

# Manston Airport Design Options Workshop – Aviation and technical stakeholders – transcript

2pm-3pm, 14 July 2020 – via Zoom

## Attendees

Name	Organisation
[REDACTED]	Air Navigation Solutions
[REDACTED]	Biggin Hill Airport
[REDACTED]	British Gliding Association (BGA)
[REDACTED]	British Helicopter Association
[REDACTED]	British Microlight Aircraft Association (BMAA) / General Aviation Safety Council (GASCo)
[REDACTED]	Gatwick Airport
[REDACTED]	Honourable Company of Air Pilots (HCAP)
[REDACTED]	Maypole Airfield
[REDACTED]	Rochester Airport
[REDACTED]	NATS
[REDACTED]	RiverOak Strategic Partners (RSP)
[REDACTED]	Osprey
[REDACTED]	Osprey
[REDACTED]	Copper Consultancy
[REDACTED]	Copper Consultancy
[REDACTED]	Copper Consultancy

[REDACTED]

Okay, hello everyone, and thank you for your patience. We were just waiting to make sure everyone who was joining was online and ready to go. Welcome to this focus group on Manston Airport Design Options - part of the airspace change process that Manston commenced last year and I know some of you have been involved in earlier stages of the process. My name is [REDACTED] I'm from the community relations team from Manston. In a moment, I'll introduce [REDACTED] Director of RiverOak Strategic Partners. The organization working to reopen Manston as an air freight hub. Will then have a presentation from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] from Osprey representing technical consultants advising on the airspace change. Following the presentation, there will be an opportunity to ascertain [REDACTED] with some questions. But first, a brief note of good housekeeping. Apologies if you're getting some sound interference at the moment.

Normally, at these sorts of events will be telling you where the emergency exits and fire escapes were but clearly there's no need for that in the brave new world of digital. However, a few things to point out very quickly before we do get going. Firstly, the focus groups being recorded, so please be aware of that. It's to help us make sure we capture all of the questions raised for inclusion in the evidence we provide the CAA. Secondly, can I ask that you make use of the raise your hand option when it comes to question time. You can find that if you click on the "participants" button, and that will help us make sure that we come to you if you've got a question that you want to ask, but also avoid what I'm sure you've all experienced on zoom calls and team calls when you get people talking over each other and some of the feedback we just experienced from various mics being open. So I suggest you hold fire on raising hands until the presentation from [REDACTED] is complete because they may well cover off questions that you have in the course of the presentation. And when we do come to the Q&A, raise your hand, and I'll introduce you and we'd like you to ask your questions and state the name and the name of the organization you represent. And we'll then go to [REDACTED] to answer the question and then come back to you for any follow up or points of clarification. We're sure there'll be lots of strong opinions today, and that's absolutely fine. But I think in the interest of time, if someone's asked a similar question, when you were going to ask perhaps lower your hands, make sure we can get as many different views as possible, and as many questions answered, as we possibly can. And the final thing just to point out from me is that whilst we will be recording and clearly taking note of any comments made on the call today, we would still like your written feedback. So we'll share details as to how to respond and the deadline, which we'd like you to respond by the close of the call. But this focus group isn't intended to be, instead of written feedback, it's just to help give you in a bit more detail on what's being proposed, and answer any points that might help hone your responses. That's all the housekeeping and I'll hand over to [REDACTED] to say a few words of introduction, and then we'll get into the presentation with [REDACTED] over to you.

[REDACTED]

Just unmuted myself and I'm assuming everyone can hear me. Thank you very much for joining the focus group last time was held in October [*correction: should state November*] when the world was more normal than it is now. And we were all actually present in the same room at the same time. We were finally granted the development consent order last Thursday, the ninth of July, which means now we can move things forward. As we originally planned, we had hoped when we last met as a focus group in October [*correction: should state November*] that we would get the decision in January. It was postponed from January to May and then again from May to the ninth of July. But here it is, and we now have it and if you'll allow me, I will read briefly from the Secretary of State's acceptance letter of the ninth of July because as many of you will know, much has been made of the fact that the examining authority recommended against the granting of the DCO. And we would like to place on record the fact that the majority of the work of the examining authority was very thorough and very scrupulous. And the way the system works is the examining authority reports at length to the Secretary of State who makes the decision. They can make recommendations, which the Secretary of State can either accept or reject. In this case, he's decided to grant us the DCO as indeed is the case in a number of other DCOs of recent times. And I'd just like to, with your permission to read from paragraph 20 of the acceptance letter. He says whilst noting the examining authorities consideration of need and conclusion that the applicants (that's us) failure to demonstrate sufficient need substantially against the case and

development consent being given, the Secretary of State disagrees and concludes there was a clear case of need for the department, which existing airports Heathrow, Stansted, EMA and others able to handle freight would not bring about to the same extent or at all. The Secretary of State concludes that significant economic and socio economic benefits would flow from the development to Thanet and East Kent as well as more widely, including employment creation, education and training, leisure and tourism benefits to general aviation and regeneration benefits. In addition, as a result of the development the potential exists for Manston Airport to develop and grow into a transport asset for the UK, which will provide a number of significant benefits locally, regionally and nationally, complimentary and in addition to those able to be provided by existing airports. These include increased capacity available in North Kent important export of freight by air to and from and within the UK including support for high value and time critical transport of goods, increased connectivity to the North Kent area, benefits which flow from its location in terms of its accessibility, enhanced access to markets and to end users facilitating of inward investment, support for the advanced manufacturing sector in which the UK is looking to build competitive strength and the provision of a passenger and executive airport in North Kent. The Secretary of State gives substantial weight to the above public benefits both individually and cumulatively.

And then paragraph 21. And I'll stop at this point it says it is to be concluded in addition, that the development would support the government's policy objective to make the UK one of the best connected countries in the world and for the aviation sector to make a significant contribution to economic growth of the UK. Because the government's aviation policy that airports should make the best use of their existing capacity and runways subject to environmental issues being addressed, substantial weight is given by the Secretary of State to conclusion that the development would be in accordance with such policies, and the granting development consent for the development would serve to implement such policy.

So that's just by way of record in the Secretary of State's letter, the ninth of July. And it's against that context that we now embark on the next stage of our airspace change engagement. At that point, I'm happy to hand it over to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Thank you very much, [REDACTED] And good afternoon, everybody. And thank you for attending this virtual focus group for Stage Two of the CAP 1616 process for Manston airport. I'm not going to through a long presentation, however, if we do need the part three, Annex A stage two document to reference, I'll ask [REDACTED] to bring that document up. But I assume that you've all looked through that. I'll just remind you that at this stage where we're still looking at options, and this is a stakeholder engagement and the consultation formally, will take place sometime next year. What we wish to achieve really from this is if you have supplementary questions, any options that you think should or should not be taken forward, perhaps with the reasons why. And we'll take written responses as well as well as recording what takes place at this virtual group. And also really to ask questions about further options and what to do later on within the process. In April we circulated the design principles that we're working to. And we then, later in April and May, we circulated initial broad spectrum of design options in the form of Sways, eliciting responses. From that we've now reviewed these and these are the design options in part three that

we're asking you to comment on at this stage. So I'd ask everybody really just in a disciplined manner to raise their hand or post questions or any points of interest that you'd like to add to the documentation that we have at the moment.

[REDACTED]  
I think we have a question from [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Hello. My name is [REDACTED] I'm representing Maple airfield, which is a small GA Airfield under the flight path to the west, and also am a GA pilot. So my interest in this really is twofold as a resident of Thanet anyway but also in respect to the airspace. So my points, I'll keep them brief. My first one is really just the obvious question, which is that I assume that someone has suggested that for the two eight departures instead of the South departures instead of routing them all South over populated areas, it's not possible to make them route them North initially around the Isle of Thanet. So across the Coast at Reculver and then route them around the island clockwise. I know it's a slightly longer route, and it may be a daft suggestion. But you know, I mean, to me, that would mitigate an awful lot of the nuisance caused by climbing aircraft. That's the first point. Sorry.

[REDACTED]  
Sorry [REDACTED] can I just stop for a second?

[REDACTED]  
Sure.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] here from Osprey. You mentioned a name place - now we're not local - when you said routing North?

[REDACTED]  
Yes.

[REDACTED]  
Can you just confirm the place you're talking about?

[REDACTED]  
Yes. If you look at page 22, which is the runway two, eight departures to the south,

[REDACTED]  
Yeah.

Because they're routing South they take off to the West, and then they all turn, turn left turn South.

██████████  
Yeah.

██████████  
What I'm suggesting is instead of turning left, turning South, they turn right North.

██████████  
Yes.

██████████  
And then they'd be very quickly would then be over the sea.

██████████  
Yeah, and the same as the options on page 24. And as ██████████ said, it's just a variety of options. It was just the name of the location you mentioned to route over?

██████████  
You can see it there at that nearest location is Birchington on that map.

██████████  
It is Birchington okay, thank you.

██████████  
But it would mean initially treating the Southerly departures as Northerly departures and then, you know, by the time they're over Margate, as you say that they're at 5000 feet anyway, so they could then just carry on South down the channel.

██████████  
And that is the intention of the options on the next page that go north first. That is the intention, as you say.

██████████  
Yeah, the northerly but not the southerly departures. They don't get to 2000 feet until they're halfway over Kent before they're even above 2000 feet and climbing obviously, which is the noisy phase of the flight.

██████████  
This is the left-hand departure towards to the South that Dover is.

██████████  
To Dover yes.

██████████  
Okay, that's valuable feedback. Thanks very much for that.

██████████  
And you know, it's a longer route, but thousands of people would not be overflown by climbing aircraft. If you adopted that approach anyway, so you've got the hang of that anyway. So the other thing really just relates to Maypole as the airfield, which is you know, we've obviously dealt with Manston before when it was an active airfield, and cohabited with them quite happily, that's not a problem.

The document is a little bit deficient in that, although it shows the establishment of the ATZ the circle over the actual airfield, it doesn't really show any other airspace that might be established to support the, for example, the runway 10 ILS approach. So on page 29, you show a hole to the North and a hole to the South. So shall I wait until you get that up, page 29.

██████████  
I think ██████████ - just to interject – it's ██████████. We're not planning at this stage to introduce any other controlled airspace. Now there will be the 80s ed. And the rest will be Class G operations.

██████████  
Right. Okay, well, that's fine. That's welcome. Because obviously, you know, everybody in GA is a bit sensitive about Farnborough and the fact that they grabbed a tremendous amount of controlled airspace when you know, from GA. But where you've got those two holds shown, one to the North and one to the South.

██████████  
Yes.

██████████  
So for those of you who perhaps are not quite so aviation literate, the hold is basically a stack where aircrafts are told to fly around in circles before they're released to the approach to the airfield. So, as an aviator, we've got obviously we've got South End to the North. We've got the danger areas to the North, which are active at 13,000 feet. You've got the restricted zone over the wind farms, which you can just see on the top right there, which is active up to flight level 65 So, to cut the long story short, any GA flights going North are in trouble already because they've either got to go left round South End, which is a big diversion left, or they've got to go right around the sheer nest danger, the firing range, which puts them right out over the North Sea and in a single engine piston aircraft that's unnecessary risk. So if I was taking off from Maple, which is basically Herne Bay, and going North, I might be in conflict with some rather large iron flying around in circles at 3000 feet, which is about the level that I'm going to be flying. So how are you going to deconflict the GA aircraft in the class G which is basically uncontrolled, it's free for all - how are you going to deconflict the planes, the GA planes from the cargo planes?

I think [REDACTED] that's an operational question. It's, certainly worth feeding that back in a written response. I expect, as in the previous arrangement to, perhaps have a letter of agreement with Maple and air traffic at Manston, so they can provide you with a service through that area if indeed the hold is established in that area. One thing I'd also note is that the whole job, hardly likely to have a stack there. And that's predominantly an emergency hold, the rate of traffic into Manston would probably dictate. It's on a rare occasion that you wouldn't have any air traffic in that hole.

[REDACTED]  
Okay, no fair enough. Obviously we'll put this in writing. But my fundamental point is that there's a GA airfield right under the approach to 10, runway 10 and we don't want to get to a stage where we can't take off unless we ring you first. Which is you know, that's what we're worried about.

[REDACTED]  
I think as always, there's a mutual operating procedure here that will have to be for safety grounds and I expect the Civil Aviation Authority would expect that. I don't think it would pose any restriction but it would allow you some sort of liaison priority with Manson about going across the lower Thames Estuary. And perhaps you wouldn't want to do that without a service anyway. It would be good airmanship to do that with some sort of listening watch as a minimum.

[REDACTED]  
Okay, that's great. Thanks very much.

[REDACTED]  
No problem. Thanks, [REDACTED] Please remember, to put in a written response with more detail if you want on that.

[REDACTED]  
I can't see any other hands raised at the moment. I'm sure there're other questions. I know as I say that I see we have a question from [REDACTED] so [REDACTED] we'll unmute you in a moment. And then please introduce yourself and ask your question.

[REDACTED]  
Hi, my name is [REDACTED] I'm representing both the Gliding Club and the British Gliding Association. And my question really was on the Southern hold, which is located for holds, it's the one that's located over the land and it's located actually right across the top of the Kent Gliding Club at Challock. And obviously, they've expressed concern at this, primarily on its location and really want to know what can be done about it. Or are there any plans to have a letter of agreement of your approach to the club or anything like that.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] hi, [REDACTED] I'll be able to take this one. Just bear in mind for this document, and it's all to do with a CAP 1616 process all the holds seen in these documents, the procedure designers prefer to plan holes at IAFs for procedures. That said, in terms of Manston, it's a very rarely used procedure. The amount of traffic in Manston is going to be relatively low to start with anyway. So we're not saying that

we are going to have this hold and the North hold and the holds for the two other approaches. And this is exactly the feedback we're looking for. It is unlikely that this hold will come to fruition because, as you say, the gliders overland, the communities overland, just don't want it, but we've shown it as something to aid the discussion. And we'll take your points on that. Absolutely.

██████████  
Okay, yeah. That's right.

██████████  
It is just an example hold of where it could be, as is the Northern one for the same approach, there's nothing to say they have to be there, we can move them, we can have a single hold for both approaches, we can have a hold for each. There are lots of options. And this is the sort of thing we're looking feedback for now so we can say you know what, you guys don't like these, let's move into somewhere else and make it easier. So this is part of the CAP1616 process, this is where it's going to go. So the feedback is very valuable. We had it also from one of the parish councils, specifically about this hole as well. And we acknowledge that.

██████████  
Okay, yeah I fully understand that and I'm sure I'll pass that along and get all the members of the Kent Gliding Club to respond to the document, pointing this out. Thanks very much.

██████████  
Just one point on that ██████████, we would probably prefer a response from the club itself rather than individual responses.

██████████  
Okay.

██████████  
Why I would say that it's not a referendum and it's not a weight of numbers necessarily that would sway CAA in their decision. It's a response from in this term. And I'm sure they all have the same view. But at this stage, of course, as you say, this is stakeholder engagement.

██████████  
Yeah.

██████████  
And this is why we are directly involving you at this stage before the formal consultation next year to see what restrictions there are on options, but we do have to consider all available options before we start to really drill down into more detail and this is why your type of feedback is very, very valuable at this stage.

██████████



Okay, yeah, thanks very much.

██████████  
No problem. Thanks very much.

██████████  
Thanks, ██████████. Thanks, ██████████. And again, I think you're all very polite and waiting for the end of a question before you raise your hand or nobody else has any other queries on. I can't see any hands up at the moment. If that's the case, I might suggest, ██████████, whether you wanted to just round up, talk about next steps. I'll just give people a few more seconds just to jump in with a hand, but I don't think there is. So perhaps we could wrap up and just talk about next steps. And when we'd like people to respond by 14 August.

██████████  
That's great. Thanks, ██████████. I'll get ██████████ to talk about next steps. Just something I want to pose before that, because the feedback is valuable. And I think ██████████ you touched on this actually, there is always a constant tension between route track miles. So CO2 and NO production by engines and limiting the noise impact to the local population and ██████████ you stumbled on that in your comments earlier, quite eloquently really, in that yes, ideally for example, off two eight or runway 28 probably to keep noise disturbance to the local community to an absolute minimum, it would be off the end over the hedge right hand turn as soon as we can to get over the lower Thames Estuary. And as you said, then going over the sea all around the houses or avoiding their houses, as it were in encircling the island of Thanet to achieve altitude to reach you on your route network. Of course, that is a costing track miles but it does avoid a lot of overland flight and a potential disturbance. And I think it's worth highlighting at this point that people do understand that and it is probably something very, very important that will need to get across to the CAA, to the local community, to allow a balanced decision to be made.

██████████:  
Thanks ██████████. I was a little bit hasty, we have a hand raised by ██████████, which has now been lowered. But we'll give ██████████ the mic in a moment just to check whether he still wants to raise a question. And then we'll go to ██████████ who also has a question.

██████████  
Thank you, that's brilliant. ██████████ I'm a TC, terminal controller on the south bank at Swanwick. And I've just got a question regarding the arrival transitions. They look to be for runway 28210, they look to be in very different positions where the connection of your design connects with our routes at 7000 feet. So for runway two eight - can't remember what page it is - it looks to be an EMKAD as a connection point. And I think the runway - is that runway one zero sorry - then runway two eight looks to be somewhere different, which is just off the page. Is that the case or is there going to be a single point where we connect the higher level design to this arrival transition?

In terms of the design, I mean, the bottom line is if you look at the two eight arrival transitions, and just in first, they were, again, they're just multiple options to give us the flexibility at this stage to see what would suit so we can facilitate northern arrivals, Southern arrivals, and they're all basically, certainly the two that are off to the east to the right hand side of the page on page 37, are from - and I can't remember their names - recognized reporting points coming through and fit in with I think South End arrivals so it was sort of dovetailed into other people's already procedures. Same with the northern one. Certainly the one that's going off to the north northwest was effectively in the vicinity of Jacko, which I believe we might be able to facilitate a arrival through traffic to the north, and the southern one was effectively piggybacking off , I think it's the Southend arrival through all the London City Biggin Hill. So it's not definitive in terms of the map at the moment. It's just from those general directions so that if anything, we are piggybacking off extant procedures and then dropping out of the airways to arrive at the transitions.

[REDACTED]:  
So let's just take an example of an aircraft coming from the west of the USA is so there's an EMKAD I think arrival point which is just quite close to Detling.

[REDACTED]:  
Yes.

[REDACTED]:  
So basically, we're saying we have in different arrival routines for different runways in use?

[REDACTED]:  
Possibly if we can, because obviously if you can come from EMKAD and route, northeast, overland, so people might have issues with that, to join the ones who approach from the south, obviously from in terms of track miles that's the most expeditious as opposed to doing what the other option would be which I think is also on the transition slide for one zero, which is coming from – if you look on page 38 - the Arrival from the north ...

[REDACTED]:  
Yeah.

[REDACTED]:  
... That is one of the points within the London City point merge.

[REDACTED]:  
Yes.

[REDACTED]:  
It was just an example point so they could join through the London City, which I believe come south, south about around the coast, join the point merge. And then the London City in particular, transiting westbound through the lower Thames Estuary, and again, piggybacking off to that and dropping off on to the IAF ones that are approached.

██████████:

██████████ sorry to interject, if there's a slide you'd like me to bring up do let me know and I'll get the appropriate image up.

██████████:

I think in this case, it will be the last one, page 29. If you can quickly. Am I right? No, no. Go back up again. Sorry. Okay, no, no. Keep going. No, that one. Yeah. Sorry. Down. Yeah. So from the west, no, no. previous one. Previous that's it.

██████████:

Yeah.

██████████

So yeah, just from the west, if we could, as you say the EMKAD is already on a procedure, a routing, so, envisaging the possibility of dropping out the bottom of that to join a procedure from the south, if not, following the London City or South End arrival all the way around towards the point merge, and then dropping out of the point merge onto the I.F. so, it's just an example of that where it could be okay.

██████████

Okay so from a TC perspective, it might be a little bit different. I've got to send apologies to about ██████████ who is due to join us shortly. But from a TC perspective, let's just say well, coming from the west, you know, that arrival routes that mimics City, Biggin Hill, South End routes works very well.

██████████

Yeah.

██████████:

And if you've got the situation of let's say an aircraft coming from the US, coming from the west, getting down to kind of 7000 foot type of level by EMKAD is going to be very, very difficult. Just through City itself, then Biggin, so the usual, usual people.

██████████

I look at and go, do you know from EMKAD if we get to 7000 feet there we can drop into the IF.

██████████

Yeah.

██████████

If you tell me from procedure we can't do that, that's exactly the feedback we're looking at, which will then say we will feed the approach in.

██████████:

I think, probably realistically a lot of time in optimal procedures, you'd find yourself being given a plane even on the radar heading, which would be, you know, to get the level crossed with the outbound from the TMA, or it could be a lot higher than 7000 feet, which obviously both are not very, not ideal. Really.

██████████:

Yeah. And that's as I say. Here's me throwing an option for you, you tell me it doesn't work, then that's fine. That's exactly what we're looking for at this stage of engagement.

██████████:

Yeah, I mean, when I was looking at it from an earlier points of view, you know, from a TC perspective, UMTUM looks at decent place. You're kind of in between that route coming in from the southeast. But it's just getting that height off, getting down to 7000 feet by that point could be very, very tricky.

██████████:

Yeah. Perfect. Yeah. Just to go back, the transitions to runway two, eight. Again, the southern one piggybacks off playing off the same route of South End arrivals. The other ones are more direct from other than the Jacko one, from FIR boundary crossings. It's when we talk to ██████████ last time he said it's feasible but again, it may or may not work. They are just options for us to look at.

██████████:

Yeah.

██████████:

It may work. If you tell us they won't, then obviously it's an option that we'll be taking off the table.

██████████:

Absolutely no problem. Thank you.

██████████:

It's certainly worth detailed feedback, ██████████.

██████████:

Yeah.

██████████:

Just so we do start to slim down those options and, and understand, let's say the cat's cradle that we have to thread through as well to get traffic down in particular from the west.

██████████:

Yeah, no problem I can send in an email too if that helps as well.

██████████  
Great. Thanks, ██████████. We'll go to ██████████ next. And then I see we've got a question from ██████████ and then ██████████. So if we go to ██████████ first of all.

██████████:  
Hi, all this is ██████████, representing Gatwick Airport. And my questions are slightly different again, general comment. I mean, your design looks fine for now and everything's okay from our side. The real questions are probably at a meta level. I've got two. So question one is have you done or do you intend to do any work on interrogating general sector demand and handling by a NAT of all your traffic in relation to all the other traffic in the area? So that's question one. And then question two. I know this has been sort of integrated into FASI South originally. What's your intent in relation to that? Is there going to be additional work done to adjust with any improvements coming through FASI South?

██████████:  
I think to jump to your second question, ██████████ it kind of answers your first question as well.

██████████:  
Okay.

██████████:  
We are fully integrated with the FASI South program

██████████:  
Okay.

██████████:  
So yes, it will to answer that. And then of course that then feeds into your first question that, yes, because it's part of FASI South, we'd expect that to be done in collaboration with the re-systemization above 7000 feet so we get a good grasp of traffic density.

██████████:  
Okay.

██████████:  
We think we have to give a little bit in the route structure into and out of Manston below seven, because of Manston's traffic density as we've already alluded to. But to allow the more busier airports to the West yourselves, and Heathrow in particular, as well as actually going as far as Luton and up to South End as well. So there will be that integration that will have to take place and we expect that to be part of the FASI South systemization.

██████████:  
Okay, so then just to clarify, there will be no ... you don't intend to do anything outside of FASI South as in existing aspects.

██████████:  
Correct.

██████████:  
Good. Okay. Thank you.

██████████:  
Thanks ██████████. We'll go to ██████████ and then ██████████ if we can.

██████████:  
██████████ if we could unmute ██████████, so he can ask his question. Thank you.

██████████:  
Hello

██████████:  
Hi ██████████ Sorry about that.

██████████:  
Okay. Well, it took me a while to work out how to raise my hand so technology problems.

██████████:  
Well thanks for your patience.

██████████:  
And good afternoon ██████████ representing Rochester airport. Firstly, broad brush, no issues with the relatively ambitious desire to have a two and a half nautical mile ATZ around the airfield that we don't see any issues with. I note the point about the holds but as a fairly recently retired airline pilot, we really don't use holds very much now on normal operations for an airport with the sort of density that Manson will have.

Having said that spent many a happy hour in the willow hold at Gatwick but as I don't see holding being significant into Manston. The question I have really is have you got any ideas where your radar head will be located and very topically now, and I was to a certain extent career wise involved in the starting of Doncaster which, of course is controlled in terms of area remotely from Liverpool. Whether you're looking perhaps at South End doing your approach controlling? Whether you will indeed even have a runway controller or whether the runway might be remotely controlled from an outside supplier, so I'd be interested to hear on that subject. Thank you.

██████████:

It's an excellent question, ██████. Operationally, we're looking at all options at the moment. Yes, looking at remote tower operations, whether the services provided by them or another ANSP, whether there will be a host radar or whether again, the radar will be remotod as well. So we're looking at all options at the moment, and certainly within with a let's say, a weather eye to future capabilities as well. Particularly as you know what is happening at City in terms of remote tower remote operations there. And it's certainly something that's within the mix.

██████████:

Yeah. Relations with South End in the GA community I think are particularly good. They're a very competent unit. They have a large number of their controllers are active GA pilots and they, they seem to get us. And I, you know, I feel that there would be a great synergy between the two airports. I appreciate their radar and it stretches legally to 25 miles. But presumably that could be upgraded. And there could be a very useful service there I think.

██████████:

I think you're right. And we've already chatted to Southend about local operating procedures as well and as we were discussing earlier with ██████ about crossing the lower Thames as well for GA. So yes, that's certainly all in the mix and something we need to start to nail down now of course, that sort of decision was pending on the DCO. But now we'll be looking at the technologies available and how we're going to manage the air traffic movements around the airport.

██████████:

Excellent. Thank you very much.

██████████:

Thanks, ██████. We'll go to ██████████ next. ██████ been waiting patiently for a while so if we unmute ██████, he can ask his question.

██████████:

Okay, let's go. Just to be aware of the requirements that we're trying to achieve within the LAMP set up within FASI South of continuous descent particularly climbing out to the East from Biggin Hill versus inbounds specifically on your southwesterly approach. One zero. Yeah, I think that's something that TC have hinted on earlier on is the ability to get down, could well be quite restricted to be able to get down to levels where you can safely position in bounds for the approach to one zero. And I just think it's something that needs to be borne in mind really, because we will be looking I know and I know other people were as well for continuous climbs outbound within the new structure the TMA.

██████████:

Yeah. Thanks, ██████ You're right. And it goes back echoing a lot of comments from all the other airports. There's a lot hooks into what happens with FASI South and there will have to be some give and take between airports on their procedures. And I think that's really one reason we've looked at the

majority of the routes going over the Lower Thames and as we alluded to earlier, the roundabout route, shall we say around the island of Thanet. Because yes, it'll be maybe increased track miles but certainly will allow continuous climb and continuous descent operations to minimize emissions in terms of CO2 and NO, even though track miles are increased.

██████████

Yeah, I think the other thing is because the point mode system is fairly well established at the moment. Obviously, we wouldn't have begun what are our number of inbounds restricted and because of unavailability of routes, so, I suppose, feeding into that point merge system would probably work better for most, well for ourselves anyway, London City as well.

██████████:

I'm sure ██████ and ██████ will have eventually. But you're right. That's why we've tried to piggyback in areas and certainly that arrival into one zero from the northeast, effectively mimicking the point merge even though it'll be descending underneath it, but at least it fits in with the traffic orientation scheme over the Lower Thames.

██████████

Yeah. Okay. Providing it stays that way of course. Who knows? Okay, thank you.

██████████:

Okay I'm, again, not seeing any hands. So I'm hoping that means we've answered all of your questions for today. Do raise your hand quickly if that's not the case. Otherwise, we will look to wrap up and I've just been reminded by my colleague ██████ to make sure that you have the deadline for responses which is Friday, the 14th of August, and also the email address to send your comments to. So if you could send comments to [manstonairspace@communityrelations.co.uk](mailto:manstonairspace@communityrelations.co.uk) by Friday, the 14th of August, that would be really very much appreciated and really helpful to all of the Manston team as we progress this airspace change process. I'll hand back to ██████ briefly just to wrap up. But thanks very much for attending and for your questions. That's been really helpful.

██████████

I think one thing I'd like to reiterate guys is, yeah, we've recorded this. The transcripts will be put with the CAA, but don't be worried about mentioning anything else that you've forgotten about. Please get that down on a written response. I think Justin there maybe quite a workload on you at the moment for the let's say, a FASI response and as well from ██████ but please try and get down as much as you can. At this stage, and I know a lot of guys are still on furlough, but of course, we will take into account as we go into the next stage anyway.

██████████

Yeah, no problem. I'm going to be able to chat with ██████ later and probably ██████ as well. So we'll have a chat and see if they've spotted things that I haven't brought up as well. So that's no problem.

██████████



Thanks very much for that I'd appreciate that. And that's about it, guys. Unless anybody's got any late questions or questions about process perhaps, for the rest of the CAP1616?

██████████  
I can't see any hands ██████████ so I think we might give people 15 minutes of their lives back.

██████████  
Yeah, that's a good idea. ██████████ Thank you. Thanks very much, everybody who's joined us on this. And, yeah, keep the comments coming. We appreciate those. And it will help the CAA as well. And it will help the whole of the Aviation community. Thanks very much, guys.