

Application by RiverOak Strategic Partners to upgrade and reopen Manston Airport
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)
Issued on 18 January 2019

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the Examination Timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the **Initial Assessment of Principal Issues (update)** provided as **Annex C** to the Rule 8 letter dated 18 January 2019¹. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word format is available on request from the Case Team: please contact ManstonAirport@pins.gsi.gov.uk.

Responses are due by **Deadline 3** (15 February 2019) in the **Examination Timetable** at **Annex A** to the Rule 8 letter.

¹ Available here: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR020002-002848>

Abbreviations used

A list of the abbreviations used in this document is provided at **Annex A**.

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/manston-airport/?ipcsection=docs>

The Examination library will be updated at regular intervals as the Examination progresses.

Citation of Questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number

eg 'LV.1.1' refers to the first question related to Landscape and Visual.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1	General and Cross-topic questions (including relevant planning policy)	
G.1.1	Thanet District Council (TDC) NOTE: TDC may choose to address this question through the drafting of a Local Impact Report (LIR)	Saved Policies of the Thanet Local Plan 2006 Saved Policies EC2, EC3, EC4, EC5 and EC6 of the adopted Thanet Local Plan 2006 are all of particular relevance to the application. Explain if the application fully accords with these policies and what weight should be afforded to them.
G.1.3	The Applicant	Thanet Local Plan TDC's Draft Local Plan to 2031 (dated 26 October 2018) allocates and safeguards land at Manston Business Park for B1, B2 and B8 uses. Would the proposed allocation have any effect on the need for the Northern Grass Area that the application proposes for B1 and B8 uses?
G.1.4	TDC NOTE: TDC may choose to address this question through the drafting of a LIR	Thanet Local Plan TDC's Draft Local Plan to 2031 (dated 26 October 2018) states at paragraph 1.43, with reference to Manston Airport that: <i>"...the site has an existing use for aviation, subject to other relevant legislation."</i> Explain the inclusion of the phrase "<i>subject to other relevant</i>"

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		legislation”.
G.1.5	<p>TDC</p> <p>NOTE: TDC may choose to address this question through the drafting of a LIR</p>	<p>Thanet Local Plan</p> <p>TDC’s Draft Local Plan to 2031 (dated 26 October 2018) states at paragraph 1.44 that:</p> <p><i>“If a DCO for aviation use at the site is granted, this would require a partial review of the Local Plan in relation to housing land supply provisions, aviation and environmental policies and other related matters.”</i></p> <p>Explain the effect that the consenting of the DCO would have on the draft Local Plan’s housing land supply and why a partial review would be required in this regard.</p>
G.1.6	<p>The Applicant</p> <p>TDC</p> <p>NOTE: TDC may choose to address this question through the drafting of a LIR</p>	<p>Thanet Local Plan</p> <p>TDC’s Draft Local Plan to 2031 (dated 26 October 2018) allocates a site called Manston Green for 785 dwellings, which it states has planning permission. Some of the site falls within the DCO application boundary.</p> <p>Explain the effect that the consenting of the DCO would have on the delivery of the site.</p>
G.1.7	<p>The Applicant</p> <p>TDC</p> <p>NOTE: TDC may choose to address this question through the</p>	<p>Thanet Local Plan</p> <p>TDC’s Draft Local Plan to 2031 (dated 26 October 2018) allocates several housing sites in close proximity to the application site.</p> <p>What effect does this have on the application and what weight can</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	drafting of a LIR	be afforded to the proposed allocations at this time?
G.1.8	The Applicant	<p>The Planning Statement (APP-080) refers to the National Planning Policy Framework, 2012. The revised NPPF was published in July 2018.</p> <p>Explain if the changes introduced by the revised NPPF 2018 have any relevance to the application.</p>
G.1.9	The Applicant Stone Hill Park Ltd TDC	<p>Stone Hill Park Ltd [RR-1601] planning application to TDC</p> <p>Manston Airport is being promoted for redevelopment for housing and mixed use scheme.</p> <p>What is the current status of this proposal?</p>
G.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Detailed CVs</p> <p>We note that brief resumes have been provided as a preamble to Chapter 1 of the ES [APP-033] as evidence of "<i>Competent Experts</i>".</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide detailed CVs of the principal author of each assessment chapter in the ES [APP-033 to 036] and of the principal author of the rest of the ES and also the Azimuth Report?</p>
G.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Post-DCO process plans, systems and strategies</p> <p>The Applicant is committing to producing a number of plans, systems and strategies following the end of the DCO process.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide a definitive list of all these documents and</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		the proposed associated approval process?
AQ.1	Air quality	
AQ.1.1	The Applicant	<p>PHE [RR-1608]</p> <p>Section 6.4.3 of the ES [APP-033] discusses the cumulative effects and Table 6.3 identifies that:</p> <p><i>"...the greatest impact of NO2 is on individuals with asthma or other respiratory conditions, but consistent impacts on these individuals is at levels of greater than 564 µg m3 , much higher than typical UK ambient concentrations..."</i></p> <p>The discussion of effects only occurring at high concentrations of NO2 applies only to effects of short-term exposures. PHE recommends that the Applicant should demonstrate that the EU limit value for short term average concentrations (200 µg m-3 as a 1-hour average) will not be exceeded. WHO (2006) noted a meta-analysis indicating effects at levels exceeding this concentration.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view?</p>
AQ.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Air quality contour plots [APP-040]</p> <p>Paragraph 9.109 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states:</p> <p><i>"Section 6.1 of the ES chapter recognises that the nature of the modelling process means that it has not been possible to include the contribution from</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>road traffic in contours that have been plotted on plans/maps, so when viewing the contour plots it should be borne in mind that concentrations close to major roads will be greater than those shown. However, the road traffic concentration has been included in the assessment of specific receptors where there is relevant exposure. For similar reasons, it has not been possible to include the contribution from road traffic in the ecological assessment of daily mean NO_x. The air quality assessment makes a number of worst-case assumptions, which means that air quality impacts are likely to be over-estimated. To assess how significant the impacts are, recommendations from the Institute of Air Quality Management and the EA."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Will road traffic emissions have any significant effects on the Thanet Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? ii. Have contour plots for road traffic emissions alone been produced? iii. The last sentence in the paragraph appears incomplete.
AQ.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Figure 9.1: Impact on NO₂ concentrations from on-airport activity in the peak activity year (Year 20)[APP-080] Quantify what is meant by "moderate" in this Figure.</p>
AQ.1.4	Natural England	<p>Air quality impacts on designated ecological sites Paragraph 9.118 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states: <i>"In terms of impacts on ecological sites, some exceedances of the annual</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>mean NOx objective are predicted where major roads pass close to designated ecological sites, mainly because of levels of emissions from existing road traffic. The additional contribution from the Proposed Development, including airport-related traffic, is small, less than 7% of the objective at any major ecological site. The impact on air quality at local ecological sites is insignificant. Exceedances of the critical loads for nitrogen and acidity are predicted due to existing deposition rates, and the additional contribution from the Proposed Development is insignificant."</i></p> <p>Does NE agree that the air quality impacts on ecological sites are insignificant?</p>
AQ.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.7 of the ES [APP-033] refers to:</p> <p><i>"Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the Habitats Regulations)."</i></p> <p>It should be 2017.</p>
AQ.1.5	Natural England (NE) TDC	<p>Scoping out SO2, CO and VOCs</p> <p>Table 6.2 of the ES [APP-033] scopes out the above compounds for the reasons given at paragraph 6.4.19 of the ES.</p> <p>Do NE and TDC agree with this scoping out?</p>
AQ.1.5	TDC	<p>Additional monitoring</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Does TDC agree with the statement in paragraph 6.3.3 of the ES [APP-033] that no additional air quality monitoring was required?
AQ.1.6	CAA	<p>Table 6.2 [APP-033] Rejection of Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) and use of Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS) rather than ADMS Airport</p> <p>What is the CAA view on row 6 of Table 6.2 [APP-033] on the Applicant's rejection of AEDT?</p>
AQ.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Combined airport and road traffic emissions</p> <p>ES paragraph 6.7.5[APP-033] states that the model provides a combined assessment of operational airport emissions and road traffic emissions in proximity to the airport. At distance from the airport ADMS roads is used to assess road sources. The distance at which the change in modelling approach takes place is not stated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm the distance from the airport at which combined airport and road traffic emissions stop being considered and only road traffic emissions are assessed. ii. The Applicant should provide detailed justification for the threshold adopted.
AQ.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Table 6.2 [APP-033] Project for the Sustainable Development of Heathrow (PSDH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Can the Applicant point to other similar airport developments

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>where PSDH has been used to inform the approach to assessment?</p> <p>ii. Reference 19 of chapter 6 [APP-033] is the reference provided for PSDH, dated 6 March 2008. Provide any further documentation for PSDH.</p>
AQ.1.9	Natural England (NE)	<p>Table 6.2 [APP-033] nonhuman receptors</p> <p>i. Are NE content that the Applicant's scope of non-human receptors considered in the air quality assessment considers the most sensitive habitats?</p> <p>ii. Has NE agreed the selection of non-human air quality receptors with the Applicant?</p>
AQ.1.10	Natural England (NE) The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.4.4. [APP-033] Cartesian Grid for Air Quality</p> <p>This grid does not cover the full extent of the specific receptors.</p> <p>i. Can the Applicant list the specific receptors that are not covered?</p> <p>ii. Does NE regard the grid coverage to be sufficient to cover the locations where the impacts are expected to be greatest?</p>
AQ.1.11	Natural England (NE) PHE	<p>Table 6.6 [APP-033]</p> <p>Do NE, PHE and TDC have any comments on rationale for incorporation of the environmental mitigation measures proposed in</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	TDC	Table 6.6 [APP-033]?
AQ.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.7.2 [APP-033] Emissions from the following sources have been calculated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aircraft on the ground; • Aircraft in the air up to 3,000ft (914m). • for years 2, 6 and 20. <p>Are the sources calculated based on the number of ATMs shown in Tables 3.7 and 3.8 [APP-033]?</p>
AQ.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Table 6.25 [APP-033] Is the contribution from road traffic emissions included in Table 6.25?</p>
AQ.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.1.10 of Appendix 6.3 [APP-044] Paragraph 6.1.10 states: <i>"Few of the PSDH recommendations are specific to Heathrow and the methodology can be used for other airports of comparable size..."</i> Is Manston Airport of "comparable size" to Heathrow Airport?</p>
AQ.1.15	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.1.11 of Appendix 6.3 [APP-044] PSDH model evaluation

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>"The model evaluation found that it gave a generally good agreement with the extensive monitoring data around Heathrow, and formed a suitable basis for evaluating the impacts of future airport developments there".</i></p> <p>Quantify what is meant by "generally good agreement".</p>
AQ.1.16	CAA	<p>Paragraph 6.1.15 of Appendix 6.3 [APP-044]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is detailed documentation on the Aviation Environmental Design Tool AEDT methodology available from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)? ii. What is the CAA view on the applicability of the recommendations of the PSDH to Manston?
AQ.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.1.18 of Appendix 6.3 [APP-044] PSDH model and ICAO advanced</p> <p>Explain what is meant by "generally consistent"?</p>
AQ.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Table 6.15 of Appendix 6.3 [APP-044]</p> <p>Does Table 6.15 [APP-044] represent the number of freight and passenger ATMs which have assessed in the EIA?</p> <p>Paragraphs 1.31 and 1.34-1.36 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] state: <i>"No limit on daytime flights is being applied for, and therefore the applied-for capability is the physical capability of the Proposed Development to</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>handle flights during the day."</i></p> <p>Is the "physical capability of the Proposed Development" different from the number of freight and passenger ATMs which have been assessed in the EIA?</p>
AQ.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Limits on daytime flights</p> <p>Paragraphs 1.31 and 1.34 to 1.36 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] state:</p> <p><i>"No limit on daytime flights is being applied for, and therefore the applied-for capability is the physical capability of the Proposed Development to handle flights during the day.</i></p> <p><i>This leaves the critical factor as the ability to handle aircraft safely and simultaneously. RiverOak's aviation expert advice is that on a conservative basis, a single cargo stand can turn around an aircraft every 2.5 hours, i.e. six aircraft or 12 movements between 0700 and 2300 per day.</i></p> <p><i>The Proposed Development is to reconstruct the airport with 19 cargo stands (and some passenger stands, which will not handle cargo aircraft), the construction of which will involve development in planning terms. Using the figure of six arriving and departing aircraft per stand per day (i.e. between 0700 and 2300 – as only limited night flights are contemplated), one arrives at a theoretical maximum capability figure of (19x12x365=) 83,220 movements per year, and therefore the capability of the airport will be at that level, noting that this is theoretical capability rather than predicted</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>operation.</i></p> <p><i>The increase in capability is therefore 83,220 movements per year of cargo aircraft, more than eight times the required threshold, assuming the existing capability is zero, as demonstrated above."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reference is made to "some passenger stands". Would these add to the 83,220 movements per year of cargo aircraft? ii. What is the total "physical capability" of the Proposed Development in terms of ATMs/year and how has that been assessed in the EIA?
AQ.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Diesel emissions and ICAO engine data</p> <p>The baseline assessment uses the Defra Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT) v7 uplifted by Calculator Using Realistic Emissions for Diesels (CURED) v2A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm what effect the use of EFT v8 emissions factors and Calculator Using Realistic Emissions for Diesels (CURED) v3A would have on the air quality assessment. ii. Confirm whether the revised ICAO engine data issued in November 2017 and May 2018 would affect the findings of the assessment.
AQ.1.20	The Applicant	<p>WebTag</p> <p>The ES [APP-033] includes a monetised assessment of air quality effects based on the WebTag methodology. The basis for the WebTag calculations is</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>uncertain, since the relevant exposure level for inclusion of receptors in the assessment is not stated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide details of the air quality exposure level used to establish the population exposure used in WebTAG calculations. ii. Provide a map illustrating the extent of this exposure.
AQ.1.21	The Applicant	<p>European sites</p> <p>ES paragraph 6.11.32 discusses a location 60m from the road that is representative of the Ramsar, SPA and SAC receptor and ES paragraph 6.11.34 [APP-033] discusses a location representative of the Foxes Bottom LNR.</p> <p>Chapter 6 does not illustrate these locations or explain why they are representative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. With reference to the figures accompanying chapter 6, provide clarification of the receptor number referenced in ES paragraph 6.11.32 as being 60m from the A256 that is considered to be representative of the Ramsar, SPA and SAC site; and the location at 45m from the A299 that is representative of Foxes Bottom Local Nature Reserve. ii. Provide justification as to why these locations are representative of the worst case impact on the designated sites.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AQ.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Air quality contours combined</p> <p>ES paragraph 6.1.6 [APP-033] explains that emissions from road traffic cannot be incorporated into contour plots. Consequently emissions are higher at roadside locations than shown. The ES explains that road traffic concentrations have been included in the assessment of specific receptors with relevant exposure. The ES goes on to state that:</p> <p><i>"For similar reasons, it has not been possible to include the contribution from road traffic in the ecological assessment of daily mean NOx."</i></p> <p>Explain whether the assessment of NOx includes road traffic NOx emissions and, if not, how this represents a worst case assessment in air quality terms.</p>
AQ.1.23	TDC The Applicant	<p>Air quality monitoring</p> <p>The ES proposes to provide funding to TDC to reinstate air quality continuous monitoring at the ZH3 Thanet Airport location. This will monitor NO and NO2 at hourly intervals in real time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="972 1086 2078 1190">i. Does TDC consider that the proposed monitoring is sufficient for operational air quality emissions arising from the Proposed Development and is the approach agreed with the Applicant? <li data-bbox="972 1206 2078 1310">ii. What remedial action does TDC consider should be undertaken in the event that emissions are worse than forecast due to the Proposed Development?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii. How is funding secured for the continuous monitoring?
AQ.1.24	The Applicant TDC	Government's Clean Air Strategy Are there any implications from the Government's new Clean Air Strategy (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/clean-air-strategy-2019) for the Proposed Development?
CA.1	Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations	
CA.1.1	The Applicant	Justification Paragraph 8.1 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012] states that: "Due to the nature of the Proposed Development powers are sought to acquire outright the main airport site, the Northern Grass and the subsoil where the Pipeline is positioned." Explain what is meant by "the nature of the Proposed Development" means in this context.
CA.1.2	The Applicant	Justification Paragraph 9.19 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012] states that: "In common with other projects, detailed design may avoid acquisition of some of the land that is within the scope of compulsory acquisition powers in the application; only land that is required for the development will be

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>acquired.” Show where the draft DCO [APP-006] secures this.</p>
CA.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Justification With reference to paragraph 9.22.1 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012], provide examples of where the person with an interest in land cannot grant the relevant land interest or right at the time when the option is exercised.</p>
CA.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Land Requirement - Works Nos. 15, 16 and 17 Paragraph 45 of the NSIP Justification Document [APP-008] states that: “Note that all of the above elements are in their nature airport-related, except potentially the development of the so-called ‘Northern Grass’ (which is divided into three zones and described as Works 15 to 17), which could become unrelated to the airport if it was not controlled in some way. To ensure that this remains in support of the operation of the airport, the Development Consent Order requires the uses at the Northern Grass to be airport-related in the description of those works.” In its description of Works Nos. 15, 16 and 17, the draft DCO [APP-006] does not require the uses at the Northern Grass to be airport-related in the description of those works. The ExA further notes that, for example, the wireline views in Appendix 11.1 of the ES Volume 12: Appendices 10 .1, Appendix B – 12.14 [APP-057]</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>distinguish between 'airport development' and 'business development'.</p> <p>Given this, show how, any request for Compulsory Acquisition in relation to Works Nos. 15, 16 and 17 fulfils the statutory requirement in PA2008 s.122(2)(a) or (b).</p>
CA.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Land Requirement – Plots 015b, 017, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 025</p> <p>With reference to Appendix 1 in the Statement of Reasons [APP-012], clarify what is meant by glide path safeguarding in relation to plots 015b, 017, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 025</p>
CA.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Land Requirement – Pipeline and outfall</p> <p>In relation to the pipeline leading to the outfall at Pegwell Bay, justify in detail the extent of the land with plots shown in blue in Insets A, B, C, D, E and F in the Land Plans [APP-016]</p>
CA.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Land Requirement – Pipeline and outfall</p> <p>Paragraph 10.8 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012] states that:</p> <p>"There has been contact from several parties affected on the pipeline plots, with queries raised. In response to this, RiverOak will be arranging a meeting to be held at the Cliffsend Village Hall, or other suitable local venue, to discuss the proposals further."</p> <p>i. Has such a meeting been held</p> <p>ii. If so, provide information on the outcomes of that meeting</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Land Requirement</p> <p>Paragraph 8.38 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012] states that:</p> <p>"... due to the nature of the design process and the timing of the consenting process, RiverOak requires a degree of flexibility as to where certain sections of the proposals can be constructed within the defined limits of deviation which are provided for in the draft Order."</p> <p>Given this, show how you can assure be made that the statutory requirement in PA2008 s122(2)(a) or (b) is fulfilled in this respect.</p>
CA.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Public Interest</p> <p>The Applicant is reminded that Section 122 of Planning Act 2008 requires that the Secretary of State must be satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition.</p> <p>All parties should note that the ExA will have regard to any answers provided to other questions including those on the need and socio-economic impact in assisting it to address this statutory requirement.</p>
CA.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013) advises at paragraph 8 that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) should have been</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>explored.</p> <p>The ExA has made a procedural decision in the Rule 6 letter to require the Applicant to provide an initial CA Status Report at Deadline 3, to accompany the responses to these questions.</p> <p>Detail your approach to negotiation with Affected Parties including the timing and nature of negotiations held and intended timescales for reaching agreement.</p>
CA.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>DCLG <i>Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i> (2013) advises at paragraph 8 that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) should have been explored.</p> <p>Provide details of any previous initiatives to seek the Compulsory Purchase of this site by yourselves or by any firms or bodies, including any by River Oak Investments, from which you have accepted all responsibilities.</p>
CA.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>DCLG <i>Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i> (2013) advises at paragraph 8 that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) should have been explored.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>i. Provide details of any previous initiatives to purchase this site by yourselves or by any firms or bodies, including any by River Oak Investments from which you have accepted all responsibilities.</p> <p>ii. Set out the reasons why any initiatives referenced were not successful.</p>
CA.1.13	Thanet DC	<p>Reasonable Alternatives</p> <p>DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013) advises at paragraph 8 that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) should have been explored.</p> <p>Provide details of any previous initiatives to seek the Compulsory Purchase of this site, including any by River Oak Investments, setting out the reasons why these were not successful and whether there remains the possibility of using this route again.</p>
CA.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Risks or impediments</p> <p>DCLG <i>Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i> (2013) advises at paragraph 19 that any potential risks or impediments to implementation of the scheme should have been properly managed.</p> <p>Set out the track record of the Applicant in developing, constructing and managing nationally significant infrastructure projects, notably</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		airports.
CA.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Risks or impediments</p> <p><i>DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013) advises at paragraph 19 that any potential risks or impediments to implementation of the scheme should have been properly managed.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Explain whether the process of obtaining Air Space Change approval from the CAA should be regarded as a risk or impediment to the implementation of the scheme ii. Explain whether the process of obtaining an Airdrome Certificate from the CAA should be regarded as a risk or impediment to the implementation of the scheme iii. Explain whether the process of obtaining an environmental permit for the Pegwell Bay outfall should be regarded as a risk or impediment to the implementation of the scheme
CA.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Acquiring by voluntary agreement</p> <p><i>DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013) advises at paragraph 25 that, as a general rule, authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought as part of an order granting development consent if attempts to acquire by agreement fail.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Set out the nature, timing and outcomes of any negotiations held with Stone Hill Park Ltd and/or their agents in respect of the purchase of land and/or rights a) before 17 July 2018 and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>b) to date.</p> <p>ii. Set out an evaluation of the current probability of acquiring land and/or rights by agreement.</p>
CA.1.17	Stone Hill Park Ltd	<p>Acquiring by voluntary agreement</p> <p><i>DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013) advises at paragraph 25 that, as a general rule, authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought as part of an order granting development consent if attempts to acquire by agreement fail.</i></p> <p>i. Set out the nature, timing and outcomes of any negotiations held with the Applicant and/or their agents in respect of the purchase of land and/or rights a) before 17 July 2018 and b) to date</p> <p>ii. Set out an evaluation of the current probability of acquiring land and/or rights by agreement.</p>
CA.1.18	Stone Hill Park Ltd	<p>Acquisition by voluntary agreement</p> <p>Paragraph 8.37 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012] states that:</p> <p>“Most of the land within the existing airport perimeter is owned by Stone Hill Park Limited, who have been unwilling to date to enter into meaningful negotiations with RiverOak, despite RiverOak’s attempts to acquire this land by agreement.”</p> <p>Comment on the Applicant’s assertion that Stone Hill Park Limited</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		have been unwilling to date to enter into meaningful negotiations with RiverOak.
CA.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Acquisition by voluntary agreement</p> <p>Paragraph 9.19 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012] states that: "RiverOak has already acquired some land and rights in land and will continue to seek to acquire all land and rights it needs by voluntary agreement, subject to the DCO being made."</p> <p>Are those plots of land where land or rights were acquired prior to the application for a DCO being made still subject to the request for Compulsory Acquisition and contained in the Book of Reference?</p>
CA.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Jentex fuel facility</p> <p>The ExA noted that it received apparently conflicting evidence at the Open Floor Hearing held on 11th January 2019 as to whether or not the site of the Jentex fuel facility had been acquired by the Applicant.</p> <p>Clarify</p>
CA.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Operation Stack</p> <p>The ExA notes that, at paragraph 12.18 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012], you state, in relation to 'Operation Stack' that: <i>"Following diligent inquiry RiverOak has received no evidence to suggest that any interest in land [by the Secretary of State for Transport] is still in being</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>and there is no evidence that the Secretary of State for Transport is in occupation. RiverOak has therefore not pursued consent in accordance with Section 135 of the PA 2008 as these provisions are not applicable where no interest exists."</i></p> <p>Set out a reasoned statement of your understanding of the position of the Secretary of State for Transport in relation to any interests that may be held under any of the Categories for any plot in the Book of Reference [APP-007].</p>
CA.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Operation Stack</p> <p>The ExA notes that, at paragraph 12.18 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012], you state, in relation to 'Operation Stack' that:</p> <p><i>"Following diligent inquiry RiverOak has received no evidence to suggest that any interest in land [by the Secretary of State for Transport] is still in being and there is no evidence that the Secretary of State for Transport is in occupation. RiverOak has therefore not pursued consent in accordance with Section 135 of the PA 2008 as these provisions are not applicable where no interest exists."</i></p> <p>The ExA received evidence at the Hearing into the dDCO held on 10 January 2019 that the Highways Agency had a written agreement with Stone Hill Park that it could utilise land at Manston Airport in relation to Operations Stack or Brock or successor initiatives.</p> <p>Given this, explain why the Highways Agency or the Department for</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Transport are not listed in the Book of Reference in this respect.
CA.1.23	Stone Hill Park Ltd	<p>Operation Stack</p> <p>The ExA notes that, at paragraph 12.18 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012], the Applicant states, in relation to 'Operation Stack' that:</p> <p><i>"Following diligent inquiry RiverOak has received no evidence to suggest that any interest in land [by the Secretary of State for Transport] is still in being and there is no evidence that the Secretary of State for Transport is in occupation."</i></p> <p>Set out the nature of any agreement with the Secretary of State for Transport in respect of Operation Stack and other relevant operations, including in your response any reference to s44 and/or 57 of PA2008 that may be relevant.</p>
CA.1.24	Secretary of State for Transport	<p>Book of Reference: Affected persons</p> <p>Set out a reasoned statement of your understanding of the position of the Secretary of State for Transport in relation to any interests that may be held under any of the Categories for any plot in the Book of Reference [APP-007].</p>
CA.1.25	The Highways Agency	<p>Book of Reference: Affected persons</p> <p>Set out a reasoned statement of your understanding of the position of the Highways Agency in relation to any interests that may be held under any of the Categories for any plot in the Book of Reference</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		[APP-007].
CA.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Book of Reference: Affected persons</p> <p>Paragraph 8.25 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012] states in relation to the pipeline leading to the outfall at Pegwell Bay that:</p> <p>"... despite RiverOak's diligent inquiries, it has not been possible to ascertain the exact nature of rights or interests in land in respect of this pipeline."</p> <p>State how this lack of certainty over ownership is to be overcome.</p>
CA.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Book of Reference: Category 3 Interests</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons [APP-006, paragraphs 7.5 – 7.7] describes the process of defining the zone within which parties might be entitled to make a "relevant claim" as a Category 3 interest.</p> <p>Indicate where in the application documentation the wider referencing zone referred to in paragraph 7.5.2 is shown.</p>
CA.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Book of Reference: Category 3 Interests</p> <p>Paragraph 7.6 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012] states that:</p> <p>"With regards to the noise assessment, RiverOak ... have also taken advice from valuation consultants as to the decibel contour that a landowner could make a compensation claim. The result of this assessment was the creation of noise contour mapping."</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Explain the role of valuation consultants in advising on the decibel contour that a landowner could make a compensation claim
CA.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Book of Reference: Category 3 Interests</p> <p>Paragraph 7.5.2 refers to the possible effects from vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, artificial lighting and discharge and in relation to s10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965. Paragraphs 7.5 and 7.7 refer solely to the drawing of a boundary in terms of noise.</p> <p>Explain your methodology and rationale for drawing limits in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. factors under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 (with special, but not sole, reference to s1 (5) of that Act); ii. the provisions of s152(3) of the 2008 Planning Act; and iii. injurious affection under s10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965.
CA.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Restrictive Covenants</p> <p>Article 22 of the dDCO [APP-006] allows for the imposition of restrictive covenants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide a draft copy of any Restrictive Covenant to be imposed under this Article. ii. Set out the circumstances in which a Restrictive Covenant may

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>be imposed.</p> <p>iii. Demonstrate the need for a Restrictive Covenant to be imposed.</p> <p>iv. State whether and how the text of any possible Restrictive Covenant will be embedded in, or secured through the dDCO, providing justification if it is not to be.</p>
CA.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Temporary stopping up and restriction of use of streets</p> <p>Article 12 - Temporary stopping up and restriction of use of streets - of the draft DCO [APP-006] provides for the use any such street as a temporary working site (para. 5.9.2 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-012]).</p> <p>State whether it is your intention to temporarily stop up streets solely for the purpose of using them as a temporary working site.</p>
CA.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Statutory Undertakers</p> <p>The Applicant and Affected parties should note that, where a representation is made under section 127 of the 2008 Act and has not been withdrawn, the Secretary of State will be unable to authorise Article 31 unless satisfied of specified matters in Section 127.</p> <p>Provide a schedule of all Statutory Undertakers referenced in the Book of Reference showing whether a representation under s127 of PA2008 has been made, the stage at which negotiations leading to a possible removal of that objection and the currently forecast likely</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.33	The Applicant	<p>outcome.</p> <p>Statutory Undertakers</p> <p>The Relevant Representation [RR-0544] by Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP on behalf of Network Rail states that there have been no formal request to Network Rail and requests the Promoter enters into discussions with Network Rail as soon as possible to seek to agree the necessary rights required for the DCO Scheme.</p> <p>Explain why discussions had not been entered into in advance of the application having been made.</p> <p>NOTE: Both parties should note that the issue of Protective Provisions has been examined in general terms at the ISH on the dDCO held on 10 January 2019.</p>
CA.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Statutory Undertakers</p> <p>The Relevant Representation [RR-0544] by Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP on behalf of Network Rail states that</p> <p><i>"...at present Network Rail objects to the draft Order on the basis that it does not include Network Rail's standard protective provisions."</i></p> <p>State whether you are willing to include Network Rail's standard protective provisions in a Protective Provision.</p> <p>NOTE: Both parties should note that the issue of Protective Provisions has</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		been examined at the ISH on the dDCO held on 10 January 2019.
CA.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Relevant Representations – Affected Persons</p> <p>The Relevant Representation from Savills on behalf of the College of St John the Evangelist, the University of Cambridge [RR-0348] states that at this stage there have been no details provided with regards to what new structures are required and what restrictions there will with regards to farming the land adjacent to these.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Explain why the College of St John the Evangelist had not been party to discussions on this in advance of the application being made. ii. State what, if any, negotiation has taken place since the date of the RR from the College of St John the Evangelist. iii. Set out details with regards to what new structures are required and what restrictions there will with regards to farming the land adjacent to these.
CA.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Relevant Representations – Affected Persons</p> <p>The Relevant Representation from Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding [RR-0442] states that:</p> <p><i>"...we have consistently raised concerns to this application due to no successful mitigation being identified."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Explain why Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>had not been party to discussions on this in advance of the application being made.</p> <p>ii. State what, if any, negotiation has taken place since the date of the RR from Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding.</p> <p>iii. Set out what mitigation being identified in this respect.</p> <p>NOTE: This question may be answered through the provision of a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) as requested through the ExA's Rule 6 letter dated 11 December 2019</p>
CA.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Relevant Representations – Affected Persons</p> <p>The Relevant Representation from Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding [RR-0442] states that:</p> <p><i>"...the Ministry of Defence has a number of freehold interests within the DCO boundaries (including the equipment referred to above) as well as a significant number of other legal interests for which no agreement has been reached as to how these will be dealt with."</i></p> <p>i. Has the Ministry of Defence been party to discussions on this in advance of the application being made?</p> <p>ii. State what, if any, negotiation has taken place on this issue since the date of the RR from Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>iii. Set out what agreements have been reached on this issue.</p> <p>NOTE: This question may be answered through the provision of a SoCG as requested through the ExA's Rule 6 letter dated 11 January 2019</p>
CA.1.38	The Applicant	<p>Relevant Representations – Affected Persons</p> <p>The Relevant Representation from NATS [RR-1407] states that NATS relies on critical infrastructure.</p> <p>The ExA notes that NATS is not referenced in the Book of Reference [APP-014] and is not subject of draft Protective Provisions in the dDCO [APP-006].</p> <p>Comment?</p>
CA.1.39	The Applicant	<p>Relevant Representations – Affected Persons</p> <p>The Relevant Representation from Southern Gas Networks PLC [RR-1833] requests details of arrangements made by RiverOak, with a view to ensuring that the Gas Infrastructure is protected during the implementation of the Works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Explain why Southern Gas Networks PLC had not been party to discussions on this in advance of the application being made. ii. State what, if any, negotiation has taken place since the date of the RR from Southern Gas Networks PLC. iii. Set out what specific arrangements have been made by RiverOak, with a view to ensuring that the Gas Infrastructure

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>is protected during the implementation of the Works.</p> <p>NOTE: This question may be answered through the provision of a SoCG as requested through the ExA's Rule 6 letter dated 11 December 2019</p>
CA.1.40	The Applicant	<p>Crown Land</p> <p>Provide a position report on engagement with the affected Crown bodies affected by the request for the acquisition of land and/or rights subsequent to 17 July 2018 including outcomes of that engagement.</p>
CA.1.41	The Applicant	<p>Special Category Land</p> <p>Part 5 of The Book of Reference [APP-007] lists four plots described as being Special Category Land. These are plots 185b, 185c, 185d, 185f. These are described as being 'Open Space' and the Land Plans [APP-016] show 'Acquisition of permanent rights over land' for these plots.</p> <p>The ExA notes that these plots relate to a pipeline running diagonally under these plots.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Justify the extent of this land. ii. Justify the need for the acquisition of permanent rights.
CA.1.42	The Applicant KCC	<p>Special Category Land</p> <p>The ExA is minded to recommend that the circumstances set out in s131(4) or 132(4) related to replacement land; 131(5) or 132(5) relating to area, or</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	TDC Nemo Link Ltd Stone Hill Park Ltd	use and necessity of replacement land; 131(4A) or 132(4A) relating to availability of replacement land and public interest for a speeded procedure; or 131(4B) or 132(4B) relating to acquisition for a temporary purpose do not apply in relation to plots 185b, 185c, 185d, 185f. Show any evidence to the contrary.
CA.1.43	KCC TDC Nemo Link Ltd Stone Hill Park Ltd and All parties	Special Category Land PA2008 s132(3) states that this subsection applies if order land, when burdened with the order right, will be no less advantageous than it was before to the persons in whom it is vested, other persons, if any, entitled to rights of common or other rights, and the public. Set out your reasoned opinion as to whether this subsection is fulfilled in the case of the Special Category Land at plots 185b, 185c, 185d, 185f.
CC.1	Climate Change	
CC.1.1	The Applicant	UK Climate Projections Detailed consideration must be given to the range of potential impacts of climate change using the latest UK Climate Projections available at the time, and to ensuring any Environmental Statement (ES) that is prepared identifies appropriate mitigation or adaptation measures. This should cover the estimated lifetime of the new infrastructure. A new set of UK Climate Projections have become available after the preparation of the ES. The next

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>generation of UK climate projections, UKCP18, was released in November 2018.</p> <p>Provide an assessment of how this next generation of UK climate projections would affect the conclusions of Chapter 16 of the ES [APP-034].</p>
CC.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Climate Change Assessment Chapter 16 of ES [APP-034]</p> <p>Demonstrate that there are no critical features of infrastructure design which may be seriously affected by more radical changes to the climate beyond those projected in the latest set of UK Climate Projections ie UKCP18.</p>
CC.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Climate Change Adaptation Section 16.5 and paragraph 16.6.7 of ES [APP-034]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What is the current status of the Applicant’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy? ii. Point to where in its Masterplan [APP-079] the Climate Change Adaptation Strategy features.
DCO.1	Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	
<p>Annex D to the Rule 6 letter (11 December 2018) provided notice of an Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) on the dDCO which was held on 10 January 2019 (ISH1). A detailed agenda posted on the National Infrastructure Planning website on 21 December 2018 (https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR020002/TR020002-002836-</p>		

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<p>181221%20TR020002%20-%20detailed%20agenda%20for%20ISH1%20on%20dDCO.pdf) set out a schedule of issues and questions for examination at ISH1. The Examination Timetable provides that matters raised orally in response to that schedule are to be submitted in writing by Deadline 1 (18 January 2019). Comments on any matters set out in those submissions are to be provided by Deadline 2 (6 February). Interested Parties who participated in ISH1 and consider that their issues have already been drawn to the ExA's attention do not need to reiterate their issues in responses to the questions below. Interested Parties are requested to review the Deadline 1 written submissions arising from ISH1 before responding to the question below. Matters set out in Deadline 1 written submissions arising from ISH1 are best responded to in Deadline 2 comments rather than in responses to the following questions, which aim to capture matters that were not raised at ISH1.</p>		
DCO.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Associated Development</p> <p>The ExA note that We have noted that the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-007] states, at 2.10, that:</p> <p><i>"... RiverOak has chosen not to differentiate the NSIP and associated development works in Schedule 1 to the Order.</i></p> <p>It has further noted that the <i>NSIP Justification Document</i> [APP-008] does identify a list of works at para. 44 that:</p> <p><i>"... are not part of the NSIP itself can be categorised as supporting the operation of the NSIP or addressing its impacts, and are therefore associated development."</i></p> <p>It has further noted that there is no definition of 'associated development' in the dDCO [APP-006] Schedule 1, Article 2 but "<i>associated development</i>" is referred to in the definition of "<i>authorised development</i>" and in Schedule 1.</p> <p>With reference to the then Department for Communities and Local</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Government Planning Act 2008: Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects published in April 2013, provide a reasoned note on Associated Development which applies your argument and reasoning in this respect to the Works as set out in the dDCO.
DCO.1.2	Kent CC	Article 12(2) – Temporary stopping up and restriction of use of streets Article 12(2) in the draft DCO [APP-006] states that: <i>“...the undertaker may use any street temporarily stopped up or restricted under the powers conferred by this article and which is within the Order limits as a temporary working site...”</i> Is KCC content with this Article?
DCO.1.3	The Applicant	Article 13 – Permanent stopping up of public rights of way Article 13(2) deals with public rights of way and the use of a temporary alternative route before a new PROW is opened. Comment on whether there should there be a commitment secured in the dDCO to setting a period by the end of which any permanent substitute public right of way has to be completed?
DCO.1.4	Kent CC	Requirement 16 – Archaeological remains The ExA notes that the Relevant Representation from Kent County Council

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>[RR- 0975] states that:</p> <p><i>"a DCO requirement should cover the need to preserve the archaeology including through adjustment of development parameters as well as covering the necessary stages of evaluation and investigation. The requirements should also cover extensive investigation of those areas of the airport where archaeology will be affected by development but is not to be preserved in situ. The County Council welcomes the intention to agree a Written Scheme of Investigation for future archaeological investigations."</i></p> <p>Suggest any amendment to Requirement 16 that would satisfy the County Council in these respects.</p> <p>NOTE: Kent CC may choose to answer this question in association with that at HE. 1.25.</p>
DCO.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Landscape - Planting scheme</p> <p>Para 11.1.9 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that:</p> <p><i>"Some fixed areas of planting are proposed, Elsewhere in the 'Northern Grass' area, planting will be introduced as part of the final layout of this area. However, this planting has not been defined within the broad zones to allow for future flexibility in the design."</i></p> <p>Show where final scheme approval is secured in the draft DCO.</p>
DCO.1.6	The Applicant	Radar Tower

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Para 11.3.6 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that one of the parameters for modelling potential visibility is a radar tower at a height of 27m AGL.</p> <p>Show where this height is secured in Schedule 1 of the dDCO [APP-006]</p>
DCO.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Lighting</p> <p>Table 11.11 in in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in ES Volume 2 [APP-034] the sets out details of the lighting scheme for the airport and for the Northern Grass.</p> <p>Show how is the lighting scheme secured in the draft DCO [APP-060]?</p>
DCO.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Public Rights of Way</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.1 of the 'Public Rights of Way Management Strategy' (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073] states that:</p> <p>"KCC requested that PRoW are to be created and funded under a Section 106 Agreement and would be maintained by KCC while remaining part of Manston Airport land. It should be noted however, that the power to undertake any mitigation work required would be established under the powers of the DCO."</p> <p>Indicate where in the draft DCO [APP-006] this power is included.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ec.1	Ecology and Biodiversity (including Habitats Regulations Assessment(HRA))	
Ec.1.1	The Applicant Natural England	<p>Kent Wildlife Trust (KWT) [RR- 0978]</p> <p>KWT believe that the Noise Mitigation Plan [APP-009] does not consider in sufficient detail the impacts of specific flightpaths. KWT would hope to see a further examination on the predicted level of disturbance and pollution that will be caused by the airport proposal at sensitive nearby sites, such as Sandwich and Pegwell Bay.</p> <p>What is the view of the Applicant and Natural England?</p>
Ec.1.2	The Applicant Natural England	<p>KWT [RR-0978]</p> <p>KWT considers that the Environmental Statement [APP-033] needs to demonstrate that the measures to safely disperse birds and other wildlife from the runways without harm need to be further demonstrated, alongside a long-term conservation management plan that can demonstrate how consideration for wildlife can be accommodated alongside the specific requirements for commercial airport land use management.</p> <p>It is the view of KWT that these above matters have still not been adequately considered since the last iteration of statutory consultation, in particular with respect to Sandwich and Pegwell Bay.</p> <p>What is the view of the Applicant and Natural England?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ec.1.3	The Applicant Natural England	<p>KWT [RR-0978]</p> <p>Kent Wildlife Trust have concerns over the methodology and detail of some of the species surveys undertaken:</p> <p>Section 41 species:</p> <p>S41 species are the species found in England which were identified as requiring action under the UK BAP and which continue to be regarded as conservation priorities under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework.</p> <p>The S41 list is used to guide decision-makers such as public bodies, including local and regional authorities, in implementing their duty under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in England, when carrying out their normal functions.</p> <p>KWT are concerned about the potential impact upon the Kent priority species brown hare. KWT would have expected to see further survey and detailed proposals to mitigate for this species.</p> <p>What is the view of the Applicant and Natural England?</p> <p>Invertebrate Survey:</p> <p>KWT believe the timing and survey effort for the invertebrate survey is sub-optimal. Considering that the survey was made late in the season and under poor conditions for bees and wasps, and that few of the group, in terms of either species or individuals, were encountered, the number of scarce</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>aculeates with restricted distribution is impressive and suggests that this group will prove of substantial interest.</p> <p>What is the view of the Applicant and Natural England?</p>
Ec.1.4	The Applicant	<p>KWT Biodiversity opportunity [RR-0978]</p> <p>Kent Wildlife Trust would hope to see more detailed proposals that would demonstrate good quality enhancement opportunities for biodiversity. Although this site is just outside the Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA), any habitat creation should give consideration to its position on the chalk plateau and a locally-appropriate species planting list for any green spaces within the site itself.</p> <p>KWT are concerned that the mitigation and enhancement package does not reflect in both scale and detail what KWT would expect in order to mitigate for the impacts associated with this application and the level of survey effort thus far is not appropriate to inform such a plan.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view?</p>
Ec.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Habitat Creation and Management Plan [APP-044 and 045]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="972 1139 2074 1241">i. Confirm whether the proposed biodiversity area provides like-for-like compensatory habitat or is intended to deliver net gain, including evidence of any calculations undertaken. <li data-bbox="972 1262 2092 1327">ii. Explain how the timing of implementation of habitat creation is secured through the dDCO [APP-006] or provide suitable

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>wording of Requirement 8 to secure this.</p> <p>iii. Section 5 of the Habitat Creation and Management Plan incorrectly states that the end date for woodland/hedgerow mitigation planting is 2010. Confirm the correct end date.</p> <p>iv. Section 2.6 of the Habitat Creation and Management Plan states that a Countryside Stewardship arrangement will be sought for the biodiversity area. What reliance can be placed on such an agreement and what measures would the Applicant take in the event that funding via Countryside Stewardship arrangements is not available?</p>
Ec.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Natural England (NE) [RR-1408] Bird disturbance Golden plover (SPA feature):</p> <p>NE's biggest concern is the potential for long term operational disturbance from aircraft flights. NE have confirmed previously with the Applicant that beyond distances of 500m in altitude and 1km ground-level lateral distance, golden plover are unlikely to be disturbed by the visual presence of flying aircraft.</p> <p>NE do not agree with the application of a noise threshold of 70dB L_{Amax}, below which it can be assumed that no significant disturbance effects will occur. NE [RR-1408] cite Cutts et al. (2009)² who indicate that moderate to</p>

² Cutts, N., Phelps, A. & Burdon, D. 2009. Construction and Waterfowl: Defining sensitivity, response, impacts and guidance. Report to Humber INCA. Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, University of Hull

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>high disturbance (birds moving away) occurs above 70 dBA and it is therefore evident that birds are likely to begin reacting (heads-up, alarm calls etc.) to noise levels significantly below this. Even relatively low noise levels might still generate moderate behavioural responses in birds (e.g. increased vigilance) which can be significant under certain circumstances (e.g. freezing weather conditions when reduced foraging efficiency can reduce survival). NE advise that care should be taken when drawing conclusions based on other airports and other SPAs as NE's experience has been that impacts are likely to be site and population specific.</p> <p>NE do not agree with the Applicant's argument that golden plover in the vicinity of the Project Site are more likely to be habituated to sudden, high noise levels as a result of various agricultural activities (ES Paragraph 7.8.58 and 7.8.67 [APP-033]) as no evidence is provided as to how the local golden plover population reacts to these. Until this matter has been addressed to NE's satisfaction NE believe that a conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA for this species is premature.</p> <p>Turnstone (SPA / Ramsar / SSSI feature):</p> <p>NE concerns with regards to the noise modelling to date are the same as for golden plover and until this matter has been addressed to NE's satisfaction NE believe that a conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA / Ramsar for this species is premature.</p> <p>Little tern (SPA / SSSI feature):</p> <p>NE concerns with regards to the noise modelling to date are the same as for</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>golden plover and until this matter has been addressed to NE's satisfaction NE believe that a conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA for this species is premature.</p> <p>Other waders (SSSI features):</p> <p>NE would expect to see the ES [APP-033] consider the potential for operational disturbance from aircraft flights as has been done for the SPA / Ramsar species.</p> <p>What is the view of the Applicant on these four items?</p> <p>NE have requested the following additional information to be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise contour maps: Noise contours (LAeq and LAm_{ax}) for the most important frequencies (2-8kHz in most situations) should be superimposed on the area of concern (e.g. designated site boundaries) using intervals of about 5dB. These should be mapped down to 55dB LAm_{ax}. • Confirmation of the types of bird scaring methods to be used at Manston, and if they are similar and applicable to use in the Applicant's HRA, to those used at London Ashford Airport (Lydd) (As per Appendix 7.1, Appendix C, Table C.2 [APP-044]). • An assessment of operational noise, vibration and visual disturbance impacts on the following SSSI interest features: grey plover (<i>plurialis squaterola</i>), sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) and ringed plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>).

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ec.1.7	The Applicant Environment Agency (EA)	<p>Can the Applicant provide these three items?</p> <p>NE [RR-1408] Surface water discharge</p> <p>The ES contains details of an outline drainage strategy (DS)[APP-033 and APP-045-048]. The intention at the operational stage is for all surface water to be treated on site and then discharged via an existing outfall into Pegwell Bay.</p> <p>Based on Figure 1.1 [APP-036] it is clear that the outfall lies within the boundary of a number of designated nature conservation sites. However, the Biodiversity chapter 7 [AP-033] is unclear exactly which designated sites and relevant interest features have the potential to be affected by the surface water outfall. References to 'the Pegwell Bay designated sites' are not sufficient.</p> <p>It is clear that the detailed design of the drainage strategy is not intended to come until after DCO consent at which point the Applicant 'may' need to apply for a new discharge permit from the Environment Agency (EA) (ES , Para 3.3.74 [APP-033]).</p> <p>However, Table 7.7 [APP-033] states on the same issue that 'Discharge from these ponds will be via a permitted discharge to Pegwell Bay.'</p> <p>Table 8.6 [APP-033] summarises the Applicant's discussions to date with the EA. The most recent position appears to be that as the discharge to the Pegwell Bay outfall would be of surface water it would not normally require a permit. Given that the DS is an outline, that there is apparent ambiguity over whether the surface water discharge during operation will be controlled</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>by a permit and the current lack of clarity over the designated site interest features which could potentially be affected, Natural England considers it premature at this stage for the Applicant to conclude that there will be no significant impacts on internationally or nationally designated sites as a result of the surface water discharge.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="972 612 1794 644">i. What is the view of the Applicant and the EA? <li data-bbox="972 663 2040 903">ii. Provide the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1070 716 2040 820">• A clear list of the designated sites and relevant interest features which have the potential to be affected by the surface water outfall; and <li data-bbox="1070 839 2018 903">• A description of the type of habitat that surrounds the outfall. <li data-bbox="972 927 2092 1031">iii. Confirm the likely nature, method and extent of works required to repair the damaged scour protection at the Pegwell Bay Outfall (ES Appendix 7.8 photographs in Appendix F)
Ec.1.8	Natural England	<p>ECJ Rulings on Mitigation in HRA Screening</p> <p>In April 2018, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) issued a decision in the case of <i>People Over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta (C-323/17)</i>. The ruling confirmed that proposed mitigation measures cannot be taken into account for the purposes of screening under the UK Habitats Regulations, which give effect to the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) [APP-044].</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Does Natural England (NE) have a view on the significance of these rulings for the Applicant's Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment [APP-044]?
Ec.1.9	Natural England	<p>Designated sites</p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-080] states at paragraph 2.18: <i>"There are no statutory environmental designations that apply within the DCO application site. However, the outfall corridor goes through/under the Sandwich Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and its constituent Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (Sandwich Bay to Hacklinge Marshes). The outfall discharges into the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site."</i></p> <p>Does Natural England concur with the above statement?</p>
Ec.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Scoping Opinion Appendix 1.2 of ES [APP-043]</p> <p>Paragraph 7.3.13 of the ES [APP-033] states: <i>"...Inspectorate (PINS) who provided a Scoping Opinion (Appendix 1.2) which although no longer formally associated with this application is still relevant."</i></p> <p>The ExA notes the contents of paragraphs 1.5.6-1.5.8 of the ES [APP-033].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Explain the above statement in paragraph 7.3.13. ii. Confirm what you regard as the "adopted" Scoping Opinion for

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		the EIA supporting this Application.
Ec.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Significance levels Point to where significance criteria are defined in Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-033]?</p>
Ec.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Golden Plover Figure 4.4 of the Ecological desk study [APP-045] appears to show 402 Golden Plover roosting within the order limits whereas paragraph 4.2.2.11 of the Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment states that they are in a field adjacent to the south east. Provide clarification regarding the location of the Golden Plover, and a revised Figure 4.4, with the peak counts clearly shown.</p>
Ec.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment [APP-044] The Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) section 4.5.3 discusses the potential impacts of mean annual NOx levels on Sandwich Bay SAC focussing on receptors E21-E24. In year 2 the assessment states that only E22 requires further assessment. This is inconsistent with the data presented in Appendix 6.5 for receptors E21-E24. The text also does not explain that receptor E24 exceeds the critical level for NOx and the 1% Environment Agency screening threshold for further assessment in all years. Provide further clarification regarding the conclusions of no adverse effects on integrity of Sandwich Bay SAC arising from mean annual</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		NOx emissions for all relevant receptors as set out in section 4.5.3 of the RIAA.
Ec.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Thanet Parkway Station</p> <p>Thanet Parkway Station is excluded from the in-combination assessment presented in the Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment [APP-044] and from discussion regarding the effectiveness of mitigation in the proposed area for habitat creation to the south of the airport.</p> <p>Provide commentary regarding the implications of this project for the conclusions in the RIAA and the biodiversity chapter should the parkway station be consented?</p>
E.1	Other environmental	
E.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Public Health England (PHE) Health Impact Assessment (HIA) [RR-1608]</p> <p>The HIA (Chapter 15 of ES [APP-034] has undertaken a community engagement and consultation with the local public health and health care system. It identifies a series of recommendations that should be agreed with the local Director of Public Health (DPH) and incorporated into the development plans.</p> <p>Explain what effort has been made to address the concerns of consultation bodies including Public Health England regarding the</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>necessary engagement required to establish the baseline for assessment of effects to public health (including related systems) and how this might affect the findings of this assessment?</p> <p>Does the Applicant propose to have an ongoing assessment in conjunction with input from the local DPH / Care Commissioning Group (CCG) and through local community consultation?</p>
E.1.2	The Applicant	<p>The “worst case”</p> <p>At paragraph 1.57 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] it states: <i>“Where details will not be known until the detailed design stages of the development process, for example the exact location of buildings that will be demand-led, the ES sets out the relevant design parameters used for the assessment and explains, with reference to the parameters, what the maximum extent of the proposed development may be (the ‘worst case’), and assesses the potential adverse effects which the project could have, to ensure that the impacts of the project as it may be constructed have been properly assessed. Other details such as the length and width of the runway and taxiways are ‘fixed’ for the purposes of the DCO.”</i></p> <p>Tables 3.7 (freight) and 3.8 (passenger) of the ES [APP-033] describe ATMs up to year 20. Is this the “worst case” in terms of ATMs/Year, that has been assessed in the EIA?</p>
E.1.3	The Applicant	Passenger Air Traffic Movements

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Planning Statement [APP-080] states at paragraph 3.31: <i>"The initial terminal will provide airside/landside access and will be served by three refurbished Code C aircraft stands. A later expansion of the building and addition of a fourth passenger stand will accommodate the demands of the passenger forecast."</i></p> <p>The dDCO [APP-006] states in Schedule 1: "Work No.10 — <i>The construction and rehabilitation of pavements for the creation of 3 Code C aircraft parking stands and associated pavement and infrastructure.</i></p> <p>Work No.11 — <i>The construction and rehabilitation of pavements for the creation of 4 Code C aircraft parking stands and associated pavement and infrastructure."</i></p> <p>The Planning Statement refers to four Code C aircraft stands. Schedule 1 of the DCO in Works 10 and 11 refers to seven³ Code C aircraft stands.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. How many Code C aircraft stands has the EIA assessed? ii. Did the Code C aircraft stands form part of the "worst case" scenario assessed in the EIA?
E.1.4	The Applicant	Waste

³ It is assumed that three of these are "recycling hangars" as per Table 3.3 of [APP-080]

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Can the Applicant provide an estimate of operational waste generated by the proposed airport and provide commentary on the impact of such waste on local landfill capacity?
E.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Assessment of Strategic Site Alternatives NTS [APP-032]:</p> <p>Paragraph 2.1.13 of the NTS [APP-032] states:</p> <p><i>"A range of alternative strategic sites were considered, these being airfields in the south-east and London's six main airports: Stansted; Heathrow; Gatwick; Luton; London City; and Southend. However, each of the above has major shortfalls in terms of successfully supporting an increased freight and passenger capacity (Table 2.1)."</i></p> <p>Can the Applicant provide the detailed assessment of strategic sites that supports Table 2.1[APP-032] and Table 2.1 of the ES [APP-033] over and above that provided in paragraphs 2.3.5 to 2.3.27 of the ES [APP-033]?</p>
E.1.6	The Applicant	<p>PHE</p> <p>In its RR [RR-1608] PHE point to the omission of a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) from the application. PHE believe that a DEMP can also feed into the planning and design process, ensuring that a site is constructed and managed in such a way as to simplify or expedite decommissioning when the time comes. PHE would recommend that decommissioning, demolition and contamination issues are fully considered in the design and construction stages of the project to minimise</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>future risks to the environment and public health at such time as the site ceases to operate or faces further major development.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view?</p>
E.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Planning Statement [APP-080] and dDCO [APP-006]</p> <p>The Planning Statement at paragraphs 1.35-1.36 states:</p> <p><i>"The Proposed Development is to reconstruct the airport with 19 cargo stands (and some passenger stands, which will not handle cargo aircraft), the construction of which will involve development in planning terms. Using the figure of six arriving and departing aircraft per stand per day (i.e. between 0700 and 2300 – as only limited night flights are contemplated), one arrives at a theoretical maximum capability figure of (19x12x365=) 83,220 movements per year, and therefore the capability of the airport will be at that level, noting that this is theoretical capability rather than predicted operation.</i></p> <p><i>The increase in capability is therefore 83,220 movements per year of cargo aircraft, more than eight times the required threshold, assuming the existing capability is zero, as demonstrated above."</i></p> <p>Schedule 1 of the DCO states:</p> <p>"Work No.9 – <i>The construction and rehabilitation of pavements for the creation of 19 Code E aircraft parking stands and associated pavement and infrastructure."</i></p> <p>Has what is being applied for in the DCO ie 83,220 movements, been</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
E.1.8	Natural England (NE) KCC Environment Agency (EA) Heritage England (HE)	<p>assessed in the EIA [APP-033-036]?</p> <p>Incomplete surveys Paragraph 5.4.17 of the ES [APP-033] states: <i>"Although complete surveys have presently not been possible, sufficient information exists whereby the following has been applied. Where survey information is absent, a realistic worst-case approach has been adopted to what might be found had all the surveys been carried out, based on desktop surveys, analysis and site surveys undertaken. This is coupled with a commitment to carry out further surveys once access to land has been obtained, whether through voluntary agreement or compulsory access following the making of the application, or should the DCO be granted, access once ownership of the land has been obtained."</i></p> <p>What limitations and uncertainty do NE, EA, KCC and HE believe these incomplete surveys introduce into the EIA?</p>
E.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 15 Health and Wellbeing [APP-034]</p> <p>i. With reference to relevant definitions can the Applicant explain how sensitivity and magnitude of impacts are defined in the context of this Chapter and confirm the extent to which they have been used to inform the assessment of significance and the need for further mitigation?</p> <p>ii. Point to where the significance criteria:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negligible; • Minor; • Moderate; and • Major <p>are defined.</p>
E.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 15 Health and Wellbeing [APP-034]</p> <p>Paragraph 15.8.5 states:</p> <p><i>"The evidence suggests that the relative change in noise also has the potential to contribute towards approximately one annual incident case of disease or mortality from ischaemic heart disease or stroke at Year 2 levels, rising to around two to four cases at Year 20 levels. This corresponds to a 2.8% to 4.3% change in background incidence."</i></p> <p>The ExA appreciates that this does not imply that all cases would be mortality.</p> <p>In the Applicant's professional opinion how many cases will end in mortality in Year 20?</p>
E.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 15 Health and Wellbeing [APP-034] and Cumulative Effects [APP-058]</p> <p>i. Point to where in the EIA, cumulative health effects are</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>explicitly assessed?</p> <p>ii. Confirm whether an assessment of the cumulative impacts from noise on proposed and future receptors has been undertaken, and point the ExA to where this is located within the application documents?</p>
E.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 15 Health and Wellbeing [APP-034]</p> <p>Point to proposed health mitigation in the EIA, which seeks to maximise the health benefits of the Proposed Development and mitigate any negative health impacts.</p>
E.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 15 Health and Wellbeing [APP-034]</p> <p>Explain what effort has been made to address the concerns of consultation bodies including PHE regarding the necessary engagement required to establish the baseline for assessment of effects to public health (including related systems) and how this might affect the findings of this assessment.</p>
E.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 15 Health and Wellbeing [APP-034]</p> <p>Confirm that those actions noted at “<i>further recommended actions</i>” in section 7 of Appendix 15.1, represent mitigation measures that will be brought forward as part of the Proposed Development, and whether they have been relied upon as part of the health and wellbeing assessment.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
E.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 15 Health and Wellbeing [APP-034] Explain the extent to which mitigation measures relied upon within the ES are secured in the DCO.</p>
E.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 15 Health and Wellbeing [APP-034] The ES presents a moderate adverse effect to human health associated with exposure to operational noise. The ES does not explain the extent to which options available to mitigate such effects have been explored. Explain the extent to which additional options to minimise such effects have been considered and the reasons why any such option has not been taken forward.</p>
E.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects In Chapter 18 of the ES [APP-035] eight different types of effect are mentioned but not all are defined:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cumulative effect 2. In-combination effect 3. Inter project effect 4. Inter related effect 5. Interactive effect

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		6. Combined effect 7. Inter relationship effect and 8. Individual effect Define what they mean by these eight different effects.
E.1.18	TDC	Shortlist of projects for cumulative assessment Does TDC agree with the shortlist of projects considered in the cumulative effects assessment [APP-035]? If not please specify which other development TDC considers has the potential to give rise to significant cumulative effects that should be considered.
E.1.19	The Applicant	Table 18.7 2nd row [APP-035] Significant daytime inter-related noise and visual effects are anticipated in relation to visitor arrival and departure at the museums on site and any outdoor exhibits during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. What mitigation is proposed for visitors to the museums?
E.1.20	The Applicant	Table 18.7 final row [APP-035] The community of Manston, particularly in the area of Preston Road, Manston; in northern section of High Street, Manston; in southern section of High Street; Manston; Jubilee Cottages on Manston Road; PRowS TR8, TR9,

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>TR10 and TR22; Manston Court Caravan Site and Preston Parks are assessed to have significant daytime inter-related noise and visual effects during the operational phase of the Proposed Development, in both shared open spaces and indoor spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What mitigation is proposed to mitigate noise and visual effects in shared open spaces? ii. What mitigation is proposed for the interior spaces of the caravans at Manston Court Caravan Site?
E.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Location</p> <p>A number of the application documents (for example, the Statement of Reasons [APP-006, 6.6]) describe the location of the Proposed Development as such:</p> <p><i>"The town of Margate lies approximately 5km to the north of the site and Ramsgate is approximately 4km to the east. Sandwich Bay is located approximately 4-5km to the south east."</i></p> <p>The RR from Jane Roberts [RR-0743] states that houses start at just 1.3km from the runway.</p> <p>Clarify the distance in relation to the nearest built up areas in terms of distance from the edge of the runway.</p>
F.1	Funding and resources	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
F.1.1	The Applicant	<p>The Undertaker and availability of funds</p> <p>The Applicant’s attention is drawn, in particular, to the Relevant Representations from Jane Lee-Hopkinson [RR-0742], Gary Lewis [RR-0580].</p> <p>The ExA invites the Applicant to comment on the statements contained in there RRs.</p> <p>NOTE: In responding to this question, the Applicant should note that some of the content of these RRs has been redacted and should take this into account in responding.</p>
F.1.2	The Applicant	<p>The Undertaker and availability of funds</p> <p>Provide full details, including audited accounts, for any companies, bodies or undertaking wholly or partly owned by RiverOak Strategic Partners Limited.</p>
F.1.3	The Applicant	<p>The Undertaker and availability of funds</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP- 013] states in paragraph 19 that:</p> <p><i>“Through its joint venture agreement, RiverOak is able to draw down these two categories of funding (£7.5m land acquisition and £5.6m noise mitigation measures) when required.”</i></p> <p>Provide a copy of the joint venture agreement showing who is party to the agreement.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
F.1.4	The Applicant	<p>The Undertaker and availability of funds</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP- 013] states in paragraph 23 that:</p> <p><i>"To meet the capital costs of construction, RiverOak will select one or more funders from amongst those who have already expressed interest and others that are likely to come forward, to secure the best deal for constructing and operating the project."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Name those funders who have expressed interest and show audited proof of assets; and/or ii. Provide other evidence to demonstrate that there is a reasonable prospect of the requisite funds for constructing and operating the project becoming available.
F.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Resource Implications – Implementation of the project</p> <p>The Applicant is reminded that that DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (DCLG (2013) Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land, April) states that:</p> <p><i>"Any application for a consent order authorising compulsory acquisition must be accompanied by a statement explaining how it will be funded. This statement should provide as much information as possible about the resource implications of ... implementing the project for which the land is required."</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Provide a copy of any business case and/or plan which forms any part of the basis for estimating the net cost of implementing the project.</p>
F.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Resource Implications – Implementation of the project</p> <p>The Applicant is reminded that that <i>DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i> (DCLG (2013) Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land, April) states that:</p> <p><i>“Any application for a consent order authorising compulsory acquisition must be accompanied by a statement explaining how it will be funded. This statement should provide as much information as possible about the resource implications of ... implementing the project for which the land is required.”</i></p> <p>Resource Implications – Implementation of the project</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP- 013] states in paragraph 15 that:</p> <p><i>“RiverOak has taken expert advice from RPS on the cost estimate for the project that is the subject of the application. The initial phase of the project, which will bring the airport back into use, is estimated to cost about £100 million. The cost of developing the remaining phases of the project over a 15-year period is estimated to be an additional £200 million, i.e. a total of £300 million.”</i></p> <p>i. Show where in the application documentation the detailed</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>costings used to arrive at this figure are to be found; or</p> <p>ii. Set out the assumptions and broad estimates of the costs of the different elements of the proposed scheme that underlie this estimate of £300 million.</p>
F.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Resource Implications – Implementation of the project</p> <p><i>Paragraph 11 of the Funding Statement [APP-013] states that:</i></p> <p><i>"RiverOak anticipates that it will raise further equity and debt finance following the making of the DCO in order to develop the authorised development to completion."</i></p> <p>The ExA notes the use of the word "anticipates".</p> <p>i. Provide evidence of your ability to raise further equity and debt finance following the making of the DCO in order to develop the authorised development to completion; and</p> <p>ii. Provide an evidenced estimation of the probability of doing so.</p>
F.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Resource Implications – Acquiring the land</p> <p>The Applicant is reminded that that DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013) states that:</p> <p><i>"Any application for a consent order authorising compulsory acquisition must be accompanied by a statement explaining how it will be funded. This statement should provide as much information as possible about the</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>resource implications of ... acquiring the land ..."</i></p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP- 013] states in paragraph 16 that:</p> <p><i>"...RiverOak has obtained advice from surveyors CBRE that the total cost of acquiring the necessary land for the project at its value in the 'no-scheme world', the basis upon which compensation for compulsory acquisition is calculated, as no more than £7.5 million."</i></p> <p>The ExA notes that Article 9 - Guarantees in respect of payment of compensation, etc in the dDCO [APP-006] proposes guarantees in respect to this sum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Show where in the application documentation the detailed costings used to arrive at this figure are to be found; or ii. Set out the assumptions and estimates of the costs of the different elements that underlie this estimate of £7.5 million.
F.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Resource Implications – Noise Mitigation Plan</p> <p>Paragraph 18 in the Funding Statement [APP- 013] shows costs in relation to the Noise Mitigation Plan that:</p> <p><i>"Implementation of insulation policy and Part I claims: £4m (up to 1000 properties at £4000 each); and</i></p> <p><i>Implementation of relocation policy: £1.6m (up to eight properties)."</i></p> <p>The ExA notes that this totals £5.6m.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Show where in the application documentation the detailed costings used to arrive at these figure are to be found; or ii. Provide details of the costings of elements of the estimates underlying the costing of £5,600,000. iii. Show where the availability of this sum is subject to any form of guarantee in the dDCO [APP-006].
F.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Resource Implications - blight</p> <p>The Applicant is reminded that DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013) advises at paragraph 18 that the resource implications of a possible acquisition resulting from a blight notice have been taken account of.</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP- 013] states in paragraph 20 that:</p> <p><i>“In some circumstances, landowners can make blight claims once the application has been made but before it is decided. Statutory blight is triggered once an application for a DCO has been made, pursuant to paragraph 24(c) of Schedule 13 to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The three categories of land to which this applies are small businesses, owner-occupiers and agricultural units. CBRE advise that there is no land subject to compulsory acquisition under this application in any of these categories. Nevertheless, RiverOak is has set aside funding for potential blight claims out of an abundance of caution and have drawn down £500,000 from their investors at the time of making the application in case any claims</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>are successfully made."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Show where in the application documentation the detailed costings used to arrive at this figure are to be found; or ii. Provide details of the costings of elements of the estimates underlying the figure of £500,000. iii. Show audited evidence that RiverOak has assets of at least £500,000. iv. Provide full details, including current audited accounts, of the investors cited in this paragraph. v. Show where the availability of this sum is subject to any form of guarantee in the dDCO [APP-006].
F.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Potential shortfalls</p> <p>The Applicant is reminded that DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013) advises at paragraph 17 that the Applicant should provide an indication of how any potential shortfalls are intended to be met.</p> <p>Figures in the Funding Statement [APP- 013] show the estimated capital cost of the scheme as being £300m. Figures in the Funding Statement show the estimated potential combined cost of compulsory acquisition, the Noise Mitigation Plan and blight to be £13.6m.</p> <p>A letter from PWC AG appended to the funding statement refer to assets of</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>£15m.</p> <p>Show how the shortfalls in funding are intended to be met and by whom.</p>
F.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Timing of availability of funds</p> <p>The Applicant is reminded that DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013) advises at paragraph 18 that applicants should be able to demonstrate that adequate funding is likely to be available to enable the compulsory acquisition within the statutory period following the order being made.</p> <p>Demonstrate that adequate funding is likely to be available to enable the compulsory acquisition within the statutory period following the order being made.</p>
F.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Guarantee</p> <p>The ExA notes that Article 9 - Guarantees in respect of payment of compensation, etc in the dDCO [APP-006] proposes guarantees in respect to £7.5m.</p> <p>Figures in the Funding Statement [APP- 013] show the estimated potential combined cost of compulsory acquisition, the Noise Mitigation Plan and blight to be £13.6m</p> <p>Justify the figure of £7.5m in Article 9 of the dDCO [APP-006].</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
F.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Guarantee</p> <p>The ExA notes that Article 9 - Guarantees in respect of payment of compensation, etc in the dDCO [APP-006] proposes guarantees in respect to £7.5m.</p> <p>Demonstrate how Article 9 of the dDCO [APP-006] provides sufficient security for individuals in consideration of the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.</p>
F.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Cost efficiency and sustainability</p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-080] states in paragraph 6.47 , with reference to the Airports NPS, that:</p> <p><i>"Paragraph 4.39 states that the applicant should demonstrate in its application that its scheme is cost efficient and sustainable, and seeks to minimise costs to airlines, passengers and freight owners over its lifetime. Whilst this is relevant primarily to the Heathrow Northwest Runway, RiverOak have set out the relevant details applicable to their scheme in the Funding Statement provided with the DCO."</i></p> <p>Show where and in what ways the Funding Statement [APP- 013] demonstrate the proposed scheme is cost efficient and sustainable, and seeks to minimise costs to airlines, passengers and freight owners over its lifetime.</p>
F.1.16	The Applicant	The Airports NPS (new runway capacity and infrastructure at airports in the

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>South East of England, June 2018) refers in paragraph 4.37 to the fact that the CAA has granted an economic licence to the operator of Heathrow Airport to levy airport charges. This licence sets a maximum yield per passenger that can be recovered by the operator of Heathrow Airport through airport charges.</p> <p>Are you applying for, or expect to be granted, a similar economic licence?</p>
F.1.17	The Applicant	<p>The ExA has noted the advice contained in paragraph 4.40 of the 2018 Airports NPS that:</p> <p><i>“Detailed scrutiny of any business plan put forward by the licence holder will fall under the CAA’s regulatory process under the Civil Aviation Act 2012, and the detailed matters considered under that process are not expected to be scrutinised in the same way during the examination and determination of an application for development consent.”</i></p> <p>This paragraph goes on to state that:</p> <p><i>“The applicant is expected to provide the CAA with the information it needs to enable it to assist the Examining Authority in considering whether any impediments to the applicant’s development proposals, insofar as they relate to the CAA’s economic regulatory and other functions, are capable of being properly managed.”</i></p> <p>Provide a list of the information provided to the CAA in this respect.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
F.1.18	The Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons [APP-012] contains a number of references (eg at paragraphs 5.9.1, 5.9.2, 5.9.6, 5.9.7, 5.9.9) to provisions under which parties may be entitled to compensation.</p> <p>Show where provision has been made for this in the calculation of the costs of the project.</p>
HE.1	Historic Environment	
HE.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>Table 9.1 of the ES, Volume 1, Chapter 9 [APP-033] states that the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) is addressed within the ES by "<i>there are no listed buildings on the site</i>". However, the Act covers listed buildings and their settings. The Secretary of State is required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building.</p> <p>Do you have any further comments on this matter?</p>
HE.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Conservation Areas</p> <p>Table 9.15 in Chapter 9 of Volume 1 of the ES [APP-033] states that the magnitude of change to the conservation areas of Acol and Minster resulting from the proposal would both be 'negligible'.</p> <p>i. With reference to paragraphs 5.198-5.205 of the 2018 Airports NPS, do you consider that such effect would result in less than</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets?</p> <p>ii. If so, could you direct the ExA to a summary of the public benefits of the scheme in your view?</p>
HE.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Conservation Areas</p> <p>Figure 9.5 of the ES [APP-040] shows that the St Nicolas at Wade Conservation Area would be located on the approaches flight path to the west of the airport.</p> <p>What effect, if any, would this have in your view on the character and appearance of this conservation area?</p>
HE.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Conservation Areas</p> <p>Paragraph 9.6.18 of the ES, Volume 1, Chapter 9 [APP-033] identifies Ramsgate Conservation Area as potentially subject to significant adverse indirect effects. However, Table 9.15: Assessment of effects arising through change to setting of designated heritage assets, does not include an assessment for Ramsgate Conservation Area.</p> <p>Detail the effects that you consider the proposed scheme would have on the character and appearance of the Ramsgate conservation area.</p>
HE1.5	The Applicant Historic England	<p>Heritage Action Zone</p> <p>The Heritage Action Zone in Ramsgate looks to achieve economic growth by using the historic environment as a catalyst.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		What effect, if any do, you consider the scheme would have on aims of the Heritage Action Zone?
HE.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Scheduled Monuments</p> <p>For the two identified scheduled monuments (SM) near to the site, Table 9.15, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] states that effects of the scheme on the SMs would be negligible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. With reference to paragraphs 5.198-5.205 of the 2018 Airports NPS, do you consider that such effect would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the SMs? ii. If so, could you direct the ExA to a summary of the public benefits of the scheme in your view?
HE.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 5.198 of the 2018 Airports NPS how would you describe the significance of Chapel House?</p>
HE.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>Table 9.15, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] assessment of effect for Chapel House states that <i>"noise at the projected level may become intrusive at particularly quiet periods, but sustained noise exposure would not be of a sufficient magnitude to give rise to a qualitative change to the perception of the asset as a rural farmhouse."</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		i. Do you consider that such exposure would affect the significance of the listed building? ii. If so, what would be the level of harm caused?
HE.1.9	The Applicant	Listed Buildings Table 9.15, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] description of significance and contribution of setting for Cleve Court states that the listed building has a generally rural setting but is adjacent to a modern farmyard which is in active agricultural use. Would such a use not be expected within a rural setting?
HE.1.10	The Applicant	Listed Buildings Table 9.15, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] states that the grounds of Cleve Court and Cleve Lodge would fall within the 60db L _{Aeq} noise contour. i. What effect would this have on any features of special architectural or historic interest which this Grade II* listed building possesses? ii. Would the setting of the listed building be affected? iii. If so, what would be the level of harm caused?
HE.1.11	The Applicant	Listed Buildings

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Table 9.15, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] states that Cleve Court and Cleve Lodge may qualify for the Dwelling Noise Insulation Scheme (DNIS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Do you consider that such a scheme could be utilised for a listed building where alterations are tightly controlled? ii. If not, what are the alternatives to noise insulation for such a property to mitigate harm from noise?
HE.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>Table 9.15, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] describes Way House and Wayborough House as rural houses with the relatively quiet setting of the houses contributing to their significance. The assessment of effects states that noise at the projected level may become intrusive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How would this affect the setting and the significance of the heritage asset? ii. What level of harm, if any, would such an effect cause?
HE.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>Table 9.15, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] states that Way House and Wayborough House may qualify for the Dwelling Noise Insulation Scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Do you consider that such a scheme could be utilised for a

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>listed building where alterations are tightly controlled?</p> <p>ii. If not, what are the alternatives to noise insulation for such a property to mitigate harm from noise?</p>
HE.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>Table 9.16, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] summarises significant adverse effects on Way House, Wayborough House, Cleve Court and Cleve Lodge that would be caused by operational noise from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>With reference to The Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 and paragraphs 5.198-5.205 of the NPS, do you consider such harm to be justified?</p>
HE.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>Table 9.15, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] states that Minster Abbey would experience a slight but discernible change to its setting as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>Would this equate to less than substantial harm under paragraph 5.205 of the 2018 Airports NPS?</p>
HE.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>RR-1342 states "<i>Plains of Waterloo is a road of Georgian houses of architectural merit, it bisects Wellington Crescent – an important Georgian</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>crescent comparable in architectural importance to the Royal Crescent in Bath. It is my belief that the high volume of flights proposed for the re-opening of Manston Airport will have a deleterious effect upon the structures in this area".</i></p> <p>What impacts do you consider the Proposed Development would have on the listed buildings sited on the Plains of Waterloo and Wellington Crescent in Ramsgate?</p>
HE.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>RR-0890 and RR-0794 raise the issue of sound proofing listed buildings, considering that listed buildings would not be able to be double glazed or secondary glazed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How do you consider that the Dwelling Noise Insulation Scheme would deal with potential required sound insulation improvements to other listed buildings? ii. If not, what are the alternatives to noise insulation for such properties to mitigate harm from noise?
HE.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Listed Buildings</p> <p>RR-1095, RR-0881 and RR-0995 all raise concerns over possible impacts on the structure of listed buildings caused by vibration from passing cargo planes.</p> <p>What impact do you consider that flights would have on listed</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		buildings in terms of disturbance and vibration?
HE.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Non-designated assets within the airport</p> <p>Paragraph 9.97, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] states that in the worst case scenario high significance receptors would be subject to a high magnitude of adverse change, resulting in a significant adverse effect that cannot be mitigated to non-significant.</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 5.192 of the 2018 Airports NPS, what weight do you consider the ExA should give to the scale of any potential loss of significance to such non-designated assets?</p>
HE.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Non-designated assets within the airport</p> <p>Historic England [RR-0676] is of the view that the scheme will cause considerable harm to the heritage significance of unlisted historic buildings within the airfield as a result of their demolition or changes to their setting, and consider that further investigation and assessment is required to ascertain their importance and condition, and subsequently whether it is desirable and feasible to preserve them and their settings.</p> <p>What is your view on this and what significance do you consider such assets contain?</p>
HE.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Non-designated assets within the airport</p> <p>KCC [RR-0975] recognises the limitations that access to the site has caused in terms of surveying heritage assets, but consider that it is not clear which</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>structures may be demolished, what will be unavoidably affected by the Proposed Development, and what may be retained. Reference is made to a table in Appendix 9.1 [APP-051 and APP-052] listing the features in the airfield and to the construction description which does not detail what may be demolished.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide more clarity?</p>
HE.1.22	Historic England TDC	<p>Non-designated assets within the airport</p> <p>Paragraph 5.192 of the NPS states that the Secretary of State will consider the impacts on non-designated heritage assets on the basis of clear evidence that the assets have a significance that merits consideration in that decision.</p> <p>What clear evidence is there that the non-designated heritage assets within the airfield have a significance that merits consideration in the decision?</p>
HE.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Archaeological features</p> <p>The ExA notes that the worst case scenario has been assumed (Paragraph 9.1.6, Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033]) for archaeology within the northern grass area, and that consequently it is assumed that highly significant archaeological remains are present in this area which may be harmed by intrusive groundworks.</p> <p>Are you of the view that requirements would be sufficient to mitigate this risk given the possible existence of a ring ditch?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HE.1.24	The Applicant	<p>KCC [RR-0975]</p> <p>Paragraph 9.3.8 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-033] states that the evaluation results have been used to inform the ES.</p> <p>However, it is difficult to see where this is included within the overall baseline provided although short reference is made in Table 9.8 [APP-033]. Given the detailed information now available to the Applicant, KCC states that it would expect greater use of the outputs to inform the discussion of the baseline.</p> <p>Update or clarify where the report on the Stone Hill Park archaeological evaluation referred to has informed the ES.</p>
HE.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Kent County Council (KCC) [RR-0975], Historic England [RR-0676]</p> <p>KCC believes there is a need to survey and evaluate the Northern Grass Area prior to development. In the Northern Grass Area and areas of the airport which have yet to be evaluated, there remains the potential presence of archaeology of a significance that could require preservation in situ as the desirable outcome. KCC would accept that this can be achieved post determination, as long as there is sufficient - and perhaps substantial - flexibility in the development design to enable preservation to be achieved.</p> <p>Historic England state that the archaeological potential of the Northern Grassland area is not well enough understood at present to effectively avoid harm by design. HE welcome the intention to adopt a "worst-case scenario" approach to assessment of archaeological potential and to undertake</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>investigation to inform the design when access becomes available. Flexibility to redesign the scheme should be allowed so that if archaeological remains of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments are discovered they can be preserved but it is not clear to HE that this has been adequately provided for.</p> <p>A DCO requirement should be included to cover the need to preserve the archaeology including through adjustment of development parameters as well as covering the necessary stages of evaluation and investigation. The requirement should also cover extensive investigation of those areas of the airport where archaeology will be affected by development but is not to be preserved in situ.</p> <p>Provide your view and clarity on this matter.</p>
HE.1.26	The Applicant	<p>KCC [RR-0975]</p> <p>Section 9.8 of the ES [APP-033] discusses the significance of the archaeological baseline and has drawn on the results of the Stone Hill Park evaluation.</p> <p>KCC has agreed that whilst there are substantial areas of the Stone Hill Park findings that can be mitigated through investigation and recording, there are also areas identified for preservation in situ including a:</p> <p>WWII anti-aircraft battery; and</p> <p>Remains of a Roman enclosure possibly associated with the Caesar invasions and the barrow cemeteries on Telegraph Hill, which are likely to be more</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>extensive than the two evaluated.</p> <p>KCC state that most of the features would potentially be preserved in the proposed masterplan [APP-079] although their significance needs to be highlighted so that they are considered as plans evolve.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view?</p>
HE.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Historic England (HE) [RR-0676]:</p> <p>Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-033] does not provide sufficient detail about design flexibility to give HE confidence that major harm to important heritage assets will be avoided. For example it does not adequately describe the likely extent and depth of ground disturbance, the worst possible effects on heritage significance or the provision for flexibility in the quantum of development, design and construction methods.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view?</p>
LV.1	Landscape and Visual	
LV.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Landscape - Contribution and enhancement</p> <p>Table 11.11 sets mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the Proposed Development in order to avoid, reduce or compensate for potential adverse landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>However, Table 11.1 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] quotes the draft 2018 NPPF as stating that:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (Paragraph 168). The ExA notes that the final 2018 NPPF states at paragraph 170 that: <i>"Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes ... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside."</i></p> <p>Demonstrate how the proposal, taken as a whole enhances both the natural and local environment and valued landscapes and recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p>
LV.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Landscape – Masterplan</p> <p>Table 11.11 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] references a landscape masterplan.</p> <p>Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Show where this is to be found in the submitted documentation; or ii. Provide a copy.
LV.1.3	TDC	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact - Thanet Local Plan</p> <p>Table 11.1 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] quotes relevant policies from the Thanet Local Plan</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(2006) Saved policies.</p> <p>State the effects that the new deposited local plan policies would have in this respect.</p>
LV.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Landscape – Trees and hedgerows</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (Environmental Statement Volume 2: Main Text – Chapter 11 – 11.4.8) [APP-034] states that 'vegetation within the site is minimal', but includes:</p> <p>An Avenue of tree planting along sections of B2190 Spitfire Way (inside the site boundary and immediately outside but adjacent to the boundary on the grass verge outside the perimeter fence);</p> <p>A Short avenue of trees in the south-east corner of the site, within the site boundary and does not appear to mention hedgerows within the site.</p> <p>Article 34 of the dDCO [APP-006] deals with Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows.</p> <p>The ExA were informed at the ISH on the dDCO held on 10 January 2019 that there would not be any felling or lopping of trees or removal of hedgerows.</p> <p>However, the ExA notes that the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments [APP-010] references "new tree planting to be undertaken to replace that lost."</p> <p>Confirm this and, if so, show where this commitment is secured in</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LV.1.5	The Applicant	<p>the dDCO or in any of the documents secured through Schedule 10.</p> <p>Landscape - Planting scheme</p> <p>Para 11.1.9 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that:</p> <p><i>"Some fixed areas of planting are proposed [...] Elsewhere in the 'Northern Grass' area, planting will be introduced as part of the final layout of this area. However, this planting has not been defined within the broad zones to allow for future flexibility in the design."</i></p> <p>Given this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Comment on whether, if any planning scheme is to be relied on for screening, there should be a requirement that this is provided in advance of the date of opening. ii. Show how any planning, if not yet defined, has been taken into account in any assessment of the visual impact of the proposed development.
LV.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Landscape - Planting scheme</p> <p>Para 11.1.9 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that:</p> <p><i>"Some fixed areas of planting are proposed, ... Elsewhere in the 'Northern Grass' area, planting will be introduced as part of the final layout of this area. However, this planting has not been defined within the broad zones to</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>allow for future flexibility in the design."</i></p> <p>Given this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Comment on whether, if any planning scheme is to be relied on for screening, there should be a requirement that this is provided in advance of the date of opening. ii. Show how any planning, if not yet defined, has been taken into account in any assessment of the visual impact of the Proposed Development.
LV.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Landscape - Assessment of Landscape Effects</p> <p>Section 11.8 Assessment of Landscape Effects in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] shows a significant effect for a number of receptors summarised in Table 11.133.</p> <p>The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments [APP-010] sets out some mitigation in the form of, for example, landscaping and local bunding.</p> <p>Provide a table showing how these mitigation actions will serve to reduce the significant effects for specific receptors listed in table 11.133.</p>
LV.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Design – Principles</p> <p>The 2018 Airports NPS, which is an important and relevant consideration in the examination of this application, states in paragraph 4.30 that:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>“Visual appearance should be an important factor in considering the scheme design, as well as functionality, fitness for purpose, sustainability and cost. Applying ‘good design’ to airports projects should therefore produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, efficient in the use of natural resources and energy used in their construction, and matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetics as far as possible.”</i></p> <p>Describe how the design approach set out in the Design and Access statement (Part 4) [APP-084] fulfils the four characteristics of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being sensitive to place; • efficient in the use of natural resources; • efficient in energy used in their construction; and • an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetics as far as possible.
LV.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Design – Principles</p> <p>The 2018 Airports NPS, which is an important and relevant consideration in the examination of this application, states at paragraph 4.34 that:</p> <p><i>“There may be opportunities for the applicant to demonstrate good design in terms of siting and design measures relative to existing landscape and historical character and function, landscape permeability, landform, and vegetation.”</i></p> <p>The Relevant Representation from Historic England [RR-0676] states that:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>"We think that the open grassland character evokes the wartime airfield use, constitutes an historic area in its own right and contributes to the heritage significance of the wartime buildings, the museums and the memorial garden. The proposed development would be very harmful to historic character so we think that the potential to reduce harm by amending the design should be explored."</i></p> <p>Describe how the design approach to the development of open grassland, including in the Northern Grass, has sought to reflect the historic character of the site.</p>
LV.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Design - Principles</p> <p>Para 11.1.9 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that:</p> <p><i>"The 'Northern Grass' area has been presented through a zonal approach whereby broad zones of building heights have been established without fixed building footprints being defined."</i></p> <p>Given this approach, how has the visual impact of this part of the proposed scheme been assessed?</p>
LV.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Design - Principles</p> <p>Table 11.4 states that:</p> <p><i>"The design principles set out in the Design and Access Statement will be used to ensure that all elements of the Proposed Development, including</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>materials and colour are designed to a high standard as detailed design progresses."</i></p> <p>The ExA assumes that the design principles are those contained in section 7.0 of the Design and Access Statement (Part 4) [APP-084].</p> <p>Show where the design principles ensure that colour is designed to a high standard and where this is reflected in, for example, the Visualisations in Part 8.0 of the Design and Access Statement (Part 4) [APP-084].</p>
LV.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Design – Principles</p> <p>With reference to para 7.15.1 of the Design and Access Statement [APP-084] set out what is meant by a "<i>consistent contemporary and light industrial aesthetic.</i>"</p>
LV.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Design – Principles</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 4.31 of the 2018 Airports NPS explain how good design has been used to meet the principal objectives of the scheme by eliminating or substantially mitigating the adverse impacts of the development.</p>
LV.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Design – Principles</p> <p>With reference to 4.33 of the Airports NPS show how the design of the scheme contributes to the quality of the area in which it would</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		be located
LV.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Design - Tranquillity and dark skies</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.4.39 to 11.4.44 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] reference CPRE Tranquillity and Night Blight Mapping.</p> <p>Show how the use of these documents has influenced scheme proposals as submitted.</p>
LV.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Design - Museums</p> <p>Table 11.3 states that the two museums are being retained as part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The ExA received evidence from Mr Russell at the Open Floor Hearing held on 11 January 2019 that there are proposals to move the museums.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Indicate the status of any proposals to move the Museums; and ii. state whether these proposals have been incorporated into the design process for the proposed scheme.
LV.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Study area</p> <p>Figure 11.1 and paragraph 11.6.5 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] shows the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) study area as being within 5km of the site.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Justify the choice of this boundary.
LV.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Study area</p> <p>Justify the boundaries of in the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) as set out in ES Volume 4: Figures [APP-041] given the statement made in the ISH on the dDCO held on 10th January 2019 that there is uncertainty as to the existing levels within areas of the Order Limits.</p>
LV.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Study area</p> <p>Para 11.3.2 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states the study area has been selected with regard to previous experience of undertaking LVIAs for similar types of development.</p> <p>Reference the similar types of development to Manston Airport used in the definition of the study area.</p>
LV.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines</p> <p>Para 11.3.9 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that ZTVs for aircraft approaching, moving along and departing from the runway have not been modelled.</p> <p>It justifies this, in part, by stating that it is not considered likely that overflying of aircraft in the sky could give rise to significant visual effects due to the intermittent, transitory and small-scale nature of the changes that would arise in views. This is repeated in paragraphs 11.6.2. and</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		11.6.16. Given, inter alia, the number of ATMs proposed, justify the implication that the frequent presence of aircraft overhead would not alter the visual perception of any locations within the study area.
LV.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines</p> <p>Paragraph 11.6.18 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that visual effects during the construction phase of the Proposed Development could lead to effects on human receptors</p> <p>However, paragraph 11.3.9 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that ZTVs for the construction phase, including two 40m mobile cranes have not been modelled.</p> <p>One justification for this is that there would be a temporary presence of the cranes.</p> <p>However, Section 11.8 Assessment of Landscape Effects in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] does appear to assess the impact of the construction phase on receptors.</p> <p>Given that Table 6.2 in the ES Volume 15 [APP-061] shows that there will still be construction activity in 2037 and given the statement in paragraph 11.6.18 and given the description of Year 1 impacts in Section 11.8, justify the statement in paragraph 11.3.9.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LV.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines</p> <p>Table 11.5 states, in response to a consultation request from Stone Hill Park Ltd that:</p> <p><i>“Viewpoint photography has not been included from the PRowS close to the eastern boundary as this will require a diversion as part of the proposals.”</i></p> <p>Justify this statement, given that the diversion will also follow the Eastern Boundary.</p>
LV.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines</p> <p>Landscape Institute Advice Note 01/11 on Photography and photomontage in landscape and visual impact assessment recommends that the viewpoint’s height above ground level and OS grid coordinates are recorded. The wirelines set out in Appendix 11.1 in Environmental Statement, Volume 12: Appendices 10 .1, Appendix B – 12.14 [APP-057] record height above OD rather than ground level.</p> <p><u>Either</u> provide a table showing the heights of the viewpoints in figures 1 to 26 in Appendix 11.1 above ground level <u>or</u> confirm that all viewpoints were taken at ~1.8m above ground level as recorded in ES Volume 4: Figures [APP-041].</p>
LV.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines</p> <p>Figure 1 in Appendix 11.1 in Environmental Statement, Volume 12:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Appendices 10 .1, Appendix B – 12.14 [APP-057] shows “ <i>Proposed spitfire and hurricane [sic] memorial museum</i> ”. This proposal is not shown in Schedule 1 of the dDCO [APP-006] or shown on the Works Plans [APP-018]. Explain this discrepancy.
LV.1.25	The Applicant	Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="972 660 2074 767">i. Explain what Figures 6, 8, 13, 15, 19, and 20 in Appendix 11.1 in Environmental Statement, Volume 12: Appendices 10.1, Appendix B – 12.14 [APP-057] actually show. <li data-bbox="972 783 2074 852">ii. Would any of the Proposed Development be visible from these viewpoints?
LV.1.26	The Applicant	Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines Paragraph 11.3.7 9 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that: <i>“...a ZTV for the operational phase has been modelled to demonstrate the potential visibility of aircraft stationary at the stands. This has utilised a maximum height of a tail fin of 19.5m...”</i> Appendix 11.1 in Environmental Statement, Volume 12: Appendices 10 .1, Appendix B – 12.14 [APP-057] does not show any tail fins as being potentially visible from any of the viewpoints chosen. Will tail fins be visible?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LV.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines</p> <p>Figure 7 in Appendix 11.1 in Environmental Statement, Volume 12: Appendices 10 .1, Appendix B – 12.14 [APP-057] appears to show part of the indicative obscured business development zones as being above the level of the horizon.</p> <p>Explain by what this proposed development is obscured.</p>
LV.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines</p> <p>Para 11.3.6 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] shows parameters for modelling potential visibility. With the exception of the radar tower, these heights cited do relate to the descriptions of the relevant Works set out in Schedule 1.</p> <p>Show where in the assessment of potential visibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The general vertical upward deviation of 2 metres allowed for in Article 6(c); and ii. the maximum height for specified works allowed for in the table in Article 6(c) have formed the basis of modelling for potential visibility.
LV.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Visual Impact – Viewpoints and wirelines</p> <p>Figure 4 and 5 in Appendix 11.1 in Environmental Statement, Volume 12: Appendices 10 .1, Appendix B – 12.14 [APP-057] appears to show the same</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>viewpoint (2) but from different directions. Both figures show the same 'Direction to site'.</p> <p>Explain.</p>
LV.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Design – Customs, immigration and security</p> <p>The 2018 Airports NPS, which is an important and relevant consideration in the examination of this application, states in paragraph 4.32 that:</p> <p><i>"The Secretary of State will also need to be satisfied that extant security, customs and immigration measures are maintained or reprovided."</i></p> <p>The Planning Statement at paragraph 4.15 states that:</p> <p><i>"The Masterplan allows for the required security, customs and immigration measures."</i></p> <p>Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. show where in the application documentation considerations of security and customs and immigration measures are considered in the design of the proposed scheme and where the masterplan and the design principles take these into account; or ii. provide an explanation of how security and customs and immigration measures have been considered in the design of the proposed scheme and how the masterplan and the design principles take these into account.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LV.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Design – Customs, immigration and security</p> <p>Paragraph 6.46 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states that: <i>“It is noted that the Examining Authority and Secretary of State will take into account the ultimate purpose of the infrastructure and bear in mind the operational, safety and security standards which the design has to satisfy.”</i></p> <p>Show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. where these standards are set out in the application documentation; and ii. where is it demonstrated that the design has satisfied these standards.
LV.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Design – Customs, immigration and security</p> <p>Paragraph 3.49 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states that suitable security, customs and border check point facilities would be constructed at the site access points and at cargo building facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Show where these are included in the masterplan, engineering drawings, or in the Design and Access statement. ii. Show how the positioning of these has influenced the design of proposals for the internal road network.
LV.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Design – Customs, immigration and security</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Paragraph 6.53 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states that paragraph 4.64 of the Airports NPS recognises that the nature of the aviation sector as a target for terrorism means that security considerations will likely apply in the case of the infrastructure project for which development consent may be sought under the Airports NPS.</p> <p>The ExA notes the statement in table 14.4 of the ES Volume 3:Main Text – Chapters 17 – 18 [APP-035] that Airport security and resilience is fundamental to EASA licensing and that Relevant CAP and CAA guidelines will be followed including those of security.</p> <p>Explain how this consideration has been built into the design of the proposed scheme.</p>
LV.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Design – Customs, immigration and security</p> <p>Paragraph 6.53 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states that paragraph 4.65 of the Airports NPS states that where national security implications have been identified, the applicant should consult with relevant security experts from the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure and the Department for Transport to ensure that physical, procedural and personnel security measures have been adequately considered in the design process, and that adequate consideration has been given to the management of security risks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm if national security implications have been identified. ii. State whether discussions took place with the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure in advance of the

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>application for a DCO being made.</p> <p>iii. Show how any such discussions influenced the design of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>iv. State whether you consider that the scheme, if consented, would constitute 'Critical National Infrastructure'.</p>
LV.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Design – Customs, immigration and security</p> <p>Advice from the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure is that: Before taking any decisions, a full risk assessment should be undertaken within each individual location to understand the various threats and vulnerabilities and their potential impacts to help identify the most appropriate security response. (https://www.cpni.gov.uk/advice).</p> <p>The ExA notes the statement in table 14.4 of the ES Volume 3:Main Text – Chapters 17 – 18 [APP-035] that Airport security and resilience is fundamental to EASA licensing and that Relevant CAP and CAA guidelines will be followed including those of security.</p> <p>i. State whether such risk assessment has been undertaken.</p> <p>ii. If it has, either show where it is set out in the application documentation, or provide it.</p>
LV.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Lighting</p> <p>Paragraph 11.6.17 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in ES Volume 2</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>[APP-034] states that it is not expected that there would be any significant lighting effects as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>It goes on to state that the lighting of the Proposed Development will be the subject of further development and assessment and as this takes place the design should be reviewed and more detailed modelling of the likely impacts undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Justify the expectation of no significant lighting effects given that more detailed modelling of likely impacts is yet to be undertaken; and ii. State when and in what form that more detailed modelling will be made available to the ExA.
LV.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Lighting</p> <p>As examined at the ISH into the dDCO held on 10 January 2019, the height of the new high mast lighting for aprons and stands referenced in, for example, paragraph 1.14 of the Planning Statement [AP- 080] and paragraph 2.2 of the Draft Explanatory Memorandum [APP-007] is not secured in the dDCO [APP-006].</p> <p>Given this, how were any possible effects of this lighting on potential receptors assessed?</p>
LV.1.38	The Applicant	<p>Lighting</p> <p>Para 11.1.9 in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Statement Volume 2 [APP-034] states that as the detailed design process moves forward additional information will be provided and the information contained here will be confirmed through more detailed modelling of the lighting conditions at specific receptors.</p> <p>State the timescale for this more detailed modelling and the deadline at which it will be entered into the Examination.</p>
LV.1.39	The Applicant	<p>Lighting</p> <p>Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. show where the impact of lighting on aircraft landing at, and taking off from, the proposed scheme on potential receptors has been assessed; or ii. Provide such an assessment.
LV.1.40	The Applicant	<p>Northern Grass</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm whether planting, bunding or screening is proposed in the Northern Grass buffer zone area and what benefit the final treatment provides in terms of mitigation for adjacent properties, since each treatment would provide somewhat different mitigation?</p>
LV.1.41	The Applicant	<p>Air Traffic Control height</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm whether the maximum ATC height stated</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>in Schedule 1 Work No 3 of the dDCO [APP-006] is correct or whether engineering drawings and sections – building height is correct in constraining the ATC height to 24m? The Applicant should update the dDCO as necessary and confirm what the implications are for the landscape and visual impact assessment and for the proposed ground levels.</p>
ND.1	Need	
ND.1.1	The Applicant CAA	<p>Planning Statement [APP-080]</p> <p>Paragraph 5.18 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states, in relation to the question of whether or not the Aviation Policy Framework is out of date, the Applicant’s view that this is the case on matters relating to airport expansion:</p> <p><i>“...since the conclusions of the Airports Commission’s brief (July 2015) to find an effective and deliverable solution to increase aviation capacity in the South East as well as supporting the UK.”</i></p> <p>In what way, if at all, did Manston Airport feature in the Airports Commission deliberations on aviation capacity in the South East?</p>
ND.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Draft government Aviation Strategy</p> <p>Paragraph 1.47, 1st bullet of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states that:</p> <p><i>“The Government in its draft Aviation Strategy make it clear that there is an</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>urgent need for additional runway capacity in the South East of England and specifically for air freight. Without new airport infrastructure, the objectives of the Government’s aviation policy cannot be fulfilled.”</i></p> <p>i. Does the Strategy explicitly refers to Manston Airport?</p> <p>ii. If not, could you set out your analysis of the applicability of the Strategy for Manston?</p>
ND.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Assessment of Strategic Site Alternatives NTS [APP-032]:</p> <p>Paragraph 2.1.13 of the Environmental Statement - Non-Technical Summary [APP-032] states:</p> <p><i>“A range of alternative strategic sites were considered, these being airfields in the south-east and London’s six main airports: Stansted; Heathrow; Gatwick; Luton; London City; and Southend. However, each of the above has major shortfalls in terms of successfully supporting an increased freight and passenger capacity (Table 2.1)”.</i></p> <p>Provide the detailed assessment of strategic sites that supports Table 2.1[APP-032] and Table 2.1 of the ES [APP-033] over and above that provided in paragraphs 2.3.5 -2.3.27 of the ES [APP-033].</p>
ND.1.4	Azimuth Associates	<p>The ExA notes that the Azimuth Report [APP-085] does not deal specifically with alternative sites.</p> <p>Why is that?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
ND.1.5	Azimuth Associates	<p>Reference is made on page II in the Azimuth Report [APP-085] to air freight capacity being full (footnote 5).</p> <p>However, the news report linked to states that capacity was reached (in November/December 2017) for the first time in 10 years and later on references Christmas as being a reason, with quotes that costs tailed away after this specific week.</p> <p>It appears therefore that this report references a single point in time.</p> <p>What is your view on this interpretation?</p>
ND.1.6	Azimuth Associates	<p>Page II of [APP-085] states that airport capacity constraints is a plausible explanation for why the UK appears to carry a lower percentage of air freight in dedicated freighters as opposed to bellyhold.</p> <p>Could you expand on your reasoning of why the UK freight market is dominated by bellyhold freight?</p>
ND.1.7	Azimuth Associates	<p>Page II of the Azimuth Report [APP-085] states that it is clear that the aviation market prefers the South East and that without extra capacity 2.1million tonnes of freight would be diverted mainly to Northern European Airports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="972 1193 2085 1257">i. State the extent to which you have analysed possible diversion to UK airports outside the South East; <li data-bbox="972 1278 2085 1343">ii. Would it not be quicker, cheaper, and easier to divert to other UK airports not in the South East rather than to Northern

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Europe?
ND.1.8	Azimuth Associates	How would trucking times from the Proposed Development to central or north London compare with those from East Midlands or Stansted Airport?
ND.1.9	Azimuth Associates	<p>Paragraph 1.2.1 of [APP-085] states that the only cargo hubs in the UK are East Midlands and Stansted Airports, both of which focus on the integrator model, and that the UK needs a new hub for dedicated freighters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What is the difference between the integrator model and a hub for dedicated freighters? ii. Do integrators currently offer rapid turnarounds and specialist security clearing?
ND.1.10	Azimuth Associates	<p>Table 1 of the Azimuth Report [APP-085] relates to capacity proportions used by airports.</p> <p>The ExA notes that, in this respect, the table relates to the higher of terminal or runway capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is there a separate or an expanded table showing capacity proportions for both terminal and runway capacity? ii. If the capacity proportions in the table refers to terminal capacity do you agree that it is easier to extend or increase terminal capacity than to provide a new runway?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
ND.1.11	Azimuth Associates	<p>Paragraph 3.3.2 of [APP-085] reports on trade levels between Manchester Airport and China, due to the introduction of a new route between MAN and China. However, this appears to be a passenger route, for which bellyhold freight would provide a welcome addition to a route's sustainability</p> <p>To what extent do you consider there to be a difference between passenger flights and their associated bellyhold freight, and pure freighters in terms of the viability of a route?</p>
ND.1.12	Azimuth Associates	<p>Paragraph 4.01 of [APP-085] refers to certain key routes which may be affected if trade routes to Heathrow are reaching capacity. Such routes utilise belly hold freight.</p> <p>Provide evidence that demand exists for pure freighters to such routes.</p>
ND.1.13	Azimuth Associates	<p>Paragraph 4.14 of [APP-085] states, in relation to declining cargo air traffic movements at Stansted that this is perhaps an indication of the capacity constraints at Stansted impacting on cargo-only operations</p> <p>Provide further evidence for this assertion.</p>
ND.1.14	Azimuth Associates	<p>Paragraph 4.28 of [APP-085] states in relation to the DfT's freight forecasts that the zero percent growth may be pragmatic due to the lack of capacity for dedicated freighters, particularly in the South East.</p> <p>Provide evidence for the assertion.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
ND.1.15	Azimuth Associates	Table 6 of [APP-085] details freight flights at European Airports. East Midlands Airport is located at number 5 on this list. Do you have any evidence relating to further capacity at this airport to cope with extra demand for dedicated freighters?
ND.1.16	Azimuth Associates	The ExA note that integrators often use night flights, thereby allowing late pick up in the late afternoon/early evening by integrators, loading onto planes that night that then travel to airports overnight and cargo can be delivered the next morning. Do you agree with this assertion, and if so does this model conflict with the night flight quotas proposed by the scheme?
ND.1.17	Azimuth Associates	Paragraph 4.48 [APP-805] states that around half the goods that could be transported between Heathrow and continental Europe as air freight are already trucked by road. Air freight is commonly seen as good for urgent high value low weight items, due to its cost implications. What proportion of freight trucked by road would be suited to high value, low weight model?
ND.1.18	Azimuth Associates	Section 5.1 of [App-805] details constraints at Stansted due to planning conditions and competition with passenger operations. i. Is it the case that the freight operations at Stansted operate primarily at night when the low cost carriers are not generally

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>in operation?</p> <p>ii. Provide more evidence over capacity constraints at Stansted.</p>
ND.1.19	Azimuth Associates	<p>Section 5.2 of [APP-805] concerns Heathrow and notes the proposed 3rd runway.</p> <p>i. Do you consider that the 3rd runway would be likely to cater for in the main (a) low cost carriers or (b) more 'traditional' airlines?</p> <p>ii. If (b) would bellyhold capacity increase substantially?</p>
ND.1.20	Azimuth Associates	<p>The Government's final consultation on the new Aviation Strategy, 'Aviation 2050 The future of UK aviation' (December 2018) states that it has been estimated that the proposed 3rd runway at Heathrow will nearly double the capacity for freight at the airport to 3 million tonnes a year [para 4.49]</p> <p>i. How would this impact the proposed scheme at Manston?</p> <p>ii. In what ways do your views on the effects of the proposed third runway at Heathrow differ from the Government, and why?</p>
ND.1.21	Azimuth Associates	<p>Gatwick as a centre for freight is dismissed [section 5.3, APP-805] due to a lack of experience in freight operations.</p> <p>What is the direct experience of the Applicant in freight operations?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
ND.1.22	Azimuth Associates	<p>Section 5.7 of [APP-805] concerns East Midlands Airport (EMA), and notes road congestion hampering surface access to the south east.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Given the assertions regarding surface access congestion, why do you consider that EMA is the UK hub for DHL and UPS? ii. How does capacity and road congestion on the M1 compare with that experienced on the A299 and M2/A2?
ND.1.23	Azimuth Associates	<p>Section 6.2.4 of APP-805 concerns Brexit, and states that friction at borders is likely to increase to meet security demands and payment of tariffs, suggesting this could promote a switch from trucking freight to air.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What would be the effect of increased friction at customs entry points and possible higher tariffs on air freight? ii. How would this differ from road freight?
ND.1.24	Azimuth Associates	<p>Section 6.2.6 envisages a situation where an airport may have to security check all visitors as they enter an airport, as opposed to at the landside/airside border (Further questions on design can also be found within the Landscape questions).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Where has such an arrangement be suggested, and do you consider it to be realistic? ii. How would increased delays for passengers impact on freight?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
ND.1.25	Azimuth Associates	<p>Section 6.3 of [APP-805] concerns bellyhold and dedicated freight and notes that bellyhold freight may go through a number of different airports. Paragraph 6.3.2 notes that dedicated freighters hop from airport to airport.</p> <p>Elaborate on how these two situations are different and what are the benefits of pure freighters over bellyhold in this scenario.</p>
ND.1.26	Azimuth Associates	<p>Section 6.3.9 of [APP-805] compares Stansted and East Midlands Airports to Schipol, where it is stated constraints have led to pressures on slots for freighters. However, Schipol is the hub airport for the Netherlands.</p> <p>Compare the passenger number and freight ATMs at these respective airports, setting out the differing constraints for the three airports.</p>
ND.1.27	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>The RR from Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Stone Hill Park Ltd [RR-1601] describes the decrease in cargo air traffic movements from 2000 to 2017.</p> <p>Given this evidence, how realistic are your forecasts for the Proposed Development?</p>
ND.1.28	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>Given that a large proportion of existing pure freight flights take place at night, in order to provide a next day service, how realistic are the forecasts of proposed daytime cargo flights?</p>
ND.1.29	TDC	<p>The RR from Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Stone Hill Park Ltd [RR-1601] states that TDC previously sought to explore whether airports operations at the site would be viable but could not find suitable partners to carry out such</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What is your view on this statement; and ii. has anything changed in this respect since October 2015?
ND.1.30	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>The RR from Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Stone Hill Park Ltd [RR-1601] contains, as an appendix, a report on the Commercial Viability of Manston Airport prepared for TDC by AviaSolutions in September 2016 (the AviaSolutions Report).</p> <p>This concludes that airport operations at Manston “are very unlikely to be financially viable in the longer term, and almost certainly not possible in the period to 2031”. The ExA note that AviaSolutions do not offer any opinion on the reasonableness of otherwise of your commercial plans for the airport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What are your views on this report and its conclusion? ii. In what ways do your proposal and evidence differ from that presented by this report? iii. Comment on any differences identified.
ND.1.31	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>The AviaSolutions report notes, in relation to the view that stagnation of growth in the UK air freight air freight market since 2000 has been caused by a lack of airport capacity in the London area and specifically at Heathrow, that whilst the lack of ATM growth at Heathrow undoubtedly hampered the development of the national air freight market, it is also true that over this period there was adequate airport capacity available at both Stansted and</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Manston to support additional dedicated freighter movements.</p> <p>The report notes that freighter movements at Stansted decreased over the period, while Manston closed, suggesting that the stagnation of UK airfreight was not a consequence of capacity constraints given the excess capacity at Stansted and Manston.</p> <p>What are your views on this assertion regarding demand for air freight?</p>
ND.1.32	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>The AviaSolutions report states that much of the previous cargo at Manston was fresh produce from Africa, and considers that the airport was popular with shippers as it was uncongested, offered good quality handling services (provided by airport staff) and the airport charges were competitive.</p> <p>However, it also notes that airlines/shippers nonetheless had to incur the costs of flying freight aircraft virtually empty on the return leg to their base airport (e.g. Luxembourg, Ostend and Liege) after off-loading as “<i>Manston was almost exclusively used for imports, and this averaged 107 tonnes per import, with virtually no export volume.</i>” (Paras 6.2, 6.3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What are your views on this assertion? ii. Does your business model assume more export for freight would be attainable under your proposals, and if so, what is the basis for this assumption? iii. Provide a copy of your business model.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
ND.1.33	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>The AviaSolutions report considers that if Manston Airport were to re-open, that the most likely role would be to serve smaller freight operators and the larger operators on an ad-hoc basis, and states that <i>“There is no compelling reason to believe that the airport would be able to generate appreciably more freight activity than previously, other than in the context of a shortage of airport capacity in the London area”</i> [para 6.3]</p> <p>Which markets and services does your business model consider your proposal would be able to attract, given the view above?</p>
ND.1.34	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>The AviaSolutions report considers that the geographical location of the airport would affect the demand to use the airport for freight:</p> <p><i>“Infrastructure, and the associated knowledge, skill and supporting industry at airports such as Heathrow and Stansted, as well as the major European hubs such as Frankfurt, and Paris, would be almost impossible for Manston to replicate. The geographic location of the airport, tucked into the corner of the UK, cannot compete with airports such as East Midlands for Integrator services that are sold as fast delivery, due to the increases in surface transportation times”</i> (para 8.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="972 1126 2018 1193">i. How do you consider the location of Manston Airport would affect the demand for freight flights at the airport? <li data-bbox="972 1214 2085 1318">ii. Do you consider it likely that infrastructure can be successfully provided at Manston to provide an alternative to existing established airports?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
ND.1.35	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	How many flights do you expect to see generated from perishables?
ND.1.36	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>Mention is made in [APP-805, 4.4.8] of KLM recommencing operations from Manston.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What percentage of such passengers do you envisage would be using such a route to use Schipol as a hub? ii. Report on any progress with negotiations with KLM.
ND.1.37	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>Evidence is provided relating to Frankfurt Airport [APP-805, 4.2.50-54] and its freight traffic. It is stated that cargo volumes have fallen since 2010 due to night restrictions and that a significant amount of cargo landing at Frankfurt is destined for locations outside Germany, including the UK.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Does the reduction in cargo volumes due to night restrictions indicate that cargo traffic partially relies on night flights? ii. What percentage and volume of freight at Frankfurt is bellyhold freight? iii. How much freight do FedEx carry at Frankfurt, in volume terms? iv. Provide evidence for the assertion that a significant amount of cargo landing at Frankfurt is destined for locations outside Germany, including the UK.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
ND.1.38	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>The RR from Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Stone Hill Park Ltd [RR-1601] considers that the fall in cargo ATMs has been driven by market trends towards bellyhold, described as cheaper and more flexible, whereas your analysis [APP-805] considers that the market may move away from bellyhold to pure freighters.</p> <p>How do you reconcile such opposing views on the trend for cargo in the UK?</p>
ND.1.39	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>Your forecasts [APP-805] consider around 5,000 freight air transport movements in year 2, some 11,600 in year 10 and around 17,000 in year 20. Effectively this would mean in year 2, after 1 year of operation, that Manston Airport would be the 3rd largest airport for pure freight in the UK (based on 2017 CAA figures).</p> <p>Given historical data, the location of Manston and the presence of established cargo hubs in the UK at Heathrow, East Midlands and Stansted, do you consider this to be a realistic proposition?</p>
ND.1.40	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>Your forecasts [APP-805] do not appear to include mail. Is this correct?</p>
ND.1.41	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	<p>The RR from Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Stone Hill Park Ltd [RR-1601] estimates that there were less than 18,000 non domestic cargo ATMs for England and Wales in 2017.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Do you agree with this estimate?
ND.1.42	The Applicant Azimuth Associates	The RR from Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Stone Hill Park Ltd [RR-1601] states that the DfT aviation forecast projects no growth in UK freighter ATMs in the next 30 years. What are your views on such forecasts and how they apply to your proposal?
ND.1.43	The Applicant	The Statement of Reasons [APP-006, para 4.25] quotes the 2003 White Paper, The Future of Air Transport, as acknowledging that Manston 'could play a valuable role in meeting local demand and could contribute to regional economic development'. To what extent have the changes in the global and domestic economic situation since 2003 rendered this White paper redundant?
ND.1.44	The Applicant	At one of the open floor hearings, the prospect of Thanet Parkway railway station was raised. Do you consider there to be any synergy between the proposed operation at Manston Airport and the rail station, in terms of cargo capability?
ND.1.45	The Applicant	Is there any update on negotiations with any airlines/integrators or freight forwarders?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
ND.1.46	The Applicant	<p>Stone Hill Park [RR-1601] Airports NPS⁴</p> <p>The 2018 Airports NPS exists, but it does not provide explicit policy support to Manston [APP-080].</p> <p>Can the Applicant point to any other planning policy, either national or local, which explicitly provides policy support to re-open Manston Airport?</p>
Ns.1	Noise and Vibration	
Ns.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Dover District Council [RR-0490]</p> <p>Dover District Council (DDC) has noted that properties in the Dover District fall outside of the noise contours as referred to in paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 of the Noise Mitigation Plan [APP-009] concerning noise insulation funding. Specifically, this relates to:</p> <p><i>"...residential properties with habitable rooms within the 63dB LAeq (16 hour) day time contour..." and "...residential properties with bedrooms falling within the 55dB LAeq (8 hour) contour..." and the provision of "...reasonable levels of noise insulation and ventilation for schools and community buildings within the 60dB LAeq (16 hour) daytime contour..."</i></p> <p>DDC has noted that these levels are greater than those given with respect to</p>

⁴ Anywhere reference in this document to the Airports NPS should be taken to mean Airports National Policy Statement: new runway capacity and infrastructure at airports in the south-east of England (2018)

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>acoustic insulation under the Heathrow Expansion consultation in January 2018 which refers to 60dB LAeq (16 hour) contours for an inner zone and 57dB LAeq (16 hour) contours for an outer zone.</p> <p>In addition, the CAA's recent findings on Aircraft Noise and Annoyance (February 2018) makes reference to UK policy in relation to an 'annoyance threshold' and highlights 57dB LAeq (16 hour) as marking the approximate onset of significant community annoyance.</p> <p>DDC recommends (as does KCC in [RR- 0974]) that the daytime noise contour of 60dB LAeq (16 hour) used for schools and community buildings is also used as the daytime noise contour qualification for noise insulation.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view on the DDC recommendation?</p>
Ns.1.2	The Applicant	<p>KCC [RR- 0974]</p> <p>Paragraph 12.5.8 of the Environmental Statement [APP-034] describes the measures in the Noise Mitigation Plan [APP-009] and one of these is a voluntary quota count system.</p> <p>The Annual Quota Count is 3,028 (this is for noise emissions, not number of movements, between 23:00 and 07:00). The proposed quota equates to approximately 8 quota count points per night and given that paragraph 12.7.40 of the ES [APP-034] states the forecast is to handle 7 aircraft during a typically busy night period, this is possible (given a QC/1 aircraft would use one of those points).</p> <p>The Noise Mitigation Plan currently has no dates on it.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How long does the Applicant propose the quota count system will apply? ii. When would it be subject to review and by whom?
Ns.1.3	The Applicant	<p>KCC [RR- 0974]</p> <p>At Year 20 in the daytime, 115 properties are forecast to be within the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) and 8 in the Unacceptable Adverse Effect Level (UAEL - meaning above 69 dB L_{Aeq} 16hr) [APP-034].</p> <p>Insulation for those in the SOAEL will reduce the noise exposure and remove them from the 'significant' category, and the relocation scheme will apply to those in the UAEL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Given the number of residents in the SOAEL (63 dB L_{Aeq} 16hr) that may still experience adverse effects (some more so than others, and retaining significant effects in their garden and with open windows – see Basner et al 2006⁵), would the Applicant be willing to extend the relocation scheme to those 115 dwellings on a discretionary basis if they are not within the formal scheme? ii. Can the Applicant make a copy of Basner et al 2006 available to the examination?

⁵ Section 12.6 [APP-034]

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ns.1.4	The Applicant	<p>PHE [RR-1608]</p> <p>It appears the Applicant has determined significant and unacceptable adverse effect levels (Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAELs) and Unacceptable Adverse Effect Level(UAELs)) for daytime noise exposure based on recommendations for airport actions in the Aviation Policy Framework (APF) (2013) (Environmental Statement paragraphs 12.6.64 and 12.6.65 [APP-034]).</p> <p>The night time SOAEL appears to be chosen as the level where adverse health effects occur frequently, a sizeable proportion of the population is highly annoyed and sleep-disturbed and there is evidence that the risk of cardiovascular disease increases, according to the WHO Night Noise Guidelines⁶.</p> <p>However, paragraph 15.7.8 of the ES [APP-034] states:</p> <p><i>"Given the multidisciplinary nature of health and the strength of evidence for each health pathway, the individual assessment protocols (i.e. for changes in air or noise exposure), have been applied to inform a judgement on the magnitude and distribution of change, based upon:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>□ the magnitude of potential impacts;</i> <i>□ the sensitivity of the communities affected; and</i> <i>□ identified local health needs and objectives."</i>

⁶ WHO Night Noise Guidelines for Europe, 2009

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>We could not find reference as to how the 2nd and 3rd bullet points were considered in the judgement of significance of noise effects.</p> <p>Point to where in the ES [APP-033, APP-034 and APP-044] where bullet items 2 and 3 were considered.</p>
Ns.1.5	The Applicant	<p>PHE [RR-1608]</p> <p>In its RR, PHE states that the Applicant appears to assume that sound insulation will address most of the adverse effects for those properties eligible for it [APP-009].</p> <p>Provide the evidence which demonstrates that noise insulation is effective at mitigating the adverse psychological and physiological health outcomes associated with aviation noise.</p>
Ns.1.6	The Applicant	<p>PHE [RR-1608]</p> <p>Annoyance was not included as a health outcome, as recommended by the WHO⁷ and the Interdepartmental Group on Costs and Benefits Noise (IGCBN)⁸.</p> <p>Can the Applicant express the noise impacts in terms of Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs)⁹ and in monetary terms using the methodologies in [5,6]?</p>

⁷ WHO Burden of Disease from Environmental Noise, 2012

⁸ Defra/Interdepartmental Group on Costs and Benefits Noise Subject Group, 2014

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ns.1.7	The Applicant	<p>PHE [RR-1608]</p> <p>The assessment of night-time awakenings is based on an assumption of an outside to inside sound level difference of 21 dB (assumed to be A-weighted) [APP-057].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm that this is the yearly average referenced in the WHO Night Noise Guidelines. ii. The figure of 21dB was derived specifically to be used with the annual averaged Lnight metric. Explain why it is appropriate to apply a yearly average to a noise event assessment. iii. Provide separate assessments for windows open and windows closed scenarios.
Ns.1.8	The Applicant	<p>PHE [RR- 1608]</p> <p>PHE believe there is evidence which suggests that quiet urban areas can have both a direct beneficial health effect and can also help restore or compensate for the adverse health effects of noise in the environment¹⁰. Research from the Netherlands suggests that people living in noisy areas</p>

⁹ Appendix 12.3 does refer to costed WebTag which address DALY's

¹⁰ Health Council of the Netherlands Publication no. 2006/12, 2006 LIFE09 ENV/NL/000423, QSIDE-

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>appear to have a greater need for areas offering quiet than people not exposed to noise at home¹¹.</p> <p>PHE believe the proposed sound insulation scheme will not protect amenity spaces (such as private gardens) from increased noise exposure. Furthermore, although public Quiet Areas were included in the assessment of noise sensitive receptors, none were identified within the study area. No health impacts were recorded due to increased noise exposure in public green spaces, since none were identified as receptors [APP-058].</p> <p>Given the increased noise exposure in private amenity spaces [APP-034], does the Applicant propose to create new tranquil public spaces that are easily accessible to those communities exposed to increased noise from the Proposed Development?</p>
Ns.1.9	The Applicant	<p>PHE [RR-1608]</p> <p>The ES states at paragraph 15.8.13[APP-034] that:</p> <p><i>"Construction noise would be temporary (with phased works) and subject to control by the CEMP ([APP-011] and Appendix 3.2 [APP-044]. No significant adverse impacts on health due to any temporary noise disturbance during construction are predicted".</i></p> <p>The construction phases are predicted to extend from 2019 to 2036 inclusive. It is not clear to what extent noise sensitive receptors will be</p>

¹¹ The positive effects of quiet façades and quiet urban areas on traffic noise annoyance and sleep disturbance COST TD0804, Soundscape of European Cities and Landscapes, 2013

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>exposed to increased noise levels from construction during multiple phases. Therefore it is not possible to make an assessment whether construction noise can be classified as “<i>temporary</i>” for all sensitive receivers.</p> <p>Define “<i>temporary</i>” within this context.</p>
Ns.1.10	The Applicant	<p>PHE [RR-1608]</p> <p>PHE understands that for aviation noise, noise modelling was based on indicative, rather than finalised flightpaths.</p> <p>Will the Applicant agree a strategy with relevant stakeholders to address this issue, and produce an additional HIA during the finalisation of flightpaths if consent is granted, to assess the full scale and distribution of localised impacts?</p>
Ns.1.11	The Applicant CAA	<p>Paragraph 12.2.2 of ES [APP-034] Responses to Scoping Report [APP-043]</p> <p>Paragraph 12.2.2 of the ES lists CAA as a respondent to the Scoping Report consultation. Table A12.1.1 [APP-057] and Table 4.3 [APP-043] do not record the CAA response.</p> <p>Can the Applicant point to where in its application documents the CAA’s response can be found?</p>
Ns.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Vibration</p> <p>Comparison of ES Table 12.11 and ES Table 12.26 [APP-034] potentially</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>shows an exceedence of the 3mms^{-1} continuous vibration criteria for protected or potentially vulnerable buildings.</p> <p>Provide further clarification regarding the conclusion that the peak particle velocity (PPV) is less than the adopted impact criteria for onset of cosmetic damage drawn in ES paragraph 12.7.30 [APP-034] in light of the predicted 3.6mms^{-1} external vibration.</p>
Ns.1.13	The Applicant	<p>LOAEL and SOAEL [APP-034]</p> <p>It is not clear from the ES (chapter 12 [APP-034]) how many properties would fall between the LOAEL and SOAEL, where significant adverse effects could be experienced.</p> <p>The methodology section of the ES explains that levels above the SOAEL will be significant for EIA purposes, and that levels between LOAEL and SOAEL will be evaluated against a list of considerations to determine the magnitude of significance of the effect under the EIA Regulations (paragraph 12.6.75 [APP-034]).</p> <p>The assessment for aircraft noise reports, for impacts on dwellings in Year 20, that 13,046 dwellings are above the LOAEL and 115 dwellings above the SOAEL. At night time 16,465 dwellings are reported above the LOAEL and 225 dwellings above the SOAEL (Table 12.27 [APP-034]).</p> <p>How have the dwellings between the LOAEL & SOAEL been assessed in terms of EIA significance?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ns.1.14	The Applicant CAA	<p>Noise modelling</p> <p>Paragraph 9.86 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states:</p> <p><i>"The noise assessment has been prepared without exact details relating to airspace options¹², operating principles and aircraft flight paths. These will be formalised through an Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) which is a separate consenting regime that will happen after any DCO is granted for the Proposed Development. The ACP will be submitted through the Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) airspace change process and the potential noise effects will be assessed again at that time following the CAA guidance within the Civil Aviation Publications (CAP). The ACP will therefore provide opportunities for communities to engage on future airspace options through an extensive consultation process as well as the preparation of a separate Environmental Statement to accompany the ACP."</i></p> <p>Could any Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) give rise to a scenario which has not been assessed in the Applicant's ES [APP-033 to 036]?</p>
Ns.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Demolition</p> <p>ES figure 12.3a [APP-042] sets out the construction noise assessment phasing assumptions. These show demolition of the terminal in construction phase 2 whereas ES paragraph 3.3.44 [APP-033] states that demolition will</p>

¹² ExA emphasis

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>occur in phase 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm whether demolition of the terminal is scheduled for phase 1 or phase 2 of construction. ii. In confirming the demolition phasing, also confirm to what extent this alters the conclusions reached in the assessment of construction noise within the ES.
Ns.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Baseline data</p> <p>The baseline data presented in ES Table 12.2 [APP-034]; Appendix 12.4 baseline survey data and Appendix 12.4, Table A12.4.8 appear to differ by 1-2dB [APP-057]. These apparent discrepancies relate to day, evening and night time noise data sets.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain the apparent discrepancies and the implications of the different noise values for the assessment of likely significant effects?</p>
Ns.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Road traffic noise</p> <p>TA Volume 17, Appendix E, Table 1.7 [APP-063] suggests that there will be a peak in passenger traffic to the airport between 03:00-06:00.</p> <p>Since the $L_{A10,18\text{hour}}$ metric used in CRTN accounts for traffic flows between 06:00 – 24:00, confirm how road traffic noise has been accounted for in the noise assessment before 06:00.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ns.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Traffic and aircraft noise</p> <p>Aircraft and traffic noise are assessed separately.</p> <p>It is not immediately apparent how the assessment of noise effects has taken into account combined noise emissions from increased road traffic, airport ground noise and aviation noise on relevant receptors.</p> <p>Explain the extent to which and how this has been assessed.</p>
Ns.1.19	The CAA	<p>Noise methodology</p> <p>ES Section 12.1 and ES Table 12.1 describe limitations and assumptions used in the preparation of the ES [APP-034]. The key assumptions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of professional judgement used to determine the likely equipment, working methods and times during construction; • Precise airspace arrangements are subject to the Airspace Change Process and are based on prototype arrangements that consider both overfly populations/avoid populations options; • Aircraft in future are assumed to be as noisy as today (although a trend of reducing noise is likely); and • The operational aircraft noise assessment uses an average winter's day rather than an average summer's day on the basis that due to importation of perishable vegetables, the largest increase in ATMs is likely to be during the winter months. The CAA CAP1616a document states that an average summer's day should be used as the basis for

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>assessments of noise.</p> <p>i. Does the CAA consider that the assessment of average winter's day aircraft noise is representative of the proposed airport operations?</p> <p>ii. Is an average summer's day assessment also required?</p>
Ns.1.20	The Applicant	<p>ES Appendix 12.3 – Noise methodology [APP-057]</p> <p>ES Appendix 12.1[APP-057] response to PINS comments states that air noise modelling for the ES has been undertaken using Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT).</p> <p>ES Appendix 12.3.1[APP-057] in the 'modelling overview' states that LimA has been used for ground-based noise source modelling and that AEDT v2d and Integrated Noise Model (INM) v7.0 have been used for aircraft air noise modelling.</p> <p>ES Appendix 12.3.'Choices of noise model' states that INM v7.0 modelling has been undertaken and that AEDT has not been used because at the point in time when options appraisal and work for the PEIR commenced early versions of AEDT were not endorsed for use in the UK.</p> <p>ES paragraph 12.6.17[APP-034] states that the INM rather than the AEDT has been used to model noise and that this approach is consistent with the approach set out in CAP1616a.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies in the ES notably:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 12.1 response to PINS comments; • ES Appendix 12.3.1 modelling overview; • ES Appendix 12.3 choices of noise model and • ES paragraph 12.6.17 regarding the description of the modelling approach taken. <p>i. Confirm whether AEDT modelling has been undertaken and is the information used to inform the assessment.</p> <p>ii. If not, provide further justification for the use of INM modelling. Any justification should provide commentary on the outcomes of historic INM modelling in drawing conclusions regarding noise impacts.</p>
Ns.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Meteorological data</p> <p>When discussing average meteorological conditions, ES Appendix 12.3 [APP-057] states that INM standard settings were appropriate.</p> <p>With reference to historic meteorological data, explain why INM standard settings are appropriate to represent meteorological conditions at the site.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ns.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Construction noise</p> <p>ES Appendix 12.3, Tables A12.3.27 - A12.3.28[APP-057] include 5-10dB reductions for local screening or site mitigation for some or all construction works. The anticipated reduction which is resultant from this action is not made explicit in the construction noise assessment eg. ES Tables 12.16 – 25 and ES section 12.5 [APP-034] suggest that up to 5dB reduction may be achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide clarification of this point. ii. Provide construction noise assessment tables which set out precisely where 5 or 10 dB reductions are anticipated to be achieved and with reference to the specific mitigation necessary to secure this reduction.
Ns.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Multiple noise construction activities</p> <p>ES Appendix 12.3, Tables 12.3.31-33[APP-057] and ES Tables 12.16 to 12.24[APP-034] consider the individual effect of the loudest activity rather than the combined effect of multiple activities on a single receptor.</p> <p>Confirm what the combined impact of noise from different construction sound sources is for the assessed receptors.</p>
Ns.1.24	The Applicant CAA	<p>Airspace Change Process [APP-086]</p> <p>ES Appendix 12.3[APP-057] discusses the potential noise effects relating to different aircraft flightpaths and selects a probable route that has been</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN)	<p>subject to assessment. The ES [APP-034] acknowledges that the flight path may be subject to change since it is subject to approval through the Airspace Change Process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Can the Applicant provide commentary on any progress made in relation to the airspace change process and the confirmation of specific flight paths for Manston Airport? ii. The Airspace Change Process is discussed in Section 6 of [APP-086]. What is the Applicant's understanding of the role of ICCAN in this process?
Ns.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Airport car parking</p> <p>The list of sound source data in ES Appendix 12.3[APP-057] excludes airport car parking.</p> <p>Confirm how airport car parking noise has been assessed.</p>
Ns.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Engine ground running</p> <p>ES Appendix 12.3 [APP-057] 'engine ground running' states that the most suitable location for performing Engine Ground Runs is 50m east of the runway centre no more than 50 times/year and lasting 10 minutes. The 'embedded mitigation' section of the appendix also states that the modelling assumes no runs will take place between 23.00-07.00.</p> <p>ES appendix 12.3 states that no engine ground runs will take place between 23.00 and 07.00 and uses this as a modelling assumption. However, Section</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>6 of the noise mitigation plan [APP-009] states that open field testing may be carried out 'where operationally urgent and carried out within a designated test area'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm which of these statements is correct. ii. Where night-time provision for engine ground runs is sought, confirm how this would affect the forecast $L_{Aeq,8hr}$.
Ns.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Noise Mitigation Plan [APP-009]</p> <p>The noise mitigation plan states that runway preferences for take-off on runway 28 and landing on runway 10 to avoid overflying Ramsgate, although the ES [APP-034] recognises that such operations will be prevented at higher volumes of air traffic movements.</p> <p>Confirm how many ATMs day/night will prevent such operation and the likely year of change of operation.</p>
Ns.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Noise control and quota counts</p> <p>Provide details of other noise control measures, including quota counts established at other UK airports of comparable size/aircraft composition to provide context for the proposed mitigation plan [APP-009].</p>
Ns.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Noise Mitigation Plan [APP-009]</p> <p>Section 3 of the Plan states:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>"The airport operator will provide reasonable levels of noise insulation and ventilation¹³ for schools and community buildings within the 60 dB LAeq (16 hour) day time contour."</i></p> <p>Specify what is meant by reasonable in this context.</p>
Ns.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Noise Mitigation Plan [APP-009]</p> <p>The mitigation provisions relating to noise insulation and relocation in sections 2 and 4 are subject to eligibility criteria, which are briefly described in the noise mitigation plan.</p> <p>Provide further details regarding the eligibility criteria and who would be responsible for administering any mitigation payments.</p>
Ns.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Noise Mitigation Plan [APP-009]</p> <p>Section 14 of the noise mitigation plan limits the spending of community trust fund monies to the 50dB LAeq,16hr and 40dB LAeq,8hr contours.</p> <p>Explain why a wider area of effect such as the extent of the relevant LASmax contours has not been adopted.</p>
Ns.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Caravan parks and camping sites [APP-034]</p> <p>Paragraph 11.4.32 of the ES [APP-034] states:</p> <p><i>"The Kent coast and the towns of Broadstairs, Margate and Ramsgate are</i></p>

¹³ ExA emphasis

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>popular tourist destinations resulting in numerous campsites, caravan site and holiday parks within the study area. It is likely that a proportion of the caravan sites are used for permanent residences as opposed to holiday lets. These are set out in Table 11.9 and the locations of those carried through to the Visual Assessment are shown in Figure 11.35."</i></p> <p>Paragraph 9.282 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states:</p> <p><i>"The community of Manston, particularly in the area of Preston Road, Manston; in northern section of High Street, Manston; in southern section of High Street; Manston; Jubilee Cottages on Manston Road; PRowS TR8, TR9, TR10 and TR22; Manston Court Caravan Site and Preston Parks are likely to experience significant daytime inter-related noise and visual effects in relation to visitor arrival and departure and any outdoor exhibits during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The community of Manston may also experience significant inter-related noise and visual effects during the daytime, in both shared open spaces and indoor spaces (specifically residential properties at Preston Road, Manston; in northern section of High Street, Manston; in southern section of High Street; Manston; Jubilee Cottages on Manston Road; PRowS TR8, TR9, TR10 and TR22; and Manston Court Caravan Site and Preston Parks). Effects on some indoor spaces are less likely to be significant if eligible residents take up the noise insulation scheme, however this scheme will not apply to caravan sites¹⁴."</i></p>

¹⁴ ExA emphasis

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What proportion of the caravan sites are used as permanent residences? ii. How have these caravan sites been assessed in the noise and vibration assessment? iii. How many permanent residences in Manston Court and Preston Parks will be significantly affected by inter-related noise and visual effects? iv. How does the Applicant propose to mitigate these significant effects?
Ns.1.33	The Applicant CAA	<p>ES Noise contour maps [APP-042]</p> <p>Section 15 of the noise management plan [APP-009] states that the $L_{Aeq,16hr}$ and $L_{Aeq,8hr}$ are based on the average summer's day/night respectively.</p> <p>ES paragraph 12.7.44 [APP-034] makes it clear that the worst case is considered to be a typical busy day during winter time.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Whether the ES noise contour maps are based on the winter or summer day; and ii. whether the Category 3 interests have been identified based on the average summer's day or average winter's day scenarios?
Ns.1.34	The Applicant	Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments [APP-010]

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Confirm whether the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments should include an entry regarding operational noise impacts on human receptors.
Ns.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Take-offs Runway 28/Landing Runway 10</p> <p>Based on historic monitoring data and previous airport usage, confirm how probable the proposed runway preferences identified in the noise mitigation plan [APP-009] are for take-offs on runway 28/landing on runway 10.</p>
Ns.1.36	The Applicant	<p>N60dbLsmax [APP-042]</p> <p>The ES provides N60 contours for night time noise in Figures 12.12 and 12.13 [APP-042].</p> <p>In line with the requirements of the Air Navigation Guidance 2017 – paragraph 3.11 in reference 7 of Chapter 12 of ES [APP-034], confirm whether N65 daytime contour maps have been prepared for the Proposed Development.</p>
Ns.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative noise effects from operational noise sources</p> <p>Paragraph 9.93 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states:</p> <p><i>"The potential noise effects that have been assessed are as follows:</i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise from aircraft and airport operations including from aircraft in the</i>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>air and noise from aircraft operations on the ground, associated Ground Support Equipment, airfield activities and airport buildings during operation of the Proposed Development;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Changes in surface access noise, namely road traffic noise from vehicle movements associated with the operation of the Proposed Development; and</i> • <i>Noise from the secondary business infrastructure located within the Northern Grass area."</i> <p>Figures 12.4-12.12 [APP-042] only provide noise contours for aircraft noise.</p> <p>Have noise contours been produced separately for operational road traffic and secondary business infrastructure? If not can they be provided?</p>
Ns.1.38	The Applicant	<p>Significant permanent community operational aircraft noise effects [APP-034]</p> <p>Section 12.8 of the ES[APP-034] states:</p> <p>"Aircraft noise – permanent community effects – daytime</p> <p><i>Significant In the following communities, aircraft noise would increase to the point where there would be a perceived change in quality of life for occupants of buildings in these communities or a perceived change in the acoustic character of shared open spaces within these communities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ramsgate;</i>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pegwell Bay; and • Manston. <p>Aircraft noise – permanent community effects – nighttime</p> <p><i>Significant In the following communities, aircraft noise would increase to the point where there would be a perceived change in quality of life for occupants of buildings in these communities or a perceived change in the acoustic character of shared open spaces within these communities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ramsgate; • Manston; • Wade; and • West Stourmouth.” <p>Are the 115 properties expected to be exposed to noise levels above the daytime SOAEL of 63 dB L_{Aeq,16hr}; up to eight properties¹⁵ expected to be exposed to noise levels above the daytime UAEL of 69 dB L_{Aeq,16hr}; and the 225 properties expected to be exposed to noise levels above the night time SOAEL of 55 dB L_{Aeq,8hr} included in the above permanent community effects daytime and night time?</p>
OP.1	Operational issues	

¹⁵ At paragraph 9.94 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states there are ten properties?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
OP.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Take-offs Runway 28/Landing Runway 10</p> <p>Based on historic monitoring data and previous airport usage, confirm how probable the proposed runway preferences identified in the noise mitigation plan [APP-009] are for take-offs on runway 28/landing on runway 10.</p>
OP.1.2	The Applicant	<p>N60dbLsmax [APP-042]</p> <p>The ES provides N60 contours for night time noise in Figures 12.12 and 12.13 [APP-042].</p> <p>In line with the requirements of the Air Navigation Guidance 2017 – paragraph 3.11 in reference 7 of Chapter 12 of ES [APP-034], confirm whether N65 daytime contour maps have been prepared for the Proposed Development.</p>
OP.1.3	The Applicant Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA)	<p>Aerodrome certificate</p> <p>Box 1.1 of the Environment Statement [APP-033] states:</p> <p><i>"The CAA is the statutory corporation which oversees and regulates, either directly or indirectly, all aspects of civil aviation in the UK; it is a public corporation of the DfT. Any airport in the UK which is used for commercial passenger flights, public transport flights and/or flying training in aircraft above a specified weight, is required to obtain, from the CAA, an Aerodrome Licence.</i></p> <p><i>The EASA is an agency of the European Union (EU) with regulatory and</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>executive tasks in the area of civilian aviation safety. Representatives from the member states national aviation authorities, such as the CAA, sit on the EASA's advisory bodies. From 31 December 2017 aerodromes in the UK which are open to public use and which serve commercial air transport, where operations using instrument approach or departure procedures are provided, and which have a paved runway of 800m or above, or exclusively serve helicopters, are required to comply with EASA regulations and obtain an EASA Certificate to replace their CAA Aerodrome Licence."</i></p> <p>Paragraph 4.8 of the Consultation Report [APP-075] dated July 2018 states: <i>"The process of obtaining these consents will run alongside the DCO application process and a decision on them will be made by the CAA rather than the Secretary of State."</i></p> <p>What is the current status of this parallel application?</p>
OP.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Defence Industry Organisation Safeguarding (DIOS) [RR- 0442]</p> <p>The Proposed Development occupies the statutory technical safeguarding consultation zone surrounding the Manston High Resolution Direction Finder (HRDF) and DIOS have consistently raised concerns to this application due to no successful mitigation being identified. The HRDF is a critical piece of technical equipment for the MOD it is used to precisely locate transmissions from aircraft and supports the delivery of air traffic control functions. The mast serves as an integral part of UK wide network (the UK Diversion and Distress Facility) which is used to locate aircraft or personnel and direct rescue emergency response capabilities for the management of air safety</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		incidents. DIOS believe the application in its current form may cause a physical infringement to the operation of the asset. What mitigation is the Applicant proposing for the HRDF?
OP.1.5	The CAA	<p>Prototype routes</p> <p>Paragraph 9.89 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] states:</p> <p><i>"Prototype routes have been used for the assessment of aircraft noise, which have been developed around design principles, namely 'avoid overflying populations', 'overfly populations' and 'swathe centre line'. An options appraisal of these principles is presented in Appendix 12.3 of Chapter 12 of the ES [document reference TR020002/APP/5.2-12] which, demonstrates that the variation in the population adversely effected and significantly adversely effected by noise across the design principles is less than 1%, based on the operating conditions modelled. This process is both normal and unavoidable due to the separate consenting regimes. The assessment is therefore robust because it has considered the range of design outcomes which could occur following the completion of the ACP."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What is the view of the CAA of the <1% calculation? ii. Does the CAA agree that the ES [APP-034] has considered the range of design outcomes that will be part of a future ACP application? iii. In CAA's experience, is it always necessary to seek an ACP

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		following a planning consent application?
OP.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Night flights</p> <p>Section 12.5.8 of Volume 2, Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [APP-034] proposes an annual quota count for night flights (23:00-07:00).</p> <p>How is this value (3,028) calculated?</p>
OP.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Do your forecasts indicate a date by when Public Safety Zones (PSZs) may need to be implemented? ii. If so, what provisions and modelling have been put in place for such an eventuality? iii. Would such PSZs affect any existing or consented residential properties?
OP.1.8	The Applicant	Should PSZs be required, are the effects of such zones considered within the ES?
OP.1.9	The Applicant	What would be the likely impact of safeguarding zones (for all obstacle limitation surfaces)?
OP.1.10	The Applicant	i. What would be the impact, if any, of safeguarding zones on future developments near the airport in terms of blight and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>would they have any effect on existing structures?</p> <p>ii. Would the consented Manston Green proposal be affected?</p>
OP.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Air Traffic Movements (ATMs)</p> <p>Table 3.1 of the Planning Statement [APP-080] provides a forecast passenger and freight movement numbers (2019 to 2039). This is derived from the Azimuth Report [APP-085].</p> <p>The dDCO[APP-006] states in Schedule 1:</p> <p><i>“Work No.9 – The construction and rehabilitation of pavements for the creation of 19 Code E aircraft parking stands and associated pavement and infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>Work No.10 – The construction and rehabilitation of pavements for the creation of 3 Code C aircraft parking stands and associated pavement and infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>Work No.11 – The construction and rehabilitation of pavements for the creation of 4 Code C aircraft parking stands and associated pavement and infrastructure.”</i></p> <p>What is the “physical capability”¹⁶ of Works Nos. 9,10 and 11 to handle freight and passenger ATMs/year?</p>

¹⁶ Paragraph 1.31 of [APP-080]

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
OP. 1.13	The Applicant	<p>At the Open Floor Hearing held on 10 January 2019, an Interested Party suggested a range of options to consider, including a displaced threshold for Runway 28 and the use of steeper glideslopes for the same runway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. With reference to likely aircraft types and weights consider whether a displaced threshold for runway 28 could be utilised. ii. With reference to likely aircraft types and weights consider whether a steeper glideslope, such as used at London City Airport, could be utilised for runway 28.
OP. 1.13	The Applicant	<p>It is proposed to utilise Runway 10 for landing and take offs, for noise mitigation purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. With reference to wind speeds and directions at the airport, how often could such an approach be taken? ii. Such an approach to the use of the runway would restrict usage of the airport. At what flight levels would such an approach have to be re-considered?
OP. 1.14	The Applicant	<p>Provide a figure showing expected approximate heights of aircraft departing/arriving at the airport at set distances from the runway ends (0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5 km).</p>
OP. 1.15	The Applicant	<p>Has the proposal taken account of nearby wind turbines and potential effect on radar operation?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
OP. 1.16	The Applicant	Has the proposal taken account of any potential bird strike hazards to the safe operation of the airport?
SE.1	Socio-economic effects	
SE.1.1	The Applicant	Tourism Has any assessment of potential economic effect caused by outbound tourism from local residents going abroad taken place?
SE.1.2	The Applicant	Various relevant representations (including RR-0890, RR-0224, RR-1342, RR-0171, RR-0439, RR-0874, RR-0949) raise concern over the potential adverse effect of flights over Ramsgate on the growing tourist trade. What is your view on this?
SE.1.3	The Applicant	Employment generation and scope for employment [RR-1754] considers that mechanisation of freight would reduce the potential impact of jobs created by the airport. What is your view on this?
SE.1.4	TDC NOTE: TDC may choose to address this question through the	Thanet Local Plan TDC's Draft Local Plan to 2031 (dated 26 October 2018) states at Policy SP02 that:

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	drafting of a LIR	<p><i>"Manston Business Park is the key location for advanced manufacturing and large scale job creating development."</i></p> <p>Explain the effect that the consenting of the DCO could have on the attraction of advanced manufacturing and large scale job creating development.</p>
SE.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Concern in [RR-1601] is raised over the levels of perceived optimism applied to job creation figures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide further justification and detail for the stated employment creation figures for the airport, including direct and indirect figures. ii. Do the skills exist locally for construction workers to be sourced from the local area?
SE.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Has any account been taken of potential job transfers or losses from other areas, should the proposal succeed in attracting freight operations from other airports?</p>
SE.1.7	The Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Has the Applicant identified potential partners for training schemes for required employment positions? ii. Has the Applicant identified potential educational partners and initiatives for required employment positions?
SE.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Is there more information over a proposed community trust fund?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		[AP-034, Table 15.3]
SE.1.9	The Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What effect do you consider that the proposal may have on existing schools nearby in terms of effect on education caused by noise and disturbance? ii. Would schools be eligible for noise insulation grants? iii. Has any consideration been given to any possible effects on the proposed primary school at the Manston Green consented development?
SE.1.10	The Applicant	<p>The AviaSolutions report, submitted as an appendix to the RR from Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Stone Hill Park Ltd [RR-1601] states that much of the previous cargo at Manston was fresh produce from Africa, and that:</p> <p><i>“Manston was almost exclusively used for imports, and this averaged 107 tonnes per import, with virtually no export volume.”</i>[Paras 6.2, 6.3].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Would you envisage a similar import/export profile for Manston under your proposal? ii. If so, how would such an export dominated profile affect the local economy in your view?
SE.1.11	The Applicant	<p>War graves</p> <p>[RR-0839] mentions the existence of twentieth century war graves at the site.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>i. Where are these located?</p> <p>ii. Would the proposal affect them and, if so, what measures are planned to obviate any impact?</p>
SE.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Sections 13.2 – 13.3 of the ES [APP-034] outline the legislation, policy and guidance that have been used in the assessment of this aspect chapter. The methodology applied to the socio-economics assessment is then outlined in section 13.7 of the ES. The assessment focuses on potential impacts during construction and operation to business, employment, local services, crime, safety and tourism, and generally comprises a high-level desktop review of the current baseline followed by a qualitative assessment to determine likely significant effects.</p> <p>In the case of employment, section 13.1.4 of the ES states that the assessment has relied upon the use of secondary data within calculations and assumptions in order to generate an understanding of the potential effects, and highlights the limitations associated with the application of secondary data. Section 13.7 identifies that this secondary data is from National Online Manpower Information System (NOMIS) Labour market statistics provided by the Office for National Statistics.</p> <p>Provide a comprehensive list of the assumptions made in the socioeconomic assessment and confirm whether these assumptions have been agreed with the relevant consultation bodies.</p>
SE.1.13	The Applicant	Paragraph 13.8.13 of the ES[APP-034] states that employment forecasts for

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>the operation of the Proposed Development have been calculated from the forecasts of freight and passenger traffic in the operational phase multiplied by the estimates of job numbers per tonne of freight and per million of passengers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To provide clarity regarding this approach, provide a table presenting a breakdown of these calculations and any assumptions applied. ii. Comment on the robustness of this approach.
SE.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Dover District Council [RR-0490] has requested clarification from the Applicant on the scope of work that will be undertaken to ensure that the economic benefits of the Proposed Development for East Kent can be realised.</p> <p>Similarly, TDC [RR-1941] has highlighted that ensuring that local employment and training is provided from the Proposed Development is a main issue for consideration. The CEMP [APP-011], which is secured by Requirement 16 of the dDCO [APP-006] does state that measures will be incorporated at the construction stage to optimise local recruitment but no further detail on this is provided.</p> <p>Please provide clarification as to how you intend to work with the local planning authorities to ensure that the economic benefits of the Proposed Development, eg as outlined in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments and CEMP, are adequately realised, including an update on any such discussions that are</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
SE.1.15	The Applicant	<p>currently taking place.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1.5 of the ES [APP-033] states that while certain aspects of the Proposed Development, for example the length and width of the runway and taxiways can be fixed for the purposes of application, other aspects, such as the size and location of buildings, will be subject to the Rochdale envelope approach.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1.7 then states that the assessments contained in the technical chapters have adopted a realistic worst case based on the parameters set out in ES Chapter 3 and Figure 3.1. Chapter 13 of the ES does not specify an aspect specific worst case scenario beyond this.</p> <p>The Applicant’s assessment of socioeconomic effects is based (in part) on assumption and professional judgment. The ExA consider that there is an inherent uncertainty associated with this approach.</p> <p>Explain to what extent you have had regard to effects different or greater than those anticipated taking into account uncertainty and the potential for a worst case than that which is presented.</p>
SE.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Section 13.5 and Table 13.19 of the ES [APP-034] set out the mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the Proposed Development in order to prevent, reduce or offset impacts. The table sets out the predicted changes and potential effects on a receptor basis, along with the associated mitigation measure.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Construction Traffic Management Plan and Surface</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Access Strategy and Traffic Plan to secure elements of these mitigation measures. While the detailed mechanism to secure other elements of mitigation is not set out in the ES, it is provided by the draft Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)[APP-011] and set out in the Register of Environmental Action and Commitments [APP-010], which the dDCO [APP-006] proposes to be certified documents.</p> <p>Reference is also made to mitigation measures relating to the generation of local employment as follows:</p> <p>Implementation of measures to optimise local recruitment during construction and operation, including measures to ensure linkages to local training initiatives and/or agreements relating to local recruitment.</p> <p>There is further scope to employ those who are currently unemployed; assumption that approximately 1,800 jobs may be provided to those currently unemployed, if the unemployment rate were to drop as a result of the Proposed Development so that it is more in line with the Kent average.</p> <p>As noted above, in the case of employment, section 13.1.4 of the ES states that the assessment has relied upon the use of secondary data within calculations and assumptions in order to generate an understanding of the potential effects.</p> <p>Please provide details of the monitoring and remediation measures to be put in place to ensure delivery of local employment or to account for impacts which may arise should local employees not be sourced, leading to an increase in the population which in turn</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		places pressure on local services.
Tr.1	Transportation and Traffic	
Tr.1.1	The Applicant	<p>In its RR KCC [RR-0975]state the proposed masterplan for the Northern Grass Area [APP-079] and wider highway mitigation proposals [APP-060 and 061] conflict with draft Strategic Routes Policy SP47 (within the draft Thanet Local Plan - 2031) that seeks to safeguard key road schemes and junction improvements to support the Thanet Transport Strategy.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view?</p>
Tr.1.2	The Applicant	<p>KCC [RR-0975] is concerned that the Proposed Development will generate a material increase in traffic on already constrained highway links surrounding the site such as the B2050 Manston Road and Manston Court Road. This could lead to increased levels of vehicle conflict to the detriment of highway safety, amenity and the free flow of traffic.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view?</p>
Tr.1.3	The Applicant	<p>KCC [RR-0975] believes the trip generation and distribution methodology presented in the Transport Assessment [APP-060 and 061] are heavily based on assumptions which are not adequately justified or referenced to appropriate 'real world' examples in a number of cases; notably Heavy Goods Vehicle movement profiles and load factors, and airport staff shift patterns and staffing requirements.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>KCC set out that this limits their ability to comment on their validity with a sufficient degree of confidence and to assess the appropriateness of the proposed highway mitigation strategy.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view?</p>
Tr.1.4	The Applicant	<p>KCC [RR-0975] believes that the Applicant's mitigation strategy [APP-060 and 061] should be considered within the framework of the draft Thanet Local Plan - 2031 and its supporting Transport Strategy.</p> <p>The site and junction-specific [APP-062 to APP-073] – rather than strategic – approach to capacity assessment taken in the Transport Assessment is considered inappropriate, resulting in highway mitigation proposals that deliver only partial benefits, and which do not align with, or incorporate, the robust, long-term solutions proposed by the Thanet Transport Strategy.</p> <p>What is the Applicant's view?</p>
Tr.1.5	The Applicant KCC	<p>The ES Volume 15 Part 1 [APP-060] Para 3.2.1 notes that "<i>At the time of the preparation of this TA, a formal request to use the model has been made, and a detailed scoping methodology is soon to be provided to KCC. However, the model was not ready to use before the submission of this DCO application.</i>"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is the model yet ready and, if so, will it be used in the production of further traffic analysis? ii. When would this further work be made available to the ExA?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>iii. Please confirm what the impact of the modelling work is on the ES traffic and transport assessment and linked assessments such as air quality and noise.</p>
Tr.1.6	KCC	<p>The ES Volume 15 Part 1 [APP-060] Para 3.2.3 asserts that "<i>Spreadsheet modelling is an acceptable approach and the methodology is set out in this TA.</i>"</p> <p>This assertion needs to be justified.</p> <p>Does KCC agree with it?</p>
Tr.1.7	The Applicant	<p>i. Are there likely to be traffic movements associated with the aircraft recycling facilities, business aviation hangars and facilities, and helicopter stands?</p> <p>ii. If so, have these been taken into account in the Transport Assessment?</p> <p>iii. If so, where?</p>
Tr.1.8	The Applicant	<p>The identification of sensitive links for further assessment has been based on 24 hour traffic flow data (ES Table 14.19 [APP-034]).</p> <p>This does not address any daily peaks in either local traffic or airport traffic, where additional traffic may impact on existing congestion issues.</p> <p>i. Provide further justification for the use of 24 hour vehicle flows (ES Table 14.19 [APP-034]) rather than peak vehicle</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>flows to screen in specific roads for further assessment.</p> <p>ii. Explain whether use of the peak flow rather than the 24 hour flow would affect the findings of the assessment and the links screened into the assessment.</p>
Tr.1.9	The Applicant	<p>The caption for ES Table 14.19 [APP-034] is '2039 Compared with 2039 Peak Operational Traffic Year 20(2039)'. The heading for the sixth and seventh columns of the table reads '2039 future baseline plus construction'.</p> <p>Confirm whether the data in these columns also includes operational traffic.</p>
Tr.1.10	The Applicant	<p>A number of assumptions that underpin the assumed traffic flows used in transport modelling are set out in Volume 15, Section 6.6 of the Transport Assessment [APP-060].</p> <p>The assumptions include data provided by 'the Client' or from 'aviation experts'.</p> <p>Provide further substantiation for the following assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Spreading HGV flows over the 24 hour period rather than considering peak flow periods; ii. 30% efficient working; iii. Traffic counts have been undertaken in the winter rather than the summer periods (March and October);

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. 10% 'tail to tail' ratio; v. Traffic generation data provided by 'the Client' in Tables 6.4.4 and 6.6; vi. Average loads provided by 'aviation experts' (TA paragraph 6.4.17); vii. Mode share (TA Table 6.8); viii. Overnight mode share and definition of 'overnight'; and ix. 45% of staff not on site on a particular day (day off, off shift, sickness) (TA paragraph 6.4.56).
Tr.1.11	The Applicant	<p>The preliminary construction traffic management plan (PCTMP) paragraph 6.5.4 [APP-072] states that year 1 "<i>represents a peak of construction traffic movements</i>".</p> <p>Confirm why year 2 has been selected as the worst case year for assessment of construction air quality and noise.</p>
Tr.1.12	The Applicant	<p>ES paragraphs 14.4.20 and 14.5.23 [APP-034] state that there has been double counting of some heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements during surveys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm which survey locations have double counted HGV flows; and ii. show how the flows have been adjusted to take account of

ExQ1		
	Question to:	Question:
		this.
Tr.1.13	TDC KCC	Do TDC and KCC agree with the scope of cumulative projects considered in the transport assessment [Section 10, APP-061]? What information does KCC consider is available to assess the impact of a Thanet Parkway Station on 2039 traffic flows?
Tr.1.14	The Applicant	Confirm how construction traffic management measures outlined in Transport Assessment Appendix K – PCTMP [APP-072] and operational traffic management measures outlined in Transport Assessment Appendix L – Framework Travel Plan [APP-072] will be secured in the absence of specific reference to this plan in either the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments [APP-010] or the draft Development Consent Order [APP-006].
Tr.1.15	The Applicant	With particular reference to junction 20, confirm what environmental assessment of the junction mitigation proposals due to land take has been undertaken.
Tr.1.16	The Applicant	Respond to Highways England’s objection [RR-673] to the Proposed Development and their concern that M2 J7 and A2-A258 Duke of York Roundabout have not been assessed and that “<i>the applicant has not demonstrated that the development will have an acceptable impact on highway safety or that the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe.</i>”

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Tr.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 5.10 of the Airports NPS states that the Applicant should assess the implications of airport expansion on surface access network capacity using the WebTAG methodology stipulated in the Department for Transport guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Does the TA produced by the Applicant comply with this standard; and ii. if not, in what regard is it deficient and what steps will be taken to make good any omissions?
Tr.1.18	KCC	<p>Provide a response to the way in which the Applicant has addressed your concerns and considerations as set out in the ES Volume 15 APP-060 Table 3.2 'KCC – January 2018 Section 42 Consultation Response'.</p> <p>NOTE: This question may be responded to through a SoCG or a LIR.</p>
Tr.1.19	Highways England	<p>Is Highways England content with the scope of the additional work detailed in the ES Volume 15 [APP-060] Para 3.2.2 and with the results obtained?</p>
Tr.1.20	KCC Network Rail	<p>The ES Volume 15 [APP-060] APP 60 Para 3.4.4 details discussions on the proposed Thanet Park Way Station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What is the current status of the project? ii. Is any progress on this anticipated during the course of this

ExQ1		
	Question to:	Question:
		Examination?
Tr.1.21	The Applicant	<p>The ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] paras 6.4.48 to 6.4.51 address the modal share of staff journeys.</p> <p>Are the figures produced in Tables 6.16 to 6.27 based on the existing provision of rail services or is there an assumption that the proposed Thanet Park Way Station will be operational during the period considered?</p>
Tr.1.22	The Applicant KCC	<p>The ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] para 7.2.1 notes two future year scenarios that have been used in carrying out traffic impact assessments: 2039 Baseline with background traffic growth; and 2039 Baseline with Proposed Development traffic.</p> <p>State whether a more logical formulation should include 2039 Baseline with both background traffic growth and Proposed Development traffic.</p>
Tr.1.23	The Applicant	<p>APP 61 Table 6.2 sets out that construction activities will be undertaken in 2037.</p> <p>How will overall traffic movements in 2037 compare with those in 2039 when there are no construction activities?</p>
Tr.1.24	The Applicant	<p>In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] Table 7.1, Table 7.9: the status of the text below the Tables is unclear.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Tr.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Clarify.</p> <p>In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] Section 7 gives details of junction analysis.</p> <p>For Junction 6 the Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) for the PM peak at A253 Canterbury Road leg is 1.26 for the year 2039 plus development traffic analysis as given in Table 7.22. The RFC for the same leg after mitigation given in Table 7.23 is 1.91.</p> <p>i. How does this represent mitigation?</p> <p>ii. Is this analysis correct?</p>
Tr.1.26	KCC	<p>In respect of In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] Section 7, is KCC content with the lack of mitigation measures proposed for junction 8 as set out in Para 7.11.7?</p>
Tr.1.27	KCC	<p>In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] Table 7.56 shows that junction 16 is currently working above capacity. Para 7.18.7 indicates that this will still be the case following mitigation and using Year 2039 plus development traffic figures.</p> <p>Is this acceptable to KCC?</p>
Tr.1.28	KCC	<p>In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] Table 7.96 shows that junction 27 is currently working above capacity. Para 7.28.6 indicates that this will still be the case following mitigation and using Year 2039 plus development traffic</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		figures. Is this acceptable to KCC?
Tr.1.29	KCC	In respect of In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] Section 7, is KCC content with the lack of mitigation measures proposed for junction 28 as set out in paragraph 7.29.4?
Tr.1.30	The Applicant	In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] Table 7.103 is incomplete. Para 7.30.1 notes that " <i>Junctions that require mitigation are marked with a " "</i> ". <i>Junctions where mitigation could be delivered but is deemed not necessary due to overall network performance improvements delivered by the mitigation measures already in place are noted as " "</i> " None of these markers appears in the Table and this deficiency should be rectified to provide clarity and avoid confusion.
Tr.1.31	KCC	In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] para 7.30.14 sets out the timing and other arrangements for installing mitigation measures at road junctions. Is KCC content with these arrangements?
Tr.1.32	The Applicant	In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] para 7.31.1 Bullet 3 refers to the B5020: this should presumably refer to the B2050 and the reference should be emended to avoid confusion.
Tr.1.33	The Applicant	In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] para 7.31.2 refers to works to be undertaken at three junctions in order to improve road safety and notes that

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	KCC	two of these are also to be improved on grounds of capacity. Does the Applicant, with KCC, intend to give priority to the works which will improve road safety?
Tr.1.34	The Applicant	In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] para 8.4.1 states " <i>To understand impacts on the HE network a series of assessment points were required across the various roads.</i> " Explain the meaning of the word 'required' in this context or is this a typo?
Tr.1.35	HE	In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] Section 8 deals with traffic impacts from the development on the motorway and trunk road network. Is Highways England content with the methods of analysis used and the conclusions of the analysis set out in Paras 8.5.3 and 8.5.4?
Tr.1.36	The Applicant KCC TDC	In the ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] Section 10 deals with sensitivity testing for possible changes resulting from the adoption of the TDC local plan. The potential for changes to the measures proposed for improvement and mitigation to alter as a result of this sensitivity testing is identified. At what stage, if at all, will these changes be made?
Tr.1.37	The Applicant KCC	The ES Volume 15, Part 2 [APP-061] contains Appendices A to D of the ES, with Appendix A giving consultation meeting notes. This question relates to information included in this Appendix.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Various points were raised by KCC in a letter to the Applicant dated 21 September 2017 about a scoping document of July 2017.</p> <p>Have all the issues raised been resolved to the satisfaction of KCC?</p> <p>In a letter dated 16 February 2018 KCC provided a response to the Applicant's second statutory consultation. In this reference was made to a letter of 21 July 2017 containing the KCC response to the first consultation and indicating that the information in both responses should be considered together. The second letter, of 21 July 2017, is not included in the bundle and should be produced.</p> <p>Have all the issues raised in it been resolved to the satisfaction of KCC?</p> <p>The KCC responses to the traffic and transport issues raised in the PEIR are included as Appendix 2 to the letter of 16 February 2018.</p> <p>Have all the issues raised in it been resolved to the satisfaction of KCC?</p>
Tr.1.38	The Applicant	<p>The ES Volume 25, Part 2 [APP-072] notes at Para 2.2.1 that "<i>At this stage in the project it has been assumed that there is no requirement for any Abnormal Invisible Load (AIL). Therefore, the movement of AIL has not been assessed in this Preliminary CTMP</i>".</p> <p>A typo presumably?</p>
Tr.1.39	The Applicant	<p>The ES Volume 25, Part 2 [APP-072] notes at Para 3.8.1 that "<i>Sub-</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>Contractors will be provided with copies of this CTMP and comply with it in full."</i></p> <p>How will this be achieved, monitored and enforced?</p>
Tr.1.39	<p>The Applicant Department for Transport Highways England KCC</p>	<p>What effect will the application have on the implementation of measures under Operations Stack and Brock (or any later iterations)?</p>
Tr.1.40	<p>KCC The Applicant</p>	<p>PRoW</p> <p>Para 2.3.5 of the 'Public Rights of Way Management Strategy' (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073]) cites a chance meeting with a local resident.</p> <p>Have the Applicant or KCC carried out any other more evidenced studies of current usage of the sections of the potentially affected PRoWs?</p>
Tr.1.41	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>PRoW</p> <p>Para 2.3.5 of the 'Public Rights of Way Management Strategy' (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment,</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073]) cites “<i>Heather from KCC</i>”. The ExA assume that this refers to Heather Waller, The East Kent Area Officer-Public Rights of Way & Access Service, KCC.</p> <p>Is this assumption correct?</p>
Tr.1.42	KCC	<p>PRoW</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.1 of the ‘Public Rights of Way Management Strategy’ (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073]) states that:</p> <p>KCC East Kent Area Officer for PRoW & Access Service has been consulted regarding the Proposed Development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Comment on the proposals as set out in the ‘Public Rights of Way Management Strategy’; and ii. confirm or otherwise its formal agreement to them.
Tr.1.43	The Applicant	<p>PRoW</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.1 of the ‘Public Rights of Way Management Strategy’ (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073] states that:</p> <p>“KCC requested that PRoW are to be created and funded under a Section</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>106 Agreement and would be maintained by KCC while remaining part of Manston Airport land. It should be noted however, that the power to undertake any mitigation work required would be established under the powers of the DCO."</i></p> <p>Indicate where in the dDCO this power is included.</p>
Tr.1.44	KCC The Applicant	<p>PRoW</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.1 of the 'Public Rights of Way Management Strategy' (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073]) states that:</p> <p><i>"KCC requested that PRoW are to be created and funded under a Section 106 Agreement and would be maintained by KCC while remaining part of Manston Airport land."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm or otherwise that any agreement will be made a Development Consent Obligation under s174 of PA2008 of the 2008 Planning Act (PA2008); and ii. report on progress in developing this agreement.
Tr.1.45	The Applicant	<p>PRoW</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 of the 'Framework Travel Plan' (Appendix L in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>J (Junction 21B) – O [APP-072]) state that:</p> <p><i>"...the airport is situated sufficiently close to major population centres of East Kent to make walking and cycling for staff members a viable alternative to the car. [...] To facilitate this, retention, enhancement and optimisation of the existing PRow network is required."</i></p> <p>Demonstrate how the proposals for, inter alia, extinguishing and diverting PRowS contained in the 'Public Rights of Way Management Strategy' facilitate this.</p>
Tr.1.46	KCC The Applicant	<p>PRow</p> <p>Paragraph 4 of 'Appendix A - Site visit undertaken on 31 of October 2017 - Meeting minutes' in the 'Public Rights of Way Management Strategy' (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073]) states that:</p> <p><i>"Currently, PRow applications take about 2.5 years to be looked at by KCC. That timescale is likely to soon reach 3 years. If, however, the submission is classed as Nationally Significant Project, that timeframe may possibly be shorter."</i></p> <p>Table 3.1 of the 'Public Rights of Way Management Strategy' (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073]) states in relation to TR8 that: <i>"The previous route will be permanently closed and the new route permanently established. This will be done early in the project life cycle so it is established before major works take place."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Comment on the apparent discrepancy between the timelines for the PRow application and the commitment to undertake this action early in the project life cycle; and ii. Show where the need for this consent is referenced in 'Details of Other Consents and Licences that may be required' [APP-087]
Tr.1.47	KCC Network Rail	<p>PRow</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.6 of the 'Public Rights of Way Management Strategy' (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073]) states in connection with a strategy to create a new link between Thanet Parkway Station and TR9 that:</p> <p><i>"[The] Creation of a new link around the eastern boundary of the proposed Airport redevelopment will not be progressed. This however could be potentially addressed by a bus service providing a north south link should</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>the planned Thanet Parkway Station go ahead."</i></p> <p>Comment on this proposed decision in relation to any proposals for Thanet Parkway Station.</p>
Tr.1.48	The Applicant	<p>PRoW</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.2.1 and 4.1.1 of the 'Public Rights of Way Management Strategy' (Appendix M in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O 3/3 [APP-073]) refer to Figure 2.1 and paragraph 2.2.3 refers to Figure 2.2. Figure 2.1 in this volume is 'CAA 2014 Survey – Modal Share' and Figure 2.2 is 'Passengers per Year vs Total Parking Space – UK Airports Comparison'.</p> <p>Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Indicate where figures 2.1. and 2.2 may be found; or ii. provide a copy of each of them.
Tr.1.49	The Applicant	<p>PRoW</p> <p>Paragraph 2.5.6 of the 'Framework Travel Plan' (Appendix L in the Environmental Statement Volume 25: Transport Assessment, Appendices J (Junction 21B) – O [APP-072]) refers to Figure 2.5.</p> <p>Either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Indicate where Figure 2.5. may be found; or

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ii. provide a copy of it.

Annex A

Abbreviations used in this document

ACP	Airspace Change Proposal	ISH	Issue Specific Hearing
ADMS	Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System	kHz	Kilohertz
AGL	Above ground level	KCC	Kent County Council
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area	KWT	Kent Wildlife Trust
ASCP	Aviation System Capacity Plan	LimA	Proprietary noise mapping software package
ATM	Air Traffic Movement	LIR	Local Impact Report
BOA	Biodiversity Opportunity Area	LOAEL	Lowest observed adverse effect level
BoR	Book of Reference	LVIA	Landscape and visual Impact Assessment
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	MIO	M.I.O Investments Limited
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority	MOD	Ministry of Defence

CCC	Canterbury City Council	NATS	National Air Traffic Services
CCG	Care Commissioning Group	NE	Natural England
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan	NO2	Nitrogen Dioxide
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan	NOx	Nitrogen Oxide
CURED	Calculator Using Realistic Emissions for Diesels	NPS	National Policy Statement
dB	Decibel	NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
dDCO	Draft DCO	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government	PA2008	The Planning Act 2008
DCO	Development Consent Order	PCTMP	Preliminary Construction Traffic Management Plan
DDC	Dover District Council	PHE	Public Health England

DEMP	Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan	PPA	Planning Performance Agreement
Dft	Department for Transport	PRoW	Public Right of Way
DIOS	Defence Industry Organisation Safeguarding	PSDH	Project for the Sustainable Development of Heathrow
DNIS	Dwelling Noise Insulation Scheme	PSZ	Public Safety Zones
DPH	Director of Public Health	RADT	Rejection of Aviation Environmental Design Tool
DS	Drainage Strategy	RFC	Ratio of Flow to Capacity
EA	Environment Agency	RIAA	Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment
EASA	European Aviation Safety Agency	RR	Relevant Representation
ECJ	European Court of Justice	SAC	Special Area of Conservation
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	SoCG	Statement of Common Ground

EM	Explanatory Memorandum	SOAEL	Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level
ES	Environmental Statement	SoS	Secretary of State
EU	European Union	SoST	Secretary of State for Transport
ExA	Examining Authority	SPA	Special Protection Area
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration	SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
HE	Heritage England	SoR	Statement of Reasons
HGV	Heavy goods vehicle	TA	Transport Assessment
HIA	Health Impact Assessment	TDC	Thanet District Council
HRA	Habitat Regulations Assessment	UAEL	Unacceptable Adverse Effect Level
HRDF	High Resolution Direction Finder	UK BAP	UK Biodiversity Action Plan
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization	UKCP18	UK climate projections 2018

ICCAN Independent Commission on Civil Noise

WebTAG Web based Transport Appraisal Guidance

INH Integrated Noise Model

ZTV Zone of Theoretical Visibility