



Meeting note

File reference	TR020002
Status	Final
Author	Louise Evans
Date	26 September 2017
Meeting with	RiverOak Strategic Partners (RSP)
Venue	Teleconference
Attendees	Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) Gareth Leigh – Infrastructure Planning Lead Richard Hunt – Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor Richard Price – Case Manager Louise Evans – Case Officer The Applicant Tony Freudmann – RSP Niall Lawlor – RSP Oliver Gardner – Amec Foster Wheeler Angus Walker – BDB Law Alex Hallatt – BDB Law
Meeting objectives	Project update
Circulation	All

Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Project update

The Applicant confirmed that work on preparing the application was progressing, and that they were still aiming to submit in full before Christmas 2017. The Applicant stated that they were continuing their analysis of consultation responses received, but had so far not come across any major obstacles or issues.

It was agreed that draft versions of certain documents would be submitted to the Inspectorate on Friday 29 September 2017, including the Development Consent Order (DCO), Explanatory Memorandum, Statement of Reasons, Book of Reference, Consultation Report and Funding Statement. Draft versions of the Land Plans and Works Plans would be submitted the following week, and chapters of the

Environmental Statement and Habitats Regulations Assessment Report submitted the week after that. The Inspectorate advised that their review at this stage would involve examining the structure of the documents as well as their content, and requested at least one hard copy version of the draft documents.

With regard to the community outreach requested by the Applicant, the Inspectorate advised that it would consider this once the application was submitted but could not commit to it at this stage.

Consultation update

The Applicant confirmed that over 1700 responses had been received by email or post using their consultation feedback form, and nearly 500 emails had been submitted to the Applicant's project email address. The Applicant stated that about two thirds (65%) of the responses received to Question 1 of the feedback form ('To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposals for Manston Airport?') had selected 'Strongly Approve' or 'Approve'.

The Applicant confirmed that the principal issue that had been raised in response to the consultation was noise in the local area; in particular as a result of night flights during operation. The Applicant stated that a decision had been reached to impose restrictions on the amount and type of night flights that would occur during operation, based on a 'quota count' system and specified aircraft types. The Applicant confirmed that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) assumed 8 night flights as a worst case. In addition, the Applicant highlighted that noise controls would include on-site noise mitigation during operations, a noise insulation package to be made available for local residents within the vicinity of the scheme, and no scheduled passenger flights between 11pm and 6am, plus a limited number of flights between 6am and 7am. The Applicant confirmed that penalties would be imposed on aircraft that did not comply, and that these restrictions would most likely be sought to be secured in the DCO by Requirement.

The Applicant stated that air quality as a result of aircraft movements had also been raised as an issue during the consultation, and that they will now provide a Health Impact Assessment at the request of Public Health England. Concerns over whether or not the local road network will be able to withstand the level of traffic as a result of the Proposed Development have also been raised as a concern.

Consultation was ongoing with the Ministry of Defence in respect of the High Resolution Direction Finder on the site.

Two areas of complaint had been raised regarding the statutory consultation, which were that the Applicant did not distribute their leaflets widely enough in the vicinity of the airport, and that the consultation event held at Ramsgate at the weekend was too short.

With regard to the former complaint, the Applicant stated that their draft Statement of Community Consultation had originally proposed to distribute leaflets within 1km of the airport's boundary. After receiving feedback advising them to increase this to 3km, the Applicant decided to increase to 2km which it considered to be proportionate.

With regard to the complaint concerning the length of the weekend consultation event, the Applicant stated that they had tried to extend the time but this was not possible as the hotel had other bookings, and that this was the only venue available at the time with disabled access. The Applicant confirmed that the event at Ramsgate was the busiest of all with over 400 people attending; no attendees were turned away, and they had provided a full team of consultants to advise on the Proposed Development and answer questions.

EIA update

The Inspectorate queried which version of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (the EIA Regulations) the Applicant would be applying. The Applicant stated that the application was subject to the transitional provisions of the EIA Regulations 2017 therefore the application would be accompanied by an EIA under the EIA Regulations 2009. The Applicant stated that they will comply with the EIA Regulations 2017 where practicable.

The Applicant provided an update on their progress with Habitats Regulations Assessment, surveys and contamination assessments. The Applicant confirmed that they are using guidance from the Civil Aviation Authority in relation to effects on ecology due to overflights of Pegwell Bay, specifically with regard to the noise parameters for defining significant effects.

The Applicant confirmed that surveys are on-going at the site at present, and that ecological surveys have been planned up until the end of 2017.

The Applicant confirmed that Statements of Common Ground with the Environment Agency and Natural England were progressing. The Inspectorate advised for these to be submitted either with the Application or as early in the Pre-Examination stage as possible.

Access to land

The Applicant confirmed that they are currently undertaking site surveys under a voluntary access license with the current landowner, Stone Hill Park, but that they are considering engaging section 172 of the Housing and Planning Act (HPA2016) for land access post-DCO submission. The Inspectorate reiterated its opinion that access to land should be based on the specific provision (s53 of the PA2008) rather than a general provision (s172 of the HPA2016). The Applicant was referred to the Inspectorate's s53 FAQ document in this respect.

The Inspectorate informed the Applicant that a meeting had been arranged with representatives of Stone Hill Park, at Temple Quay House on 27 September 2017, and that a note of the meeting would be published afterwards.

Specific decisions/ follow up required?

- It was agreed that a face to face meeting would be arranged within the next month to discuss the Inspectorate's review of RSP's draft documents. [This has subsequently been arranged for 2 November 2017]