



## Meeting note

<b>File reference</b>	TR020002
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	Callan Burchell
<b>Date</b>	19 July 2016
<b>Meeting with</b>	RiverOak and Amec Foster Wheeler
<b>Venue</b>	Temple Quay House, Bristol
<b>Attendees</b>	Tony Freudmann – RiverOak George Yerrall – RiverOak Suzanne Burgoyne – Amec Foster Wheeler Toby Gibbs – Amec Foster Wheeler  Susannah Guest – The Planning Inspectorate Richard Hunt – The Planning Inspectorate Callan Burchell – The Planning Inspectorate
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Manston Airport - Project Update Meeting
<b>Circulation</b>	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 developer (or others) can rely.

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

The Planning Inspectorate advised that it would not be possible to comment on the potential outcome of the ongoing s53 authorisation request relating to site access by the developer and scoping processes. Any discussions during the meeting would be undertaken on a without prejudice basis to those ongoing processes. The Scoping Opinion would be based on information received as part of the Scoping Request and from statutory consultees only.

### Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

#### Project Update

The developer (RiverOak) provided a general update on the progress of the scheme since the previous meeting. In summary, the developer noted that they have recently conducted non-statutory consultation events at six venues in the area and RiverOak reported a high number of attendees across these events. The developer provided a broad outline of the matters discussed over the course of these early consultation events both in the context of expressions of support and issues raised in respect of, for example, flight paths, night flights, height of hangars, visual impact, local road impact, noise, pollution and compensation/mitigation. The developer explained that the consultation period for these consultations would run until the end of 5 September 2016 and noted their intention to publish the results.

The Planning Inspectorate made the developer aware of correspondence it had been receiving that highlighted some observations and concerns about the recent non-statutory consultation events; the Inspectorate provided a sample of correspondence and confirmed that they would be providing advice to individuals to encourage them to make RiverOak directly aware of the comments. The Planning Inspectorate asked what the role of Save Manston Airport (SMA) Group was during such events. The developer explained that some members of the group had volunteered to assist. The developer stated that statutory consultations will be co-ordinated by an external consultant. The meeting discussed and agreed the significance of ensuring that information/data is clearly managed as part of the statutory consultation process.

The Planning Inspectorate questioned what lessons have been learnt from the recent non-statutory consultation events. The developer noted that they have developed further understanding of how they will draft their Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), and additionally noted understanding of how it will be used for future statutory consultation events.

The Planning Inspectorate queried the progress of engagement for the proposed project. The developer informed the Inspectorate that there have been additional meetings with Kent County Council; however, there have been no further meetings with Thanet District Council. The developer indicated that no further discussions have been scheduled with environmental bodies and other key stakeholders until the Scoping Opinion had been issued.

### **Section 53 and site access**

The developer queried the likely timeframe regarding a decision on the Section 53 request. The Planning Inspectorate highlighted that there is no prescribed statutory timeframe within which the Planning Inspectorate must determine the Section 53 request.

The developer asked whether there are any Section 53 requests that have been determined based on their timeframe of dialogue with the existing landowner. The Inspectorate referenced [Advice Note series five: Section 53: Rights of Entry](#), where it states that the developer must demonstrate why they consider that they have been unreasonably refused access, given the timeframe to reach an agreement with the landowner.

### **Scoping Report**

The Planning Inspectorate requested further information on matters relating to the Scoping Report. In summary, the Planning Inspectorate requested further information

such as the location of the proposed fuel farm, consultation since submission, noise measurements and abbreviations list.

The Inspectorate queried the location of the proposed and original infilled fuel farms. The developer informed the Inspectorate that the proposed fuel farm will replace the previously used farm when the airport was in full operation. The developer stated that the original infilled fuel farm was located to the north of the B2050 Manston Road.

The Inspectorate asked the developer whether there has been further consultation with Southern Water regarding deep piling since the Scoping Report was submitted. The developer noted no further discussions have taken place regarding these matters due to no site access and that it was unclear whether deep piling would be required.

The Inspectorate queried whether the developer had developed their discharge consent, and whether there is an indication of how much of the existing site can be used. The developer highlighted that no further information was available on these matters due to no site access.

The Inspectorate questioned whether there will be residual waste recycling on site and what method of recycling will be used. The developer noted that they are in discussions with a German recycling firm who specialize in recycling all materials used from planes. The Inspectorate queried whether existing buildings would be demolished. The developer stated that the requirement to demolish buildings would be dependent on their condition and that this would need to be established once site access had been achieved.

The Inspectorate asked whether the southern rail access could be used during construction for the transportation of materials to, and from the site. The developer noted that a rail siding had previously been used to import fuel to the airport but is not part of the proposed scheme.

The Planning Inspectorate sought clarification on the following abbreviations:

- FBO – Fixed Base Operations
- NDB – Non-Directional Beacon
- DME – Distance Measuring Equipment
- VDF – Very High Frequency Direction Finder
- ADF – Automatic Direction Finder

The Planning Inspectorate queried whether the developer had given any consideration to carbon footprinting on the proposed scheme. The developer noted that they will be conducting studies on carbon footprinting as part of the EIA process. Additionally they noted that some within the airport industry were currently considering carbon neutral airports.

The developer highlighted that their Red Line Boundary is likely to change.

### **Specific decisions / follow up required**

- Agree date for next Project Progress Update Meeting.