

Manston Airport Design Options Workshop – non-aviation stakeholders – transcript

6:30-8pm, 15 July 2020 – via Zoom

Attendees

Name	Organisation
██████████	Blean Parish Council
██████████	Broadstairs & St Peters Town Council
██████████	Folkestone Town Council
██████████	Ickham and Well Parish Council
██████████	Minster Parish Council
██████████	Ramsgate Town Council
██████████	Thanet District Council
██████████	Woodnesborough Parish Council
██████████	RiverOak Strategic Partners (RSP)
██████████	Osprey
██████████	Osprey
██████████	Copper Consultancy
██████████	Copper Consultancy
██████████	Copper Consultancy

██████████

In a moment, I'll introduce ██████████ Director of Riveroak Strategic Partners and the organization working to reopen Manston as an air freight hub. ██████ will say a few words, then hand over to ██████████ from Osprey, who are RSP's technical consultants advising on the airspace change proposal. And they're on hand to answer your questions on the design options we've shared with you and other stakeholders in advance this session tonight. But before we do that, some very brief items of housekeeping. First of all, as you may have read in the invitation, the focus group this evening is being recorded. That's to help us make sure we capture all of the questions that you've raised for inclusion in the evidence that we'll provide to the Civil Aviation Authority, which will show how we've involved stakeholders in the process and how your views have helped shape the design options. Secondly, can I ask that you make use of the raise your hand function when it comes to question time. So you can find this if you're not familiar with zoom, you can find it by clicking on view participants, and just clicking on the hand icon and remembering to click on it again to lower your hand once you've asked your question. I'll then come to you in turn, and my colleague Andrew will make sure you're unmuted to enable you to ask your question. When he does so, please introduce yourself state the name of the organization you represent. That would be really helpful. Thank you. And once the team's responded to your question, we'll come back to you just to give you an opportunity to make any follow up points or ask for clarifications. Once the team have responded to your question, and you've had your opportunity to follow up, we'll ask that you remain on mute when you're not asking a question. Purely so

we can avoid the feedback effect that you get with so many open mics on a on a busy call like the one we're on this evening. So, before I hand over to [REDACTED] just a little bit more about the purpose of this evening session, we recognize you may have strong and differing views on some of the topics we're going to discuss, we'll do our best to give everyone an opportunity to contribute. But please help us make the best use of the time we've got this evening to keep your questions succinct where you can and avoid covering ground that others have already covered. Just to summarize what the focus of the session is about, it's about understanding your preferences where there's more than one option given in the literature that we've provided, hearing about any suggested amendments to the design shown or any alternative ideas that you may have, hearing about any options you think shouldn't be taken forward, and the reasons why. And also giving you the opportunity to ask questions about the options that we provided, which we hope will help to inform the written response that we would be delighted to receive from you in the organizations you represent. So on that point, just a bit of a reminder really that whilst we are recording the session tonight, and we'll obviously be listening carefully to the views that you share with us, we would still very much appreciate written feedback from you. So please, if you could send any comments that you have via email to the email on the screen there manstonairspace@communityrelations.co.uk. And the deadline for sending us your responses is Friday, the 14th of August. So that's all the housekeeping. I'll now hand over to [REDACTED] to say a few words of introduction, [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

Good evening, everyone. Thank you very much for joining this focus group. Some of you took part in the last one we held back in October [*correction: should state November*] when times were a bit more normal, and we were able to actually see each other and in the flesh, we're not able to do that at the moment. Let's hope that by the time we move to the next phase of this process that we will be able to do it in the traditional way. The airspace change, part of the process is a very, very key part of what we're planning to do because the surrender of the airspace, if I can call it that by the people that bought Manston in 2014, was designed, we think to ensure that the airport would never be an airport again. So the reinstatement of that, with the advantages that Manson has in terms of relatively uncluttered skies and therefore the unlikelihood that aircraft will ever be put into a holding pattern over in the skies of Manston is important for us.

Last Thursday, the development consent order was granted. And the Secretary of State made his position very clear and I'm going to read to you from paragraphs 20 and 21 of the of the decisions so that you can, so that it's clear to you where the Secretary of State is coming from. And for those of you who don't know, to make it also clear that it's just, it's almost exactly a year since we purchased the freehold of the airport so this company River Oak owns Manston airport. And when we bought it, we covenanted that it would be an airport and that we would not be building houses on it or doing anything else with it. It will be an airport.

The words of the Secretary of State at paragraph 20 are as follows: " The Secretary of State concludes that there is a clear case of need for the development, which existing airports Heathrow, Stansted, East Midlands 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 generally.

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 would provide a number of significant benefits locally, regionally and nationally, complimentary and in addition to those able to be provided at existing airports. These include increased capacity available in North Kent for import and export of freight, by air to 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, the 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.

Paragraph 21 then reads. In addition, it is to be concluded 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. It is 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 the conclusion that the development would be in accordance with such policies, and that granting development consent for the development would serve to implement such policy”.

So that's our starting point. And the importance of these focus groups for us is to ensure that representatives of the community are able to express a view about the flight paths and other matters relating to the use of the airspace. So having said my bit on behalf of Riveroak I'm going to hand over now to [REDACTED] of Osprey, thank you.

[REDACTED]
Lovely. Thanks very much, [REDACTED]. Good evening, everybody, and thanks for joining us. I'll just reiterate a couple of points and then we'll get into the meat of the meeting. This has been an ongoing process, as you know as part of stage one and stage two and we're into the final parts of stage two in terms of stakeholder engagement, and thank you for your previous contributions. Just remember that this stakeholder meeting is really focused on the latest document that we produce, which was the Manston Airport airspace design procedures, options development, part three, which has been a shortlist of options per, shall we say from the initial broad list of options that you were provided with earlier in the process and the opportunity to comment on. Remember that this is a short list, and nothing is finalized at the moment but we would value as [REDACTED] said, your opinions on what we've produced so far so that we can progress the process and take design options with detailed environmental studies backing up to the CAA towards the end of the year then go into full public consultation with those sort of designs in 2021, probably the middle towards the end of 2021. And with that, I'll leave the floor open now to questions, and any points of clarification that you would like ladies and gentlemen.

So at this point, I would ask you to raise your hands and I see, I think the first question we've got is from [REDACTED] So [REDACTED] we'll go to you now, if you could, state your name and where you're from that would be great too.

[REDACTED]
Sure. Can you hear me okay?

[REDACTED]
Loud and clear.

[REDACTED]
Excellent. Okay, my name's [REDACTED] I am a counselor for Ickham and Well parish Council. For anyone that doesn't know where that is, it's literally on the outskirts of Canterbury, directly, potentially affected, shall we say by overflight by planes arriving and leaving for Manston based on the document that we've seen. So hence the reason I'm attending in to represent the Parish Council, we have already responded in a Word document, you probably have my apologies in advance that it's fairly strongly worded. The reason for that was we're basing it on there isn't really any information about the actual concerns that we have about the potential use. And all the sort of day to day kind of worries, the ordinary people on the ground living underneath these flight paths are going to have so it's very difficult to respond to something because it feels to us a little bit like if we agree to these things now, then it's very hard to then call it a question or, or raise concerns later on, because we're over the principle and now we're just haggling the detail. Well, we're not we're not quite there as far as we're concerned. So my first question really is a simple one. It's of the concerns that I put in writing, which I hope you've had a chance to review. Which are all really to do with the day to day operation, flight path, regularity, heights of planes, how often they're going to be flying overhead, how often the flight paths directly over Ickham will be used, noise pollution, key performance indicators that the operator is going to be held accountable on potential ... well, what would we call them? Mitigations I suppose that they that the operator may put in place, if any of these key KPIs as I'm calling them, but you know, whatever you want to call them are breached in any way. What are the penalties for that? What's the reporting method? So all the sort of stuff that actually concerns people that live around the airport? It's all well and good you know, we're bang up for a decent commercial airport but obviously, at the same time, I don't want my house ruined by the process in the middle. A lot of the residents in my parish at least have raised a lot of concerns about that. So the question is, when will that information be made available to us? Because that's the stuff we actually care about at this point. And it's very hard for us to commit to operating principles, for flights in and out, when we don't know what we're really committing to. Hopefully that makes sense.

[REDACTED]
It does. [REDACTED], I think the first thing I would say is that you're not committing to anything at the moment. We're still grabbing your opinions. And I think hopefully, that will reassure you. There's nothing set in stone. These are about your opinions about these proposed shortlist of procedures. And yes, how they particularly affect you or your residents. Some of the questions you've alluded to there are operational

questions and some of them were answered in the DCO process as well. So we will take all those forward to the CAA but some of them are very difficult to answer at the moment. This process that was about the design of the procedures. And I would like to, your residents and yourself to focus on your opinion of those procedures at the moment in relation to the design principles, if you recall that we came up with, or stakeholders came up with last year. Where we looked at minimizing the environmental effects, one of the high priorities was minimizing the impact of noise in particularly sensitive areas. And we would like to know your opinions based on the design principles, where you think there are better options maybe or where you think that is a good solution to perhaps some of the concerns that you have?

██████████
Okay, so I understand what you're saying. Obviously, I think that maybe your earlier consultation didn't go as wide as you perhaps think it did. Or perhaps we missed it. Quite happy to acknowledge we may have missed that.

██████████
Can I just interrupt for a second ██████████? We haven't actually entered consultation yet. This is stage two of the process. This is stakeholder engagement. Full consultation will take place next year. And that's when the whole of the public will be involved in a consultation.

██████████
Yeah, okay. From experience, these kinds of consultations will be wrapped up before then. And I'm not entirely convinced by what you're saying. Okay. So I understand that ...

██████████
██████████ there's a well written projecting ... processing CAP 1616. We're applying to that, we'll do this element, then at the end of November is taken to the CAA. They will independently view the process that we've gone through to make sure that it complies with the regulatory process. The ideas will be taken forward. And then we'll take a very narrow design options to the public then to make comment on. There's nothing, nothing in stone at the moment at all, ██████████

██████████
Okay, that's good to hear. So, in response to that, literally just the specifics of the document you sent out, which seems to be what we're restricted to here. Then, two of those pathways seem to head straight over our village. But there seem to be options heading in every single direction I can think of. It just seems to be a blanket proposal. Describe to me how it's been adjusted or designed specifically to address environmental noise impacts, for example, because it just looks like a circle with a whole load of arrows going in every single direction, both counterclockwise and clockwise with options for landing and access in both directions. I don't understand.

██████ can I just confirm that you're actually referring to Appendix A Manston Airport airspace design and procedures, options development part three.

██████████
Let me try and find the document. Bear with me. I don't have it in front of me. So you'll just have to hang on for a second. Quite possibly. Yes, I believe I did. I believe that's the document the entire parish Council is looking at unless we were given something different to look at. But we the one that was sent to us is the one that we looked at. And on there seem to be various options that had Manston with a circle on it and arrows heading in all directions around the compass. So am I missing ... have we misunderstood the document perhaps?

██████████
That is, that's an earlier document from an earlier stakeholder engagement, there's an updated document that your council should have received and should have been distributed by either the secretary or the treasurer.

██████████
Okay, I can tell you now that hasn't been distributed. And to my knowledge, it hasn't been received the document that I was forwarded, I've not got one on file from the previous consultation because I wasn't on the council for the previous consultation. So the one that was sent to me is the one that was attached to the email inviting consultation from you guys.

██████████
I don't think that's correct, not recent one. Perhaps...

██████████
Okay, there is only, the only one I've had to respond to is the one that you guys sent us. So there may have been some kind of a clerical error or administrative error there or something like that. Well, maybe the only other option can be possibly that our Clerk reattached the wrong attachment to a forwarded email from you guys. I don't know.

██████████
Perhaps that has happened. So let me reassure you we will take your email address and we will immediately send you the update document or the document that should have. And of course, you still got until August to respond to that, if you will.

██████████
That will be great, I will have to re table that to the entire group, obviously, because we've already had a parish council meeting about it. We've got all of our feedback, the public have had an opportunity to respond to it. So yeah, okay. What we will have to do then is if you can reissue it, I'll re table it for the

next parish council meeting. Hopefully people will have a chance to get in touch because it's Monday, but that should still give us time to respond within the deadline.

██████████
Yeah, that's excellent.

██████████
Okay.

██████████
Brilliant. Thank you very much.

██████████
I might be more... I might be less bothered about it then after that. So we'll see what happens. Thank you very much for your time.

██████████
Thank you, ██████████ I think we'll go to ██████████ who I believes got a question, ██████████

██████████
Hi. Yes, I represent Blean parish Council which is basically between Whitstable and Canterbury. Having looked at this latest document, I can't see that Ickham are actually overflowed by any of the diagrams that are shown. So I was a bit concerned that ██████████ perhaps didn't have the right document. But as far as I can see, there is nothing coming in his direction, which hopefully will put his mind at ease or perhaps not at their areas but there's certainly nothing coming your way, ██████████

██████████
Thank you very much. I haven't ... I definitely have not seen the document that you're sharing at the moment. So as I say, I will re table it and hopefully that will allay some fairly hefty concerns that we had about what was obviously an out of date document.

██████████
██████████ I understand, ██████████ here from Osprey. Can you see the screen that ██████████ is sharing now with the image on?

██████████
Yeah, that's what I'm looking at, with the sort of black arrowed lines.

██████████
So the blue lines, the blue arrows you're talking about, that was the comprehensive blank sheet of paper that we started with saying, you know what, we can go anywhere. That's what you ... (inaudible) This is how it's been taken forward to this document. Now I was saying what ██████████ just said obviously from the line if my geography is right, Ickham is to the East of Canterbury.

██████████
We are directly underneath one of them at least.

██████████
There are routes on there. So these are really, really little (inaudible)... These are the only routes that affect you, it's the routes to the south. These are the routes that you will probably want to comment on. So when you get the document, obviously, focus on this particular route as opposed to what was the previous blue arrows?

██████████
Yeah, sure.

██████████
So it's a lot more focused in the document now as to where the routes go.

██████████
Okay, can I just ask because obviously, I know what will happen is I'll table it and say, you know, we need to re-comment and everyone is going to look at it and go there's a line head straight over our village. So you know, all our comments stand essentially. So I sort of do refer you back to our earlier comments in a way. I appreciate that you know, there is a difference between technical procedural design and regularity of flights. But obviously, by the time we've agreed a technical procedural document that puts a flight path directly over our village we're then haggling the details. I still feel that I'm not necessarily talking out my backside when I say the consultation that will come later will presumably have these flight paths embedded in it as a presumption that that's the way forward or will these flight paths also be up for discussion later in consultation?

██████████
These flight paths are up for discussion.

██████████
Now or by the time we get to consultation later?

██████████
Now, in fact, maybe depending on what our feedback at this stage is, some of those routes may not even be progressed forward, depending on what the opinions are from everybody in the local area, and also the aviation stakeholders as well. Of course there's a balance on everything in this ██████████
What we can achieve safely, what we can integrate with the overall UK flight route structure in above the 7000 foot level and how the traffic then would integrate with i.e. entry and exit from the major - shall I call them trunk roads - that are also servicing London City Airport, South End and Gatwick.

██████████
Completely understand I suppose from our perspective, it boils down to some of the concerns that we have about things like altitudes and flight frequency are the things that would allow us to say that we

don't really have an objection or we have a very strong objection if that makes sense. So a flight path directly over our village is not a concern for us as much if there's going to be occasional use of that flight path once every two weeks. If you're telling me we're going to get 10 planes a day, and they're going to be fairly low, having just taken off from Manston then that obviously changes the character of our, our opinion of whether that flight path should be heading straight over our village or not.

Yeah, of course, and you'll get they'll be more of that detail, certainly in the consultation next year, because before the consultation next year, we have to do quantitative environmental assessments of each route that is taken forward.

Hmm, understood. So I suppose the only initial thought I have and I will obviously have to come back to you properly would be is there is there a reason that you're branching round and over such a large number of conservation areas as that exist in all of those villages, you're flying over like Ash and Wingham, Stable, Goodneston, Ickham. I mean there 34some of the most protected areas in the southeast rather than flying out over well like Minster to Cliffs End across the less inhabited areas.

Okay. When you see the whole document, you'll see that, again, I'll emphasize these are options. When you see the whole document, there are other options.

Okay.

Another reason is this, these three, let's say a perm, or are nuances on a particular option is because they were, they probably would meet one of the requirements of the national infrastructure above 7000 feet. That is not to say we have to do it, but it meets one of those requirements.

Can you explain to me what do you mean by that? How does it meet national aviation requirement for 7000 feet? I don't I'm sorry, I'm not a pilot or an aviation authority person.

No, of course. As you go further west, you'll notice that there's the London TMA, or you may note that there's London TMA and there's traffic exiting and entering into the London TMA to access and depart from the airports within the London environment. So that includes Southend, London City Airport, Heathrow, obviously Gatwick, and there's a flow of traffic at the moment that meets those airport's requirements in the way that traffic is fed in and fed out. And at the moment, there's a kind of roundabout in the sky above 7000 feet going up to 29,000 feet where traffic go from ... generally flow from east to west, down the Thames or up the Thames Estuary going into the London airports. But on the south side of the country going more towards the channel, traffic tends to be flowing from west to

east. So in turning traffic out left and southbound from Manston, as you see in that diagram, we're meeting one of the traffic flow requirements as we see it at the moment, and we think it's going to be in the future to get traffic away to the south and east into Europe.

So by that logic does that mean this option would be potentially one of the more well used traffic routes?

Not necessarily.

Right. Okay.

just for those not familiar with the jargon, perhaps you can just explain the London TMA?

I'm sorry yes. The terminal maneuvering area, so that's a piece of controlled airspace that thanks That's a piece of controlled airspace where there are, let's say, restricted requirements on the way that aircraft are operated and the flow of traffic is maintained within that area.

Okay, I think that's understood. At the moment, obviously, I can't speak for the rest of my colleagues on the council. And we're obviously responding to an old document. So I think the best thing to do would be for me to everyone else, have a say in all this.

could you share the departures to the north, please just to show there's other options available? I'm not sure which slide number that is.

Slide seven or slide eight.

Does the traffic routes to the north, obviously, only because I'm going to need to be able to explain some of this to people who are, you know, perhaps less technically minded than even myself. The sort of question that is bound to come up is well, you know, the traffic routes to the North is obviously preferable to us as a village because it's the opposite direction, clearly makes more sense for residents because it heads straight out over the sort of areas Nicholas St Wade and then out to sea so presumably much less of an impact on the residential areas. I'm assuming ... does this conversation we've just been having about traffic heading into London effect which of these two routes, this north or south route, is more likely to be used regularly or something. Can be anything that helps make some ...

██████████
Not necessarily. We still have to get the traffic in and out of the major national flow, but from your resident's personal view and your view there is a weight put on what you would see as a disturbance to yourselves.

██████████
Yeah, so if I can understand by north you're going to be trying to shove planes into as you describe it the large roundabout or by going south is a is a much easier route for the actual operator (inaudible).

██████████
There is a constant tension ██████████ and you'll see it's obvious. If I want to now from a right hand take off, from runway two eight to get all the way around to Dover, my track miles are a lot longer. So qualitatively, my fuel burn will be greater and also hence my fumes, CO2 and NO will be greater. But the advantage of that is, as you say, my lay down of noise over Thanet in particular, will be very much reduced. There's a constant tension between, in environmental assessments in requirements. And then of course, that has to be based upon what the, the upper air route flow is, as well as at the time. So there's a complex, not quite complex, but certainly complicated interaction in play here between route options, the effect on the local community, the effect on the world climate who everybody in the world is interested in terms of co2 and no. But that doesn't mean to say we're not going to take opinion of your views and your residence views.

██████████
Okay, all right. That's very kind of you. I don't know if there's anyone from the other parishes that are potentially affected by the southbound routes, but it might make sense if any of them are online for us to have a collective communication about our collective thoughts about these routes. I'll leave that there. Brilliant. Thank you very much for your time. Great.

██████████
No problem at all.

██████████
Thanks, ██████████. And thanks for kicking things off. We've got a couple of questions. We'll go to ██████████ first and then come to ██████████. So ██████████ if you could ask your question.

██████████
Yeah hopefully I'm unmuted. Can everybody hear me Is that okay?

██████████
Yes, indeed.

██████████
I'm one of the people who attended on the fifth of the ... sorry I represent Woodnesborough parish Council. And as a council, we actually voted against having the airport per se, obviously because we

don't feel the need of it and well, climate noise etc, etc. However, with what work you're putting in and we have studied, personally I've studied this map. When I attended on the fifth of November - I'll bring the point back - I specifically asked how high these aircraft would be flying. I know because Because there was four, I think four people, one from Ramsgate obviously, who's going to get the brunt of the noise pollution, everything else as they come in to land across the cross the little port. I was told we're going to be around about seven to 10,000 feet. Now I'm aghast when I see this and looking at it, when you look at it, they're going to be around about three to 4000 feet, which is a lot, lot lower than what we were first told in that document. My second part was, and they can be answered at the time and I don't suppose you can answer it now but the percentage of flights. What would the percentage of flights be coming South? Do you think, you know going west South north, because I think that will have a bearing on the amount of flights coming over the land and I suppose like everybody else, we've got three flight paths coming quite near us. And it was one of the slides you put up previously to this. Are they going to use all of those flight paths? Is it going to be one of them? Is it going to be two of them or what's it going to be?

██████████
Okay ██████████ to answer your first question. So, the minimum conservative altitudes are shown on some of the pages. And those are, those are worst case based on a 6% climb out, which is a International Civil Aviation Authority guidance. That is the standard climb out that you can use. What we have to bear in mind is that, that was, that is based on aircraft performance of 10 to 15 years ago. We've now got more efficient and more slicker aircraft so that climb gradients can expect to be much greater than then we're seeing as a minimum, as the worst case shown on some of those diagrams. Can you show the equivalent of that ██████████ with the altitudes on? And that's a minimum ██████████ Aircraft will tend to be much higher than that. Also, that's based on a departure end of the runway height of around about 16 feet. You will probably know intuitively, you'll have seen in other airports that aircraft are much higher than that even heavy freighters before they reach the end of the runway. So those are very much a minimum at the moment. You could expect those to be that bit higher. And that explains departures. Arrivals is a bit more of a difficult conundrum. Now, can you show one of the arrivals to one zero, please, guys?

██████████
Slide ten. Actually sorry. No.

██████████
I think arrivals they've got to be at a certain level to make sure they land correctly, isn't it? I've got the feeling.

██████████
That's correct. And the arrival line

██████████
Sorry, 15 ██████████ sorry.

██████████
... the last eight to ten miles of an arrival, probably on arrival to one zero would be best. Yeah. That has to be a straight line Anthony for safety and regulation. And also the glide path has to be... our glide slope has to be three degrees. So that the orientation of the runway ... it's unavoidable that for aircraft not to flying these sort of procedures not to fly over Herne Bay and to deviate from that centerline because it would be unsafe. And it wouldn't give you a controlled flight down to the runway.

██████████
From a selfish to unselfish, you know, we live in Woodlands where I don't want to play in flying right over my house anyway. But I do, the reason I voted against the airport, I have major concerns about all the other surrounding areas and the impact it's going to have on it. I'd like to come to another question, actually. So if you were told that your planes had to be at a minimum of seven to 10,000 feet, I know you said that those are bare minimums. They're say 10,000 feet over Woodnesborough, I suppose they'd have to take a steeper climb. I suppose they'd have to burn up more fuel.

██████████
As it comes, you're absolutely right, ██████████. There's a constant tension between that and again, that something that has to be looked at in the balance between fuel burn. So power used fuel burn and altitude climb and there is a constant dynamic and a tradeoff between the two. Absolutely right

██████████
So if they took over off of runway 28, which is from east to west, isn't it. I suppose that's where the majority of the flights are going to go. If they didn't have to climb too high to get over the sea, and then come around Broadstairs, do a right. Sorry, I'm not terminology correct.

██████████
Can you put the departure to eight on going to the north please guys?

██████████
Slide seven.

██████████
Sorry. Bare with me. Should be the one.

██████████
Yeah, that's the one. So if they didn't have to climb so hard and so high to get over the sea. So the impact, environmental impact on the residents of these areas, would that be a factor? If you were told you had to get above 10,000 feet? Could we not put all the planes over the sea so they come around Broadstairs, do a right and then climb at a less angle.

██████████
Sorry, I don't quite understand ██████████ So we've got to take off from runway two eight heading to the west. They have to remain straight in the climb for a minimum of a mile and a quarter.

██████████
Yeah.

██████████
That's regulation for safety. And then they can start to turn right. Correct.

██████████
That's right. But do they come in? But then perhaps, they could fly a lower level to get over the sea, not burning so much fuel would that be a way I don't know, just compensating for the steeper climb going over the land if you were told you had to fly higher over the areas are going to be inflicted, you know all this noise pollution?

██████████
It's certainly a consideration. What we would aim to do and what environmental guidance now dictates for the aviation industry is that actually the best way to avoid noise and limit co2 and no emissions is to do what we call a constant climb, at a constant climb angle. So in that initial departure, you clean up the aircraft as much as you can to undercarriage, and flap and other lift devices, which things themselves create a little bit of noise. And then as you say, you keep a constant throttle to do a constant climb and that appears to be the best way of reducing both noise and emissions at the same time where there is that dynamic. In other regimes it's a bit more difficult but in the departure incline, you do have that option.

██████████
Okay. Yeah, that's, I take that on board. It's given me another sort of angle to think about it rather than just being against the, the I mean, I'm from the first call, I just wonder whether or not this is a done deal and excuse my skepticism, ██████████ but, you know, it's going to impact a lot of people and environmental issues and everything else. I think it's an important decision.

██████████
It is.

██████████
And I'm one of these people who knows the area needs regeneration. However, in this day and age and going forward, I worried for my children, my grandchildren on the legacy that we are leaving them and I just don't want it to be a regeneration all costs. I think there's a bigger picture overall.

██████████
There is.

██████████
And if there is an airport, then I'm trying to minimize any impact on anybody in the area, not just Woodnesborough at all.

Richie Hinchcliffe|

██████████. That's definitely what we're aiming to do. And that, in fact, that's what we're mandated to do by the CAA and some of the environmental inputs into the Civil Aviation Organization too. And there are there are other things we can do in the design of the airport, which you know, from the DCO process has been discussed as well. But I think it is important that you give us this feedback ██████████ and that's very valuable. And it's interesting to note that you've noted the importance of the right turnout from two eight. I think on previous discussions, it may not be, be the ideal for, for some aspects of the future airspace around the southeast of the UK. But it has to be balanced with that requirement to minimize the environmental impact

██████████
I think a lot, obviously can't give any figures because you've got to get people on board, your customers or your stakeholders on the amount of flights that will be used in south, north, east, west at this moment in time, perhaps that will come later on in the discussion points I'd assume.

██████████
I think you're right ██████████ the cost of this, there's fairly detailed figures in the DCO. And we'll have to go over that ground again to satisfy the CAA in terms of environmental aspects. So we will have to give information about the loading of each route as well so that will be taken into account that let's say the traffic density o particular route options as well. Not just that static line in space, but also, well, how many aircraft are going to be on that line in space?

██████████
Yeah, I think that will have a bearing going forward as well. But I know some other people have their hands. I do apologize if I've taken up a bit too much time. Thank you for that.

██████████
Thanks, ██████████ Thanks for your question. We'll go to ██████████ I know ██████████ been waiting a while and then we'll get to ██████████

██████████
Good evening. I'm from Ramsgate Town Council. I think I'm in the same position as ██████████ as in that these maps that you're showing tonight I don't recognize so I must have not had this document for some reason.

██████████
We will get that to you ██████████.

██████████

I came here really expecting to listen to the bad news as far as Ramsgates concerned. But as I'm here. In the previous document you had some design principles. Principle three was to minimize noise. Six to minimize aircraft emissions over sensitive areas. So I guess I'd just like to hear from you what you've done to apply those principles as far as the 40,000 people in Ramsgate are concerned.

I think the first thing I'd point out, is that these are the stakeholder design principles. They're not ours. There's something that we have to apply, but they were done by stakeholder engagement. They were your community priorities within the design principles. There are ...

So they're not your priorities. That's interesting.

No, they are our guidance, but they're your design principles from the stakeholder group. There, we will be held to that correct. So we will start to, we are looking at these designs in the light of those design principles. For example, they need to be safe prior to work. They must accord with the CAA's modern airspace modernization strategy and comply with safety regulations in that respect. And we're looking to even minimize the impact of noise below 7000 feet and I think that's the important one that you're probably looking at

That and pollution.

It's difficult. And as you've heard from my previous discussion, there's a constant dynamic between CO2 emission and no emissions and noise. However, that doesn't get over the problem that Ramsgate is in a very, very difficult position in terms of its relationship to Manston and the airport. What we've, you know from the DCO process that we will have operational means of managing traffic. So, in everything else being equal, and weather allowing will the main part of the operations will be to and from the west, so avoiding any overflight of Ramsgate. But the alignment of the runway means that if we do use runway, two eight, so going from west to east we will have to do an approach because of that indelible straight line for eight miles from the sea, from the channel over the southern part of Ramsgate on to the airport. And equally if we need to get airborne, we will have to fly the initial one and a half miles or one and third miles as a straight line, and so be flying over again the southern part of Ramsgate. And that is unavoidable in the way that flight procedures have to be designed for aircraft at the moment.

Okay, thanks, . Unless wants to to respond on any of that, that detail we will go to again.

Hopefully you can hear me.

[REDACTED]
Yes.

[REDACTED]
Excellent. Okay, so a few things that have come up since I made a few points to start with. I suppose, before I go into them, generally kind of in agreement with what's been said. It's not, it's plain that everyone here who's got an opinion, enough to voice it has got the same sort of concerns that we have, which is you know, to some extent, the flight path conversation is a very interesting one. But it really is going to come down to the level of flights, the number of flights, how often, when they're allowed to occur. And what as I pointed out, start with are these key performance indicators i.e. what are your failure points when, you know, is it 10 flights in an evening and all of a sudden, we can make a complaint when you reach some kind of agreed principle. So I do think that any local resident group or stakeholder group is going to really struggle to commit to any of these principles that you're talking about, these operational principles, because it exposes us to a slippery slope, a thin end of the wedge kind of argument, which are valid, I'm afraid they are. So having made that point because I know you can't answer those questions at this point, the slides that you showed us this evening, one of which was very interesting, which was the updated height assessment or altitude assessments. Can you share those with me as well please, because everyone's going to be very interested to see those, the hand drawn red lines.

[REDACTED]
I think that's the two eight departure to the south.

[REDACTED]
That's right. Yeah.

[REDACTED]
Slide six.

[REDACTED]
Yeah. What I'm asking is can essentially put this presentation be shared directly with us as some kind of PDF or something? Because I'm going to have, you know, 100 residents who want to see this essentially.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] these slides that we're showing you were in that document that you should have been referring to.

[REDACTED]
Okay, brilliant that's great. Including this one with the reds, the updated altitude miles.

[REDACTED]
Yes.

[REDACTED]
Okay, fine. So that answers that question. So, I will get that as an email. That sounds good. Another question, I may expose my ignorance here. We seem to be talking about these two eight departure routes as north or south, which is sort of turn left or turn right at the end of the runway, I suppose. But am I missing something or are these options, or are the so is it north, there are three options, South there are three options and you are going to be deciding apart on which of those three options for North and South or is it we want to use all three north and south? Or is it we only want to go south. But we need north as an option. Can you explain to me the design principle of them?

[REDACTED]
We've not made a decision. We think these are options that satisfy the design principles that you stakeholders came up with in stage one.

[REDACTED]
Right.

[REDACTED]
So it's now for you to comment and say either it doesn't meet the design principles or we would rather you do this or so perhaps it's an option that we...

[REDACTED]
Sorry, is there an option therefore for us to simply say we'd rather everything went north.

[REDACTED]
There is. You can definitely say that. Yeah

[REDACTED]
Right.

[REDACTED]
There's no reason for you not to say that - I do not want any departures to the south.

[REDACTED]
No, it was me trying to understand is that an option? Or is it that Manson has to have a north and a South departure for treasons or something, we, it's haggling over which route north and south.

[REDACTED]
No.

[REDACTED]

Right.

These are options that we believe satisfy the design principles. And they satisfy the requirements of the aviation stakeholders. So that's pilots, as well as air traffic control and the future structure of the National - let me call it airways infrastructure, but also satisfy the design principles that the stakeholders at this stage of the engagement came up with.

Okay.

I'd like to think as a professional that we started with a broad spectrum and I recovered that whole broad spectrum and we're now narrowing down. However, if there's part of that spectrum you don't think we've explored, and there's an option maybe in there that you think should be considered, we're open to that as well.

Okay.

Let's remember of course when we take our narrowed options to the Civil Aviation Authority, they will be looking at those and putting our feet to the fire and saying, "Why haven't you considered that? Or why don't you consider this? What about this? What about this?"

Can you with your professional knowledge just describe to me, I don't know whether you'll be able to answer this or even if you would want to like answer. But if everybody on the southbound routes said we really don't want flights over us at those kinds of levels, in any frequency, we want you heading north, that's clearly the better route. Is there a, as you put you saw London bound traffic reason why south would be more amenable to the – what was it you described it as - the future airways infrastructure or whatever, sorry, I may be mangling your own terms there. That would mean that government will leaning towards southbound routes rather than north. I can sort of picture north being a problem for traffic.

I can't answer yes or no to that at all. But what I can say is that it all goes into the mix. There's a balance with everything.

Okay, understood.

However, from a local community to say that really that is not a good option for us, that may be an option that is taken off the table by the Civil Aviation Authority. Even though for air traffic purposes, it may be the ideal solution.

[REDACTED]

Sure.

[REDACTED]

You may have to go suboptimal on another solution to satisfy the requirement.

[REDACTED]

Understood.

[REDACTED]

There's a constant balance we have to make. This a balance between safety, the environment and the local population. And it's that, almost like a trident that you've got to balance.

[REDACTED]

Thanks, [REDACTED] We'll go to [REDACTED], then [REDACTED], and then back to [REDACTED] for another question. So [REDACTED] if you could ask your question.

[REDACTED]

Hi yeah thank you. Yeah [REDACTED] I'm here because I'm representing Broadstairs & St Peters Town council. I've come along to this on their behalf but something you said earlier maybe just maybe I want to ask you about the flight paths over, the potential for flight paths in and the flight paths out that would come over Ramsgate, something that [REDACTED] mentioned. So any flights coming in over Ramsgate, can you just tell me what the, when they hit land, from the flight to hit land from the sea, what are the minimum and maximum height that the planes might be as they plane over Ramsgate?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. Can you show me the slide for arrivals to one zero. Sorry two eight.

[REDACTED]

Yeah slide 13 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Okay that's departure.

[REDACTED]

Yes. Sorry. Was that the one you needed?

[REDACTED]

That one there, that's arrivals.

[REDACTED]

Isn't it the one that's got altitudes on.

██████████
We haven't got it on the arrival ones.

(Inaudible)

██████████
the departures as ... (inaudible).

██████████
Okay. I'll just cover the arrivals for the moment. The arrivals will be from quite a distance offshore as you would expect, as we've talked about. About six to seven miles. So over the coast, so over the old lighthouse and where the Wetherspoon's is at the moment. Traffic is going to be around about just under 1000 feet at that point for landing and then as they go over the western edge of that part of Ramsgate, going towards the ring road to the west and the railway line, just dipping below 300 ,400 to 300 feet as they go into land.

██████████
Okay.

██████████
Do you want to show the departure slide ██████████?

██████████
Yeah, slide 11.

██████████
Not looking like the right one. I think I might be out of sync here ██████████. Sorry, can you ...

██████████
That's fine.

██████████
No next one.

██████████
Yep. So again, roughly the same sort of profile, but remember that, again, this is a very conservative minimum height for departure. Because as we said previously, I think it was to, I think it was to ██████████. This assumes that the start of that black line at the departure end of the runway, for runway one zero or runway 10. This assumes the aircraft will be at 16 feet, but we know the aircraft will be a lot higher than that somewhere between 100 and 300 feet. So the 500 feet over the center south of Ramsgate is an absolute minimum and more likely to be in the region of 700 to 1000 feet at that point, and then going

over the coast, not 900 to 1200 feet. And at that, that's 1000 point dotted line, probably somewhere between 1100 and 1400 feet. So those client gradients are very, very conservative.

██████████
Sorry I didn't quite catch it. So these figures here are based on 16 feet at the end of the runway, and why did you say the maximum height at the end of the runway is...

██████████
Well we don't know. We don't know what the maximum height is. The minimum is, the minimum design on that would be 16.

██████████
Yeah.

██████████
The height that's probably for an airline, you're looking at somewhere between 200 and 350 feet at that stage, depending on what their cargo loading is or their passenger loading.

██████████
You know, we're talking cargo here aren't we. So, I'm assuming. Yeah. I mean, I'm not assuming anything actually. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Okay, yeah I haven't got anything else at the moment, but I might soon. Thank you.

██████████
Okay, thanks very much. And we'll go to ██████████ next.

██████████
Thank you. So for those who don't know, my name is ██████████ I'm planning applications manager at Thanet District council. So I'm here representing Thanet District Council to understand, you know, the comments that people are making and also to hear any information. I've had a chance to go through this document. The one that's been sent around which is showing the images and I just wanted to pick up a couple of the points linked to in fact, the diagram that you've got up on the screen now to do with runway 10 departures over Ramsgate. In the documentation it mentions specifically about the minimum height necessary before you're at the sea or turning over the sea as being 550 feet, obviously shown in this diagram, that's a very conservative estimate. 500 feet point as indicated what you'll get in the centre of Ramsgate.... (inaudible) for runway 10 departures that it does do for the southbound departures west. It indicates a minimum necessary gradient to which the incline must be at. I was just wondering whether or not there is a proposed minimum gradient that's going to be set for runway 10 departures. But as (inaudible) is how that gradient is actually controlled through either the DC process so, a yes, route is consented, licensed under 7000 feet. That process actually sediment gradients or not. Or whether or not it is great concern for Riveroak running the airport track in their own, I suppose, procedures.

█, I'm afraid your connection is quite poor I didn't really make out your question in detail. The designs are to design minimum set by IKO. We know from experience that aircraft will outperform that minima. In the process defined by the Civil Aviation Authority, they may take a view that you have to have a minimum climb gradient, but it would be rare for them to do that, unless there is vertical obstructions to avoid like terrain. London City Airport is a good example. Hence you have a specific type of aircraft and a specific type of pilot qualification to allow you to get out of that aerodrome because of the built environment of skyscrapers, etc around the commercial monetary center, shall we say of the city? It would be unusual for the CAA to set any climb gradient minima for this type of operation. I hope that answers your question. Perhaps you can put it in an email in your response.

█
Yeah, thank you for that. Thanks for that. Yes apologies about the connection if it was breaking up. No that did provide the information. Obviously, we're just trying to understand what the likely impact is of flights leaving on runway 10. If it's alright I do have a couple of other queries, if that's okay.

█
Go ahead.

█
It's not about any of the routes that have been shown necessarily. We're obviously considering information that's been provided and will be formally responding in due course. I just wanted to touch upon a couple of things and just ask the question whether or not you are inviting views on this. One is the non-directional beacon, which is I think figure four in your pack. It includes reference to four options on that document. I must admit, it might be my reading of it does appear there are only three options on there. But I'm assuming you're inviting comments on that as well which is mostly the holding pattern at about 2000 feet that could be used if necessary.

█
Yeah, could you show that █? Have we got that on the slide?

█
Coming down, slide 27.

█
Okay, bare with. There you go.

█
No, one more. Should be for before that one. That's it.

█
█ you're spot on. There were originally four options. I'm seeing the wrong slide at the moment.

██████████
Yeah, you had the right one, ██████████, you've gone past it again.

██████████
Okay, sorry. Bear with me. Sorry about this.

██████████
Notwithstanding the diagram at the moment ██████ yes, you were right there were four options. However, we took out the obvious option to the southeast because that would take aircraft over Pegwell Bay. Which is a conservation area, of particular interest to the Royal Society protection of birds also. So that no longer becomes an option. There are just the three now.

██████████
Okay. Well, we'll make sure we comment on that particular point. And I was just wondering if it was possible for a bit more information about the proposed establishment of an aerodrome traffic zone. And what's driven that and what the potential ramifications are, if possible.

██████████
Could you show that slide guys?

██████████
Slide 28 ██████████ Second from the end.

██████████
Yeah, so should be this one.

██████████
The aerodrome traffic zone, the ATZ Ian is exactly the same as, the dimensions will be exactly the same as the air traffic zone that was previously established there before the airport was closed. Ramifications in local community terms are that aircraft will be only allowed in that circle with specific clearance from air traffic control at Manston. Why is that desirable, because it then assists pilots as well as air traffic control in the safe arrival and departure of the bigger airline, the cargo aircraft in the critical phases of flight so that point of flight where they're doing their maneuver, not maneuvering, but they're on landing rather they're not maneuvering, their operating gear and flaps and lining themselves for final approach into the runway. And also for departure just after departure and maneuvering with flaps and slats and gear as well at that stage. So it's an air and nautical protection really. But it does limit other aircraft going into that zone without specific clearance. So it's a kind of traffic restriction scheme, really, in simple terms.

██████████
Is there a minimum height to that? Sorry a maximum height to that.

Richie Hinchcliffe:

There is, they're normally established at 2000 feet.

██████████
Okay. That's all the questions I've got at the moment. Thank you for that.

██████████
Great, thanks ██████████. We'll go back to ██████████ and then ██████████ So ██████████ first.

██████████
It was just a couple of questions about control really. Which control you have?
Departures to the Western south, how far away from the airport can you actually control the route that an aircraft takes? Or is it entirely up to the pilot? Similarly the rate of climb of departures over Ramsgate is obviously very important to us whether they pass over the center of the town at 500 feet or 1000 feet. How much control will you have over that?

██████████
To take your first question David because these are going to be standard instrument departures, there is a high degree of control of that route and that departure either by Manston or by the on route service provider. The second question, what control do we have on the departure of aircraft, particularly on off one zero, again, because it's a standard instrument departure, the actual route over the ground, we have full control of. The altitude of the aircraft is very difficult to have what you could say, strict control over because that's dependent upon again the loading of the aircraft and the performance of the engines on the aircraft. We have a control over the minimum and that is set by the climb gradient, the minimum climb gradient that maximum climb gradient, well, we cannot define that and that will change as aircraft performance improves over the coming decades.

██████████
So to some extent, it depends on what sort of aircraft you allow into the airport? And what sort of loading you allow them to have?

██████████
It certainly relies on the type of aircraft that you would allow. And again, that's covered in the DCO and the type of aircraft that's going to be allowed at the aerodrome. So there'll be nothing rickety, allowed to get airborne from that aerodrome and the left to fully comply with IKO and CAA regulations in terms of performance and safety.

██████████
Can you control the loading?

██████████
That's a difficult one. That's a commercial question.

Yeah, I know that's why I'm asking.

██████████
It can't be overloaded. Of course, it cannot be overloaded.

██████████
Okay. Thanks, ██████████. Before we go back to ██████████, for a further question, I suggest if anyone else has any burning issues they want to raise, if you raise your hand now, that will give us a feel for how many more issues we need to cover off as we sort of tick towards eight o'clock. So, ██████████, back to you.

██████████
Hi, there. Yeah, sorry. Thanks very much for this presentation. Because I think if I hadn't attended, we would have been missing a lot of information. There's been a lot of talk about the, I think it was sort of not constraints, sorry not constraints my brains gone dead. The tension or something along those lines, I think were words being used between pollution in terms of atmospheric pollution and noise pollution, and that having potentially quite a big impact on which is the preferred of the routes that will be used for the various different activities at the airport. How are these – to some extent I don't really want to just say how are these quantified. But obviously, you know, the impact of that is surely part of your consideration as to which proposals you're putting forward for consideration by the Central Aviation Authority whatever they're called, CAA or whatever it is.

██████████ :
Civil Aviation Authority.

██████████ :
Thank you very much. So, surely things like the regularity and the size of the aircraft and loading of the aircraft will all be, have already been considered? Or is it based on any given flight will have this level of pollution and this level of noise pollution? And therefore we can make a decision about which of those two is the lesser of the evils so to speak?

██████████ :
Interesting question. It's a complex, it's a complex dynamic, and at this stage, we've done qualitative assessments and because you can come up with simple metrics to do that in terms of yeah route miles flown. It's a very simple relationship between route miles flown and the amount of fuel then burnt and hence the amount of co2 and no deposited in the atmosphere. Similarly, a track over the ground or close to an urban environment will affect more or less people in terms of the noise footprint.

██████████ :
Yes.

██████████ :
However, once we've got your ideas from this stage of the engagement, which are your high level desires and how they meet the your design principles or the agreed design principles, then we do a much more detailed environmental assessment of each option taken forward into consultation. We may

even take what would appear to be to some people costly options in to consultation. But again, that's part of consultation. It's for somebody, then to voice their opinion on that. So that everybody has a different view on the balance between the total environment and their own personal needs.

██████████:

Yes, I totally understand that. So thus far, it's been a qualitative and not a quantitative assessment. And following this, well, whatever feedback we give you, and then your assessment of those, you will then move on to a quantitative assessment, which will also inevitably be a qualitative assessment. Right. Okay, fine.

██████████:

That's absolutely right and that's all laid down in the CAP 1616 process which the Civil Aviation Authority, ask us to follow.

██████████:

Understood. I've heard you refer a couple of times to the DCO which seems to be quite an important document that you're outlining there in terms of things like what planes will be allowed into Manston airspace to land and all the rest of it work. What document is that? Maybe I've missed that.

██████████:

There's not a document that we have, but there are certain airlines and certain operators are barred from operating in the UK because, and that's controlled by the Civil Aviation Authority ██████████. And that's based on either let's say, habitual braking of regulations or their view to be an unsafe operator, etc, etc. So the civil aviation has a tight control over who or what operates in and out of UK aerodromes.

██████████:

Right, so what was the DCO you were talking about? Sorry, I feel like I missed this document somewhere that outlined a bit more detail as to what's proposed at Manston.

██████████:

In the development consent order, part of the process and that decision process so the consultation that went on previous to this over the previous two years, there's a lot of information in there about the type of operation and the type of aircraft that it is.

██████████:

Okay and is that available?

██████████:

It is. It's on the strategic inspectors website, the PINs website. If you put in PINs Manson airport development, you'll go straight to it.

██████████:

PINs Manston Airport. Excellent. Thank you very much. That's everything I had.

[REDACTED]
Right. Thank you, [REDACTED]. We'll go to [REDACTED] first and then back at [REDACTED]. So [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]:
Hello. Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

[REDACTED]
Yep. Loud and clear.

[REDACTED]:
Wonderful. Thank you. I'm [REDACTED] and I'm a town councilor down at Folkstone. So I've come along because as much as this doesn't appear to be affecting us, I think the fact that it affects the whole of Kent, I think we should all be involved in this. I wasn't that aware. I knew that there was going to be airport reopening and the much needed redevelopment, for the fact that Folkstone has passed an environmental emergency motion. And looking at the various options if indeed, that's what we're looking at this evening. And there seems to be a bit of confusion as to whether we're actually supposed to be looking at where the flight paths are or whether we're supposed to be actually discussing the design. That the turning right into the sea, would actually, although it takes more aviation fuel over a shorter period of time, the very fact that it would affect so many less residents, so many less farmlands. We obviously have to take into consideration prevailing winds as well because it's not just that it's flying over someone's village. If the prevailing winds are in a certain direction, believe me, these planes will be heard a lot further away. So I would have thought from our side, we would look and hope that within the designs, you would look to affect the very least amount of people. And that's as I say, not just including the CO2 and the NOx, etc. but also the noise pollution. I notice one of the diagrams show that you're going to be flying over Goodwin Sands.

[REDACTED]:
[REDACTED], can I just correct you for a moment?

[REDACTED]:
Certainly.

[REDACTED]:
Again, these are options. We're not going to do anything at the moment.

[REDACTED]:
I know and I'm just discussing the options that you've put forward.

[REDACTED]
Okay.

[REDACTED]
I want to talk about that. So I'm just saying from my point of view, and just to let you know, I am a Senior Project Manager and my degree is in environmental science. So to a certain extent, I do understand what I'm talking about. So as you're coming out if we were going over the sea, one of the images you showed was flying over Goodwin sands.

[REDACTED]:
Sorry. [REDACTED] can I just stop you for a second.

[REDACTED]
Yes.

[REDACTED]y:
Is that the north, Goodwin Sands? I'm not local.

[REDACTED]:
It's to the west. If you were to ...

[REDACTED]
I think it's a two-way departure to the north.

[REDACTED]
If you go to slide nine, [REDACTED], please.

[REDACTED]
Yeah. Bare with me.

[REDACTED]:
If we get the slide up [REDACTED], you'll be able to actually point it out.

[REDACTED]
Yeah, we'll get it.

[REDACTED]:
Coming back to the last point in the slide. Coming back to some of the other issues. I actually find it quite horrifying that the minimum over Ramsgate is actually 500 feet. I think the residents just to be honest with you are going to be incredibly concerned about that. I'm not sure whether there is within your options, a way of avoiding coming in or going out over Ramsgate but I'm sure that will come.

[REDACTED]:
There isn't just as we've covered before [REDACTED] because of safety considerations, you that on takeoff that one and a quarter one and a the third miles is critical. And for landing that eight mile straight in is critical to safe operations at the airport.

██████████:

Yeah, no, I do understand. I just thought I'd raise it just in case there's a glimmer of light there. But also your design options, you've used that wonderful phrase, where practical. I often find as a project manager that the word practical means if we want to spend that amount of money. So I'd just like to raise that with people as we go forward, we need to ensure that the very best and this is not a criticism at all, please but the very best possible options are put forward. Maybe even despite that they may cost a little more and as you said, ██████████, you will be taking possible more expensive options forward as well. But I don't know if we found good wind sounds yet.

██████████

Is it not on this slide ██████████

██████████:

You need to go more east.

██████████:

I think it's in the departure transitions, I think, ██████████

██████████:

Yes.

██████████:

And it's interesting that you say that you won't go over I can't remember the name of the beach or the flats because it was an environmental protected area.

██████████:

Pegwell Bay.

██████████:

Yeah, but I'm sure you're also aware that Goodwin Sands has one of our only seal populations. So it'd be quite interesting to see at what level again, aviation wise, you're looking at flying over there because I think that would be of some concern to people as well. So I'm not trying to be negative. I'm just saying to make sure.

██████████:

No of course. Just make sure you feed that back to ██████████, please enter in a written statement, that'd be excellent. The one thing I would say about that area...

██████████:

I will I do apologise if my signal is a bit strange.

██████████

No, thank you, [REDACTED]. I'm just going to go to [REDACTED] it looks like that might be the final question. If that's the case, we'll then look to just summarize and wrap up. But do raise your hand if there are any other burning issues we haven't covered. But we'll go to Anthony for one more question.

[REDACTED]
Yeah, I know we've been discussing flight paths and everything else, but I think it's also the density of movements that are going to affect and impact on everybody as well. Have you got any because last time I was talking about when it used to be the old Manston there was about three to 4000 movements per annum. But you're talking about 25,000 movements, I believe. 18,000 freight 7000 passenger? I don't know how long that's going to take to achieve. Question is, I suppose ultimately, is what do you envisage going forward on what will be the maximum capacity of air movements, not what you're hoping to build up where you will see this going because that will mean there will be a hell of a lot more movement across whatever path you decide. So I'm looking to see whether or not there's a cap being put on this, or whether there's...

[REDACTED]:
There is [REDACTED] and again, that the information is in the DCO and that those figures are the cap.

[REDACTED]
They are the caps, so 25,000 movements is the cap.

[REDACTED]
Yeah.

[REDACTED]:
Regardless of how long this is going to be open for?

[REDACTED]:
Yes, that because that's part of the DCO decision. If that cap needs to be exceeded and [REDACTED] will correct me on in this if I'm wrong. If that cap past needs. If there's a wish, shall I say to exceed that cap then the airport operator has to go back to the DFT to ask permission to raise that cap.

[REDACTED]:
And when do you envisage the 25,000 movements. Do you have any idea at the moment.

[REDACTED]:
Now you're testing my memory. [REDACTED] I think that's after year five or six. If things go well.

[REDACTED]:
Can I answer this?

[REDACTED]:

Yes, certainly, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]:

Thank you. In fairness, this is outside [REDACTED] terms of reference. And I should say we, as RiverOak agreed to the 25,000 cap. And it's important to remember it's 18,000 cargo movements and 7000 passenger movements. If we ever wanted to increase that, that ceiling, we would have to go back to the Department for Transport, and there would have to be another public consultation process. Almost a mini DCO process again, so it's not as though we could simply up it if we wanted to. How quickly we'll reach that cap, we really don't know. It could be within five years, it might take 10 years. The other thing to be said is that the we might reach the 18,000 limit of cargo planes more quickly, because we don't know how quickly the passenger market will recover after the COVID situation. And I've said this publicly at the moment we are planning only on cargo because we're awaiting developments on the passenger side.

[REDACTED]:

Will there be a playoff then perhaps as you look if you reach your 18,000 cargo from a commercial aspect and you don't have the uptake on the passenger, will that then flip over. Will it give the ability or is 18,000 cap on freight and 7000 on passenger?

[REDACTED]:

Then you run against the run up against the capacity of the airport on the ground. Although everyone thinks this is a huge airport, by the standards of international airports it isn't. And you are limited by simply the amount of space you have on the ground and the number of parking stands and the amount of capacity in your cargo buildings. So, I would say, and this is looking into a crystal ball, if you like, that at 18,000 cargo movements, we think we will be at about half a million tonnes of cargo, maybe 600,000 tonnes of cargo, which is a significant number. It would make us a very, very, very large cargo airport. And to take us from there is not simply a question of going back to the government and seeing will you increase the cap and having a process. We would have to show that there was land available for the airport to expand on to, that there was public support for this and that it could be justified. So there would be an awful lot of tests that would have to be satisfied.

[REDACTED]:

And I suppose I've got to answer another question here because I've written down here seven, seven sevens and seven, four sevens. I can't remember if that was the previous is it that the cargo planes are going to be heavier? Bigger, louder, noisier, or I know they're all restricted by legislation. You know, the Civil Aviation Authority, I would imagine have a cap on what planes you can use. But I suppose, are the cargo planes because my belief is the older planes are going to be used for cargo. People want to fly in the newer planes. Is that going to impact the noise levels more?

[REDACTED]:

Well, no, we have limits on the amount of noise as well. So if we were, if we were to allow noisy cargo planes to come in, we would have a cap on our numbers, and we wouldn't be able to achieve the 18,000 movements because that's all in the DCO as well. And the other thing to say is, you know, you

are partly right, that in the recent COVID crisis, everyone was scrambling to get whatever cargo plane they could find up in the air. But in the medium term, no one wants to use noisy gas guzzling cargo planes, but it because it because they got, you know, they consume fuel at a huge rate and assuming that oil prices go back to more normal rates, operators don't want them. It makes them un-economic you see. So the most economical cargo planes are the latest model, the 747 800, which is much, much quieter than its predecessors. And we think that's likely to be the workhorse of the future, running alongside some 760 sevens as well. There aren't that many aircraft to choose from, to be honest with you, but you know, I'm happy to answer the question. It's technically outside the terms of reference of this evening's event.

██████████:

Right, I apologize for that. On the passenger side so will they be using the bigger planes? Or will they just be the small , short haul planes?

██████████:

This is difficult to say. Our view of 7000 movements is that Manston will serve the European market and it will be Ryanair or somebody like that. And, by the way, these will be low cost short haul carriers who don't carry cargo because low cost carriers do a rapid turnaround, or they don't have cargo. That's our view. And we don't really think there's much potential for Manston to be a long haul destination. That will all be you know, that that will all be at Heathrow primarily. And if Heathrow ever gets its third runway, they'll have even more long-haul destinations.

██████████:

So I'm saying that (inaudible) because I know I came across the flights between 6 o'clock and 11 o'clock. Is that still the case for freight? Depending on I think, whether or not the pilot keeps within those boundaries, I seem to remember that from one of the last ones, you know, delays and etc. So we could be seeing flights outside those times.

██████████:

No. The terms of the DCO are pretty descriptive, we're allowed late arrivals so if you're Ryanair flight is meant to arrive at 2300. And there's a thunderstorm at Mallorca and it's held up, it will be allowed to come in late. But those kinds of aircraft are not very noisy. There will be no departures. And the 0600 0700 slot is reserved for outbound passenger planes because if we have Ryanair or EasyJet, they need to get their aircraft into the air during that first hour in the morning because they lose an hour as soon as they fly over into continental Europe. That's all. It's not for cargo.

██████████:

Thanks, ██████████. I hope that's helpful ██████████ and answering your questions. I think we're sort of varying outside the parameters of the discussion around airspace. So it feels like that is an appropriate time to bring proceedings to a close. I hope that's been helpful for you all. It's certainly been helpful for us in, in hearing a little bit more about your views on the options presented. We will resend the document for avoidance of doubt to make sure everyone's reading from the same hymn sheet as it were. And just a final reminder for me that we would still value your written feedback by the deadline of the 14th of August. So ██████████ have you got any final words you'd like to say in summary before we close?

[REDACTED]:

No, nothing from me apart from to say, nothing's in stone at the moment. Remember, there's a public consultation next year. Thank you very much, guys.

[REDACTED]

Thank you everyone.