



Meeting note

File reference	TR020002
Status	Final
Author	Kate Mignano
Date	16 February 2017
Meeting with	RiverOak Investment Corporation LLP, now RiverOak Strategic Partners Ltd
Venue	Teleconference
Attendees	RiverOak Investment Corp LLP, now RiverOak Strategic Partners Ltd Tony Freudmann - RiverOak Niall Lawlor - RiverOak George Yerrall - RiverOak Alex Hallatt - Bircham Dyson Bell The Planning Inspectorate Tom Carpen Richard Hunt Richard Price Kate Mignano
Meeting objectives	Project Update
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

The Planning Inspectorate advised on its openness policy, explaining that any advice given would be recorded and placed on the Planning Inspectorate website under section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Surveys

RiverOak Investment Corp LLP, now RiverOak Strategic Partners Ltd (RiverOak) gave an overview of activity since the last project update meeting on 26 January 2017. Following authorisation being granted under section 53 of the PA2008 to access the site for environmental survey work, RiverOak advised that its consultants had completed a range of surveys within the specified timeframe including the following:

- Biodiversity: Surveys within the red line boundary were carried out for protected species and habitats.

- Remediation and groundworks: Non-intrusive surveys identified potential contamination related to the historic use of the site as an airport.
- Historic environment: RiverOak confirmed that archaeological features had been identified on site and would be subject to assessment. RiverOak stated that it would agree the most appropriate method of dealing with any finds with Historic England. RiverOak confirmed that it did not anticipate carrying out geophysical survey work for the site. Discussions with the Archaeological Trust were on-going and an update would be provided at the next project update meeting.
- Water environment: A 'site walkover' was carried out. The walkover focussed mostly on the site topography and natural drainage channels. RiverOak confirmed the surface water outfall pipe which runs from the airport site to Pegwell Bay had previously been diverted. The Inspectorate advised that all works (including drainage) must be included within the red line boundary and land interests must be taken into account.

Pre-application programme

The 'design freeze' was anticipated at the end of February 2017, facilitating certainty in the presentation of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). Statutory Consultation was scheduled to begin in May 2017 and run for 6 to 8 weeks. RiverOak confirmed that the application is expected to be submitted to the Inspectorate late in 2017. RiverOak had employed Copper Consultancy to manage its consultation process.

RiverOak advised that its draft Statement of Community Consultation (dSoCC) was sent to Thanet District Council for comment at the beginning of February 2017. The Inspectorate advised that it could also review an Applicant's dSoCC from a procedural perspective, and RiverOak advised that it would take up that opportunity. The Inspectorate advised that its comments would be published on its website as advice under section 51 of the PA2008.

RiverOak expressed its opinion that a tripartite meeting with Thanet District Council and the Inspectorate would be helpful in the lead up to the submission of the application. The Inspectorate advised RiverOak to continue to seek to establish dialogue with the Council. The Inspectorate advised that where there was agreed value to all parties, it may be able to facilitate and impartially chair a process-focused meeting between relevant Council officers and the Applicant.

A second potential tripartite meeting with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and the Inspectorate was also discussed, where there was agreed value to all parties. The Inspectorate advised that such a meeting could most usefully take place prior to statutory consultation and would be themed around the separation of the CAA's responsibilities between the PA2008 process and the airspace change process.

Draft documents

The Inspectorate explained the purpose of submitting draft documents for review was to allow the Inspectorate to identify any potential procedural issues, or risks for any parties if the application progressed to Acceptance and, if accepted, the Examination of the application. The Inspectorate advised RiverOak to ensure sufficient time in the

program to allow for any comments made by the Inspectorate to be robustly considered prior to the formal submission of the application.

The Inspectorate confirmed that the introductory chapters of the Environmental Statement (ES) (ie description of the development, methodology etc) and any draft Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) could be reviewed as part of draft documents. However, the Inspectorate advised that the ES could not be reviewed in its entirety.

RiverOak confirmed that following its Statutory Consultation, draft documents would be submitted to the Inspectorate for comment. These would include the introductory chapters of the ES, a detailed draft Development Consent Order and Explanatory Memorandum, the Consultation Report, Land Plans and Works Plans.

AOB

The Inspectorate noted that there had been some media coverage regarding advice that had been issued recently in relation to the Manston Airport proposals. RiverOak confirmed that it was aware of the media coverage.

Specific decisions / follow up required?

- RiverOak to provide dSoCC to the Inspectorate for comments.
- The Inspectorate to consider value and timing of tripartite meetings with Thanet District Council and the CAA, in discussion with those parties.