

Agreed (signed) Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and Dover District Council

TR020002/D6/SOCG/DDC

Examination Document

Project Name: Application Ref: Submission Deadline: Date: Manston Airport Development Consent Order TR020002 6 3 May 2019

MANSTON AIRPORT DCO [201X]

Planning Inspectorate Reference: TR020002

Statement of Common Ground

Between

RIVEROAK STRATEGIC PARTNERS LIMITED

and

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL



*

and the		Docum	ent control
		Docume	nt properties
Parties			RiverOak Strategic Partners Limited and Dover District Council
Author			
Approved by			
Title			Statement of Common Ground between RiverOak Strategic Partners Limited and Dover District Council
Document re	ference		
		Versi	on history
Date	Version	Status	
25/01/2019	1	Draft	Applicant issued to DDC
11/02/2019	2	Draft	Additional drafting from Applicant and DDC
15/02/2019	3	Final	Submitted at Deadline 3
29/04/2019	4	Final – updated	Updated for submission at Deadline 6 to reflect latest position

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction and Purpose	4
2	Summary of Consultation	4
3	Matters which are fully agreed between the parties	5
4	Matters outstanding between the parties	9

.

1

1 Introduction and Purpose

1.1 Purpose of Statement of Common Ground

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") is between the Applicant and Dover District Council (DDC) in relation to the application for a development consent order to re-open and operate Manston airport in the district of Thanet in Kent (the 'DCO').
- 1.1.2 The Applicant submitted the DCO application to the Planning Inspectorate on 17 July 2018 and it was accepted for examination on 14 August 2018.
- 1.1.3 The Applicant and DDC are collectively referred to in this SoCG as 'the parties'. The parties have been, and continue to be, in direct communication in respect of the interface between the application and DDC's interests.
- 1.1.4 This SoCG has been prepared in response to the request for a SoCG between the parties made by the Planning Inspectorate at Annex F of its Rule 6 letter, dated 11 December 2018, and supplemented by the Rule 8 letter where an additional matter is set out at Annex B. Other matters, such as those raised by DDC's Local Impact Report, have likewise been addressed.
- 1.1.5 It is envisaged that this SoCG will evolve during the examination phase of the DCO application.
- 1.1.6 Subsequent drafts will be agreed and issued, with the version numbers clearly recorded in the 'Document Control' table at the beginning of the document.

1.2 Dover District Council

- 1.2.1 DDC is a neighbouring local authority to the area within which the development is located.
- **1.2.2** DDC submitted a relevant representation, a written representation, and a Local Impact Report to the Examining Authority.

1.3 Status of the SoCG

1.3.1 This signed version of the SoCG represents the position between the Applicant and DDC at Deadline 6.

2 Summary of Consultation

- 2.1 Consultation carried out by the Applicant and the way in which it has informed the application for development consent is set out in full in the Consultation Report (APP-075) submitted with the application for development consent.
- 2.2 DDC was included in the pre-application consultation carried out by the Applicant. DDC and the Applicant have continued direct communication in respect of the application for development consent and issues pertinent to DDC's interests throughout the examination stage.

3 Matters which are fully agreed between the parties

3.1 This section of the SoCG describes the 'matters agreed' in detail between the parties.

Table 3.1: Matters which are fully agreed between DDC and the Applicant

SoCG ID	Matter	Date agreed
3.1 The scope of v	work anticipated to ensure that the economic benefits of the Proposed Development for East Kent car	n be realised.
3.1.1	 The Applicant is intending to form a Local Employment Partnership Board (as with London City Airport). This Partnership Board would consist of representatives from Dover District Council, as well as Thanet District Council, Swale Borough Council, Canterbury City Council and, potentially, Kent County Council. The Partnership Board may also include other stakeholders such as Job Centre Plus, and providers of careers services for adults. The aims of this Partnership Board would be to: Act as a conduit between the Airport Company and local, regional and national government, taking responsibility for local strategic education, training and employment issues associated with the presence of an operational Manston Airport. 	Deadline 3
	Suggest initiatives that meet local need	
	 Bring together parties working on initiatives around the area where collaboration would have greater impact for the local community. 	
	Allocate available funding.	
	Ensure suitable performance targets are set and monitor progress against these	

5

	targets.
	 3.2 The Applicant is in discussion with various stakeholders to agree a wide range of initiatives that would be secured via a Section 106 Agreement. These may include:
	Preparing an Employment and Skills Plan.
	 Liaising with schools and HE and FE providers of apprenticeships, graduate placements, workplace training and world of work to secure placements with the Airport Operator, airlines and others in the supply chain.
	 Working with local HE, FE and schools to provide opportunities to learn about aviation-related careers and to raise aspirations.
	 Recruiting ex-employees of Manston Airport creating a database of those interested in returning to work at Manston, wishing to retrain or with a desire to pass on their skills to others.
	The first meeting of a wide group of stakeholders took place on the 9 January 2019 with a second meeting scheduled for 20 February. A full list of potential inclusions to the Section 106 Agreement has been circulated to the group and will be discussed and augmented at
	the next meeting. It is hoped that following this a draft Section 106 Agreement can be circulated reflective of the various parties' preferences.
3.2 The need for	r, and possible content of, a Development Consent Obligation under s174 of PA2008.
3.2.1	An agreement pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning 1990 (as amended by the Planning Act 2008) is proposed to secure the economic benefits of the proposed development for East Kent as set out at 3.1 above. The detail of the content of the agreement will be determined through discussions with those stakeholders identified

	above.	
3.3 West Stourmouth no	ise baseline	
3.3.1	DDC questioned the exclusion of West Stourmouth from the baseline monitoring data when DDC had previously advised that adverse noise effects have been identified there to the point where there would be a perceived change in the quality of life. DDC referenced paragraphs 12.9.67 and 12.9.69 of the PEIR that identify West Stourmouth as suffering from a minor adverse impact during the day and moderate adverse impact at night. DDC requested further engagement on this. On behalf of the Applicant, Wood responded to state that short-term noise measurements during the day and night were used for locations further from the airport as it is considered by Wood to be impractical to undertake long term measurements at all sensitive receptors and instead focusses the baseline monitoring on locations close to the airport where the noise effects are expected to be highest. Review of the West Stourmouth estimated baseline sound levels is presented in Table A12.4.8 of Appendix 12.4 of the ES for location OBS 6 and presents 45 dB LAeq.8hr for the night. On the basis of the available information it is considered this approach to be reasonable and the estimated sound levels to be representative.	Deadline 3
3.4 West Stourmouth no	ise insulation contours	
3.4.1	The proposed noise insulation scheme meets the requirements of the Aviation Policy Framework and goes beyond it in principle for the schools and community buildings. A request can be made for consideration of the 60 dB LAeq,16hr contour but it would be at the discretion of the operator.	Deadline 3
3.4.2	DDC requested West Stourmouth residents are consulted on the proposed noise insulation scheme and that surveys to identify properties to be included are undertaken in this area. The Applicant has responded to say that the West Stourmouth area is outside the noise contour to which insulation will apply. Inspection of the noise contour plots presented in Figure 12.4 of the ES confirms this. As such the response is considered reasonable based on the presented noise contour data.	Deadline 3

		•
3.5 Noise and vibration	n assessment during construction and operation	
3.5.1	DDC commented that the noise and vibration assessment did not include any properties in the DDC area, during construction or operation. The Applicant responded to say that construction noise impacts and noise from mobile and fixed plant on the airport would generally be limited to 300m. The effects traffic noise during operation and construction has been assessed for roads where a material change in noise could occur. The Applicant responded to say that the study area for aircraft noise demonstrated most of the DDC area lies outside the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect (LOAEL) contour for daytime and night time noise. This approach s in line with the methodology and aviation policy and is considered reasonable. Whilst outside the LOAEL day or night, it is noted that West Stourmouth is within the 80 dB LASMax contour as presented.	Deadline 3
3.6 Night time period		
3.6.1	DDC recommended the night time period should be quoted as 23.00 – 07.00. The Applicant agreed and notec that this had always been its intention. The response is considered reasonable.	Deadline 3
3.7 Noise insulation so	heme	
3.7.1	The DDC consultation response details DDC's welcoming of the Noise Mitigation Plan and seeking to work proactively with the Applicant to ensure the provision of necessary mitigation measures. The response from the Applicant is to welcome this. The response is appropriate, subject to the level of engagement between the Applicant and DDC. It is noted that no properties within the DDC area are predicted to be eligible for noise insulation.	Deadline 3

3.8 Open field testing			
3.8.1	As noted in the previous version of the SoCG as submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-178) (signed copy submitted at Deadline 4 (REP4-003)), Dover DC requested further information on the operations of open field testing. Further details were provided by the Applicant and appropriate mitigation measures are now detailed in the updated Noise Mitigation Plan submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-008), such that this matter is now agreed.	Deadline 6	
3.9 Landscape and visual	impact		
3.9.1	As noted in the previous version of the SoCG as submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-178) (signed copy submitted at Deadline 4 (REP4-003)), Dover DC noted that it had requested further information in order to assist it in assessing the landscape and visual impact of the proposals and any alternatives from receptors located within the Dover District. The Applicant subsequently asked Dover DC to clarify what further information it sought as the Applicant had thought that this had been provided. Dover DC has confirmed that in fact it has the information it had sought. As such, this matter is now agreed.	Deadline 6	

*

4 Matters outstanding between the parties

4.1 There are currently no matters outstanding between the parties.

Signed on Behalf of RIVEROAK STRATEGIC PARTN	ERS LIMITED
--	-------------

Signature	
Name:	
Position: Director	
Date: 2nd May 20	19

Signed on Behalf of the DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL

Signature:



Name: Adrian Fox

Position: Policy and Projects Manager

Date: 19 May 2019