formal air quality assessment of vehicular emissions is likely to be required. Such an assessment will need to be carried out for designated nature conservation sites sensitive to air quality impacts where they fall within 200m of a road meeting one or more of the criteria listed here.

Chapter 6 – Biodiversity

As this is the chapter most closely aligned to Natural England's remit it is worth making a more general point here about the early stage this project appears to be at, certainly in terms of the level of detail reflected in the Scoping Report, with most of the information in this chapter being extremely generic. We share your concerns around the '*limited detail and evidence*' provided on key areas

such as the gathering of baseline data, the approach to be taken to assessing environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures (Scoping Opinion, paragraph 3.8). However, we can advise you that Amec Foster Wheeler have recently contacted us to seek more detailed advice on biodiversity issues and in particular in putting together an HRA Evidence Plan.

Designated sites

We note from Section 6.5 of the Scoping Report that a 10km search radius has been used to identify statutory sites which may be affected by the proposed development and we support your request (Scoping Opinion, paragraph 3.59) that the Environmental Statement (ES) provide justification for a zone of influence of this size. We consider that the designated sites listed below are those which are most likely to be affected by the development, all of which fall within the current 10km zone, but we will work with the applicant as more detailed information becomes available to assess whether or not there are any other relevant sites outside this.

- Sandwich Bay to Hacklinge Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (0.9km)
- Sandwich Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (0.9km)
- Thanet Coast SAC (0.9km)
- Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA) (0.9km)
- Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay Ramsar site (0.9km)
- Sandwich & Pegwell Bay National Nature Reserve (NNR) (0.9km)
- Thanet Coast SSSI (4.3km)
- Outer Thames Estuary SPA (4.7km)
- Margate & Long Sands SAC (6km)
- Stodmarsh SSSI / SAC / SPA / Ramsar site / NNR (7.6km)
- Preston Marshes SSSI (8.9km)

We are generally happy with the broad summary of impacts scoped in for further assessment as outlined in paragraph 6.6.12 of the Scoping Report. We would add that when assessing the potential impact of management measures to reduce bird collision risk the ES also covers any implications stemming from the resumption of the 13km bird strike safeguarding zone defined by the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) which would require all future planning applications within this zone to be assessed for their potential impacts on bird numbers and movements. When assessing all impacts on designated sites a comparison should be made between what is proposed in the DCO and the previous airport operations.

We agree with your request that the potential for effects on relevant habitats and species resulting from pollution incidents during both the construction and operational phases of the airport should remain scoped in at this stage (Scoping Opinion, paragraph 3.34), particularly given the confirmed presence of contamination on site (Scoping Report, Chapter 9). We support Thanet District Council's request that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should form part of the ES.

We do not believe that Table 6.2 of the Scoping Report currently provides a comprehensive cross-reference of each designated site with the likely pathways of impact by which the proposed development could affect it. We would query why the potential for deterioration in water quality is not picked up for those sites with a hydrological link to the airport. We also support Kent County Council's query as to why it is not proposed to consider the potential effects of air quality and aircraft deposition on SPA and Ramsar sites.

Protected species

At this early stage Natural England would refer the applicant to our Standing Advice on protected species which gives up to date guidance on best practice survey methodology:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-species-how-to-review-planning-applications>

As the project progresses our focus will be around European Protected Species (EPS) and we would encourage the applicant to seek guidance from us if they are planning to diverge from the best practice methods for surveys and mitigation measures set out in the Standing Advice. We note

that paragraphs 4.17 to 4.22 of your Scoping Opinion advise the applicant on the best approach to take should they conclude that an EPS licence is required. We support your recommendation in paragraph 3.62 that great crested newts should be scoped in for assessment in the ES.

Chapter 7 – Ground and Surface Water

Natural England notes that the main site discharge point from the runway and apron areas is via a pipe running out to the designated sites at Pegwell Bay and that if the applicant wishes this discharge to continue under their operation of the site then they will need to apply to the Environment Agency (EA) for a new discharge permit. In our initial meeting with the applicant on 26 April 2016 we advised that we would not wish to see any reduction in the quality of this discharge from what was previously permitted.

We are pleased to see that the ES will give further consideration to the effects on water quality targets at Pegwell Bay and associated designated sites (Scoping Report, paragraph 7.6.4) and we also support your Scoping Opinion request (paragraph 3.35) that the potential for accidental spillages to Pegwell Bay via the site drainage network during construction remains scoped in at this early stage.

Chapter 10 – Landscape and Visual

In our initial meeting with the applicant we advised that based on the distance of the proposal site from the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) we did not believe that any impacts on tranquillity from increased overflying would be sufficiently significant to meet our current criteria for engagement with landscape casework. We did however advise that the applicant should seek engagement from the Kent Downs AONB Unit.

Chapter 11 – Noise

We note that there is no cross reference here to Biodiversity as there is within the Air Quality chapter and would advise the applicant to address this when preparing the ES so that all relevant chapters are cross referenced.

I hope that these comments are helpful in setting out details to be considered by the applicant in the ES. We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Heather Twizell on 0208 0268024 or heather.twizell@naturalengland.org.uk. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Heather Twizell
Lead Adviser
Sustainable Development Team – Sussex and Kent

HID Policy - Land Use Planning
NSIP Consultations
Building 2.2, Redgrave Court
Merton Road, Bootle
Merseyside, L20 7HS

Your ref: TR020002
Our ref: 4.2.1.5485

HSE email: NSIP.applications@hse.gov.uk

FAO Richard Hunt
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay,
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Dr Hunt

28 September 2016

**PROPOSED MANSTON AIRPORT REDEVELOPMENT (the project)
PROPOSAL BY RIVEROAK INVESTMENT CORP LLC (the applicant)
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2009 (as amended) – Regulations 8 and 9**

Thank you for your letter of 14th September 2016 regarding the information to be provided in an environmental statement relating to the above project.

HSE does not comment on EIA Scoping Reports but the following information is likely to be useful to the applicant.

HSE's land use planning advice

Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE's consultation distances?

According to HSE's records, there are no major accident hazard installations or pipelines in the vicinity of the infrastructure project.

Would Hazardous Substances Consent be needed?

The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) may require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended. The substances, alone or when aggregated with others, for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set out in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015.

Hazardous Substances Consent would be required if the site is intending to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances and Preparations at or above the controlled quantities set out in schedule 1 of these Regulations.

Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority.

Explosives sites

There is a licensed explosive site at Mantson Airport. HSE may wish to comment in more detail when responding to the applicant under Section 42 of The Planning Act 2008.

Electrical Safety

No comment.

Waste

In respect to potential landfill (buried waste) the applicant should take account of and adhere to relevant health and safety requirements. More details can be found on HSE's website at:
<http://www.hse.gov.uk/waste/index.htm>

Please send any further electronic communication on this project directly to the HSE's designated e-mail account for NSIP applications. Alternatively any hard copy correspondence should be sent to:

Mr Dave Adams (MHPD)
NSIP Consultations
2.2 Redgrave Court
Merton Road
Bootle, Merseyside
L20 7HS

Yours sincerely,



Dave Adams
CEMHD4 Policy



1 Eversholt Street
London
NW1 2DN

T: 07740 224772

E: elliott.stamp@networkrail.co.uk

21 July 2017

The Planning Inspectorate
3D Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN
environmentalservices@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Dear Dr Richard Hunt,

Network Rail Consultation Response – Manston Airport – EIA Scoping Consultation and Notification (160701_TR020002_16746180)

Thank you for consulting with Network Rail in relation to the application by RiverOak Investment Corp LLC for an Order Granting Development Consent for Manston Airport.

The proposed scheme has the potential to impact on the usage of Network Rail's infrastructure. As a result the proposed scheme and associated EIA / Transport Assessment will need to assess and consider the potential impact of the development on the following railway stations and level crossing.

Cliffs End 9 Level Crossing:

The safety of the operational railway and of those crossing it is of the highest importance to Network Rail and railway crossings are of a particular interest in relation to safety.

Cliffs End 9 Automatic Half Barrier (AHB) Level Crossing is located on Foads Road, Cliffs End CT12 5EW.

The proposed scheme at Manston Airport will need to assess its potential impact on the usage and safety of Cliffs End 9 crossing. Following this assessment appropriate mitigation measures may need to be identified and introduced at the crossing. Any potential mitigation measures that are required would need to be funded by the applicant.

Minster and Ramsgate Stations:

The proposed scheme at Manston Airport will also need to assess its potential impact on the usage of Minster Station and Ramsgate Station.

If the impact on the respective stations is considered to be significant, the introduction of appropriate station improvements / mitigation measures may be necessary. Any potential station improvements / mitigation measures that are required would need to be funded by the applicant.

Thanet Park Way Station:

Network Rail is aware of Kent County Council's proposed Thanet Parkway Station scheme. The proposed scheme at Manston Airport will need to consider its relationship with the proposed new station.

Thank you for giving Network Rail the opportunity to comment on the EIA Scoping Consultation and Notification. I would be grateful if the Planning Inspectorate could consider the representations made within this letter.

It is recommended that the applicant contacts Network Rail at an early stage in order to discuss the proposed scheme and potential impact on Network Rail's infrastructure.

If you require any further information or have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us on 07740 224772.

Yours sincerely

Elliot Stamp
Town Planner