



Meeting note

File reference	TR02002
Status	Final
Author	Callan Burchell
Date	22 April 2016
Meeting with	RiverOak
Venue	Telecom from Temple Quay House, Bristol
Attendees	RiverOak Tony Freudmann - RiverOak Niall Lawlor - RiverOak George Yerrall - RiverOak Alex Hallatt - BDB Tom Henderson – BDB Geoff Dewick – RPS The Planning Inspectorate Susannah Guest – Infrastructure Planning Lead Richard Hunt – Senior EIA Advisor Callan Burchell – Assistant Case Officer
Meeting objectives	Manston Airport project update
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

The developer was reminded of the Planning Inspectorate's openness policy that any advice given will be recorded and published on the planning portal website under s51 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) (PA 2008) and that any advice given does not constitute legal advice upon which the applicants (or others) can rely.

Introductions were made by everyone present, and individual roles were explained.

Project Update

RiverOak provided an overview of the activity since the previous meeting, outlining the progress of the masterplanning work, critical elements of the proposed scheme and appointments to the consultancy team since the previous meeting. RiverOak additionally updated the Inspectorate of their current indicative timetable.

In respect of masterplanning, RiverOak explained that they are still working on the basis that Manston Airport would be capable of providing more than 10,000 additional freight movements a year. RiverOak informed the Inspectorate that they are currently refining the number of options in respect of the masterplanning process and taking into consideration matters such as capital expenditure.

RiverOak informed the Inspectorate that discussions with landowners are continuing. The Inspectorate queried whether there had been any further consideration in respect of the likelihood of a/some s53 authorisation requests. RiverOak informed the Inspectorate that while they were in discussions with the landowners a s.53 application was a strong possibility. The Inspectorate emphasised the timescales regarding any s53 request and highlighted the Inspectorate's Advice Note 5.

RiverOak outlined its approach to Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) licensing and in particular the requirement for an Aerodrome Traffic Zone. RiverOak provided a brief overview of the process and potential requirements for achieving a CAA licence and indicated that they may wish to submit a formal application to CAA in advance of any formal Development Consent Order application.

RiverOak mentioned that a meeting had been held recently with Kent County Council and that they would confirm with Kent County Council that they were happy to share the note of that meeting with PINS.

RiverOak informed the Inspectorate that there have been discussions between their environmental consultants, Amec Foster Wheeler, and the Environment Agency regarding the Environmental Statement. RiverOak stated their intention to submit a Scoping Request to the Inspectorate in May 2016. The Inspectorate queried whether the red line boundary (RLB) is likely to change prior to submission for Scoping to the Inspectorate. RiverOak informed the Inspectorate that the RLB could change and, in that event, RiverOak would send a revised shapefile to the Inspectorate two weeks prior to Scoping submission, in line with the requirements of Advice Note 7.

The Inspectorate informed RiverOak that information to support the Regulation 6(1)(b) notification as specified in Regulation 6(3) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (as amended) was missing from their notification letter. RiverOak confirmed that they would investigate and would provide any missing information in compliance with the Regulations.

The Inspectorate requested information regarding RiverOak's proposed timetable. RiverOak informed the Inspectorate that they intended to conduct non-statutory consultation in June 2016, with a stage of statutory consultation towards Q3 2016 and with formal submission at the end of 2016. The Inspectorate strongly advised that developers seek to avoid, where possible, overlapping consultation activities noting that there could be an overlap with the timetable for scoping responses and any responses from members of the public to the non-statutory community consultation in June. The Inspectorate noted previous experience where members of the public had responded to the Inspectorate in relation to the scoping exercise, which would not form part of the Inspectorate's scoping opinion, but that it was unclear whether similar concerns had then been directed straight to the developer as part of any other consultation activity in order to influence the evolution of the project and assist the

developer in understanding the range of issues at an early stage. RiverOak noted the Inspectorate's concerns and were confident that any confusion could be avoided by explaining the separate processes in the relevant consultation/scoping material.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

- Arrange Inception Meeting with RiverOak, Thanet District Council and The Planning Inspectorate
- Arrange submission of Scoping Opinion to the Planning Inspectorate
- RiverOak to supply note of KCC meeting if possible
- RiverOak to supply additional Regulation 6 information as necessary