

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

2pm-3pm, 15 July 2020 – via Zoom

Attendees

Name	Organisation
[REDACTED]	Canterbury City Council
[REDACTED]	Canterbury City Council
[REDACTED]	Dover District Council
[REDACTED]	Folkestone Town Council
[REDACTED]	Fordwich Town Council
[REDACTED]	Hackington Parish Council
[REDACTED]	Hackington Parish Council/Archbishops School
[REDACTED]	Kent County Council
[REDACTED]	RiverOak Strategic Partners (RSP)
[REDACTED]	Osprey
[REDACTED]	Osprey
[REDACTED]	Copper Consultancy
[REDACTED]	Copper Consultancy
[REDACTED]	Copper Consultancy

[REDACTED]
(regarding recording) For inclusion in the evidence we provide to the Civil Aviation Authority, and that will help demonstrate how we've involved stakeholders like yourselves, and how your views have helped shape the design options. Secondly, can I ask you to make use of the raise your hand function when it comes to questions. You can find that if you're not familiar with Zoom, you can find that by clicking on the view participants button and then just clicking on the hand icon. We'll then come to you in turn. My colleague [REDACTED] who's beavering away behind the scenes will unmute you to enable you to ask your question. When he does that, please could I ask that you introduce yourself and state the name of the organization you represent? And if you are trying to save bandwidth by switching off video, if you could switch it on when you are asking a question that will hopefully make things feel a bit friendlier and more interactive. Once the team have responded to your question, we'll come back to you for any follow up questions or points of clarification. But we will ask that you remain on mute when you're not asking a question because that way will help us avoid that nasty feedback effect that you sometimes get on calls like this where there are multiple speakers.

So, just final pieces of housekeeping if I just move on to the next slide. I've mentioned how we're going to manage the workshop, just a bit of background about what this afternoon's session is all about. It's about us and the Manston team understanding your preferences where there's more than one option given in the documents that you'll all have received. We're keen to hear any suggested

amendments to the design shown, or indeed any alternatives. We'd like to hear about any options you think should not be taken forward and understand better the reasons why. And it's also an opportunity for you to ask questions about the options available to better inform your written response, and on that note, I'd just like to remind you that we do still welcome your views. And in fact, we'd very much like to get your views by email, and in addition to your attendance at this workshop, so please do follow up after this session by sending us your comments by email to manstonairspace@communityrelations.co.uk. And the deadline for receiving those responses is Friday the 14th of August. So we'll remind you of those details again at the close. But I just wanted to make the point that as we very much appreciate you coming along to this focus group, we would still welcome your written feedback as well. So that's all the housekeeping. I'll now hand over to [REDACTED] for five minutes, say a few words of introduction, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Thank you. Thank you very much, [REDACTED]. I'd like to welcome you all to this focus group, and also make it clear that it's a focus group. Some of you have attended the focus group that we held last October [*correction: should state November*]. There were some misunderstandings out there that it was a substitute for a public consultation. It is not, there will be public consultations later this year or possibly early next year. This is what it says, it's a focus group. And it's been called in compliance with CAA regulations, and also to deal with some fake news that is still out there and current sadly, to make the point that it's now just about 12 months since River Oak RSP purchased the freehold of Manston. We own the Manston Airport, it belongs to us and it is subject to a covenant which says there shall be no housing on it.

Not that we ever intended to put housing on it, but some of that nonsense is still out there because I've seen it circulating. I would like to make that clear.

And what I propose to do now, if you'll bear with me, is to read from paragraphs 20 and 21 of the Secretary of State's decision, which was published on the ninth of July. 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 to 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 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 United Kingdom, 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. In addition, it is to be concluded that the department would support the government's mostly 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 of the development would be in accordance with such policies and the granting development consent order for the development would serve to implement such policy.

I felt it was worth reading that out for the avoidance of doubt because I have seen things which suggest to the contrary. On that basis, and just to say that we as an RSP, support the airspace change in all the process in all its detail, it will play a vital part in the development of Manston. And the contribution of the local community on issues such as flight paths, height of aircraft, and all those kinds of things is going to be very important for us. I've said my bit, I'll now sit and listen to the experts. And we will be guided by them as they report to the CAA, whose decision will be ultimate. Thank you.

██████████
Thank you very much, ██████. Thanks, ██████, for the introductions as well. And good afternoon, everybody. And thanks for coming to this focus group as ██████ just iterated, it's another chance at an early stage for informed local opinion to influence the flight paths and the type of airspace that is required to operate at Manston airport. You'll have seen there's been some progression in, let's say, updates to the design options that we've been looking at. And we've addressed some of the previous stakeholder feedback that we've received from previous focus groups and also previous information released.

This is the final part of stage two in terms of stakeholder engagement before we eventually take a set of primary options to the Civil Aviation for their consideration. What I would like to reiterate as ██████ alluded to, these are at this stage, these are options, and are options that we would like to take your opinions on. But we also would like to take your opinions if you feel there are options that have been left out or that you think would particularly mitigate or solve a particular problem that you see in your local community or area. Remember, this is a short list it will inform us and, how we take a final list to the Civil Aviation Authority. That final list will have a robust environmental assessment made on it in terms of noise, CO2, and NO emissions from engines. Thank you for that. And really now it's over to you, ladies and gentlemen, to voice your opinions. And let me have your thoughts as ██████ said, just raise your hand and we'll go through this logically. Thank you.

██████████
Although we're online, this is a bit like a face to face event where there's always a pause while somebody plucks up the courage to ask the first question, but I'm sure lots of you who've got issues or comments that you'd like to raise or make so hopefully in a moment, we'll see a hand and we can start off proceedings by going to one of your questions.

Great. Okay. We have a question from [REDACTED] if you could introduce yourself and ask your question, thank you.

[REDACTED]
Okay. Just really the key concern I guess, that most people, layman let's call it, are concerned about is the flight path routes, all of the issues around flight levels noise levels, when engines have to be under load and when they're not. And I guess the bit that I'm trying to get my head round, sorry, I should introduce myself first you asked, Hackington Parish Council so just to the north of Canterbury City, I'm the Chair there. It was really a question of that we appear to be moving down a path of a long list of options, shortening down to what's now being termed primary options. And I'm just interested to see where those develop into more formal assessments. I haven't seen any evidence that there's been technical assessments and clearly I come from a consulting, environmental consulting background.

So I know that you're not going to run technical assessments on the long list. But you, may have some sense of order about which ones have more or less impact. And I just wonder where we are in terms of when that almost formal technical process starts to come in? Or does it? Or do we, are we going down a primary route without the benefit of understanding what those impacts might be?

[REDACTED]
No, not at all, [REDACTED]. And that's a sound question. These options that we've got to so far are done primarily on a qualitative basis, and from feedback from the Local Authorities and some of the aviation stakeholders. And these the options that we have eventually come to hear in that narrowing set of options as being initially driven by the design principles, if you remember, we discussed in stage one, one of the primary drivers apart from safety and capability of design to mesh International Civil Aviation Organization guidelines is that the noise impact to the local communities was kept to a minimum. And the length of route and type of route was rather further down the priority list in terms of track miles flow. The priority seemed to be pretty clear that the distance has flown over the land had to be kept to a minimum. So that's being done on a qualitatively basis say, right that's noise effectively overland that's lay down to the local community. Let's try get the aircraft either from overseas very quickly onto the ground or off the ground and then back over the sea. After this stage, [REDACTED], then once we've diluted out of this or distilled rather out of this, a more precise set of route options, they will then undergo an analytical environmental assessment in terms of so that's a quantitative in terms of CO2, NO, and also noise on the ground.

[REDACTED]
Okay.

[REDACTED]
Thank you, [REDACTED]. Does anybody else have a question they'd like to raise with them with [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

It could be that there's elements of the document that you'd like to explore further. Okay, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has raised his hand, [REDACTED] if you could unmute [REDACTED] and we'll hear his question.

[REDACTED]
Yeah, thank you very much. [REDACTED] from City Council (Inaudible) it's the people in Canterbury is at the (Inaudible) ... in ...on the (Inaudible)on the red area Herne Bay in the main urban area I need to ... (Inaudible) come and be.... (Inaudible)

[REDACTED]
I'm sorry [REDACTED] I'm going to have to interrupt I'm not get anything of that.

[REDACTED]
... to pass over and beyond to be district flight paths directly over Herne Bay and I suppose the question locally will be whether there is scope to adjust those flight paths also the impact though directly on the urban areas in general but... (Inaudible)

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I'm afraid the quality of the line is ... yeah that's much better. [REDACTED] can you hear that okay?

[REDACTED]
I didn't hear most of what [REDACTED] had to say I'm afraid.

[REDACTED]
Hello, can you hear me at all?

[REDACTED]
I can hear [REDACTED] now.

[REDACTED]
Yeah. [REDACTED] if you wouldn't mind just repeating your question, sorry, the quality of the line was very poor.

[REDACTED]
Can you hear me now I've switched my video off?

[REDACTED]
Yes, that's much, much clearer. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

Okay, that's no problem. Thank you. Good as what I'm saying is that the concern for Canterbury district is the obviously the flight paths passing over the residential areas particularly Herne Bay, which is very close to the runway. And I'm not a technical expert, but some of the drawings within the (inaudible) Document flight paths they pass directly over Canterbury but also Herne Bay. Now what that's going to be a great concern to local people and will increase the noise impacts. So I suppose my question really is, is there scope to adjust those from ours in order to avoid passing over urban areas, particularly at the height that they're likely to pass over, given the proximity of Herne Bay, I think this is a particular concern. The proximity of home base the runway to the aircraft is going to be naturally lower. Is there scope to alter the flight path so they don't cause that effect?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] could you show the first of the departures off to eight going to the west, please, just to answer that question.

[REDACTED]

Yeah sure thing sorry I'm just going to get the document up on my screen. Sorry for the wait.

[REDACTED]

Page seven, [REDACTED] might be better.

[REDACTED]

Thank you [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] what we've tried to do initially, I'll tackle this in two parts. We've tried to be sensitive to that concern that was aired in in stage one and also the early parts of this stage in coming up with design options. So departures as you'll see from this diagram, yes, as you say go over to the north go between Reculver and Westgate-on-sea and particularly to try to avoid Herne Bay where at all possible, and we can confidently do that and thread the aircraft through that, let's say that urban gap. Similarly, with the previous diagram going to the south that would again avoid the Herne Bay Area and predominantly go over very, very sparsely populated areas of Southeast Kent and Thanet. I think your concern probably centers on the approaches to one zeros. If you could show one of those ...

[REDACTED]

Page 15 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] could I just quickly, the numbers referred that I've, where I've marked ... (inaudible) consultation document, a one runway (inaudible). What that shows is blue thick blue arrows lines with arrows and it's one left hand departures and that they appear to be going directly on the runway across Herne bay without any kind of deviation or direct route from what I see.

[REDACTED]

If I could answer that one, it's [REDACTED] from Osprey. Yeah, I think the images you're talking about, were from the document that preceded one we're talking about now. So that effectively showed that the blue arrows you're talking about and, and this is all about the CAA process, we have to discuss with you guys a comprehensive list of options for all the procedures. And what that document effectively said is, you know, what if we had a blank sheet of paper, and we didn't care about anybody, we could actually go anywhere. So we could go straight ahead, we could go left over Canterbury, we could go right we could turn about. So those arrows are just representing where the aircraft could possibly go, if we didn't take anything into account. After we sent that document out and I think there's a step in between, we've got feedback to say, those lines go over Herne Bay, they go over Canterbury, and that is where we've now come up with a document that [REDACTED] is showing on the screen, where we've got more precise routings that have answered a lot of the concerns of the local communities about where those blue lines went. And so we've stepped away from all those blue lines in particular the ones you're talking about going direct straight ahead over Herne Bay. And then I think in particular, the one that goes left on to Southwest goes right over the center of Canterbury. Based on the feedback we got from that document, we've now come up these routes where hopefully they have where possible, in particular avoided the big filter areas so that the A one with all those blue lines have effectively come up with the last slide that [REDACTED] showed where we can either go right, as [REDACTED] said, just the west over-sea, or we have South overland and that's how we've narrowed down those blue lines to where we are now.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] can I just check that you have actually seen or are able to access Appendix A Manston Airport Airspace Design and Procedures Options development, part three, which this discussion is about?

[REDACTED]
I'm sorry, I, I've lost [REDACTED] Totally.

[REDACTED]
(Inaudible)

[REDACTED]
We are struggling with the line [REDACTED] but it sounds like you may be referring to the document from the previous stage of consultation, of engagement rather. So perhaps we could pick that up offline with you and make sure you got the latest version on which we're seeking feedback?

[REDACTED]
Right. Okay. What I'm looking at is the last consultation which is stage two of the process. And so what you're saying now is that the you're now developing the revised flight paths, which will then present formerly at stage three consultation, and this is a this is a precursor to that?

██████████ it is, but these still remain options and we value your feedback. And just to reiterate, we're now looking for feedback on the Options Development, part three to the Manston Airspace Design and Procedures.

██████████
It should be attached to the invitation you've received for this focus group. So if you wanted to double check, you've got the latest version, you'll find it attached to that email. Okay, and thanks very much, ██████████ I'm just gonna go to ██████████ who's been waiting patiently to ask a question. So ██████████, if we unmute you if you could introduce yourself and ask your question or make your comment thanks.

██████████
Yeah. Can you hear me?

██████████
Yes. Go ahead. ██████████

██████████
Yeah. ██████████ Head of Inward Investment and Tourism at Dover District Council, I think to some degree echoing the earlier comments that my colleague ██████████, not ██████████ was it, ██████████ from Canterbury actually made, I think as a premise our preference clearly would be to see maximum flight pathways occurring and taking place so overwater is distinct from land. And of course, if one looks at the earlier plan that you actually displayed on the screen, and making a left hand turn as it were, and heading south over Dover, Dover district. Yeah, that's the one and clearly there are a number of fairly isolated communities there, insofar as the rural nature of Dover district. And clearly the tranquility, and such is probably as good as it gets a by comparison to some of the more rigorous rural urban localities, if I put it that way. So I think from our point of view, you know, we would really come at this from a position of trying to maximize flight pathways overwater, as distinct from land, but recognizing, of course, that we're in a process where the environmental considerations will eventually put an awful lot of detail on the selected pathways in terms of the various ingredients that need to be considered. But I think above all, perhaps it's noise that is the main concern and the intrusion into those very remote rural communities.

██████████
██████████ I think you're absolutely right. And that's what we received loud and clear from the Design Principles way back in stage one. You're absolutely right. And there are a couple of options that we haven't included and discounted from this later stage. Exactly because of that reason that intuitively as well as qualitatively, there was long flight paths going over land, and the ones we're now showing as options are shorter flight paths over land. But we certainly take on board that that option as well, a left hand turn to go down towards Dover is something that you would not appreciate.

██████████
Yeah. Thank you.

Okay. Are there any other questions? I can't see any hands raised but I'll leave it a few moments to give people time to gather their thoughts. So, okay, [REDACTED] we'll go back to [REDACTED] got a question.

[REDACTED]
Okay, yeah, if we're shy or at least not quite as many as I thought you might get on this call. let's have another go. I guess the questions that we're being asked at a sort of parish local level is where's the sort of timing of this and very clearly the DCO has clarified the intent clearly. If I was the developer of Manston I'll be moving on at a reasonable pace having overcome that particular hurdle. The phase that you appear to be describing now is reducing those primary options to a point where you then submit something to the CAA. We're also conscious of the fact that part three, sorry, stage three is a consultation, then is going to push this back into the wider public domain. Which comes first, submission to the CAA or stage three?

[REDACTED]
We have to confirm with the CAA that the process that we've gone through is sufficient for the regulatory process. So that we offer these, let's say these finalized options to the CAA. And they then look at those from a point of view of the process saying are these a reasonable set of procedures or designs that have come out of the stage one and stage two engagement process?

[REDACTED]
Okay.

[REDACTED]
And that's a gate that we have to pass [REDACTED] as a regulatory process. Following that, and having been given the okay to then proceed saying we've done, we followed the process and the expectation of the engaged stakeholders that's when we go into a more detailed process of looking at quantitative assessments of each procedure coming up with detailed designs, and those are the designs then, design options but a very narrow set of design options that then will go to the public consultation in 2021.

[REDACTED]
Okay, so forgive me the question was, roughly then in terms of timescale submission to the CAA is when?

[REDACTED]
This at the end of this stage of the process and where we submit the process and the results of the stakeholder engagement that is at the end of November this year.

[REDACTED]
Okay.

██████████
Then we will go to full public consultation, as we said, in 20, next year in 2021. Okay, and that will be a, as would be expected, a full 12-week public consultation. And then the assessment then again, will be made on those of which we, what procedures we perceive as the best options for the airspace users as well as the stakeholders on the ground.

██████████
Yeah. Okay. I mean, I'm just having a second guess where the (inaudible) is going to come from. If I was a member of the public, who potentially have engaged to the level that they may or may not wish to do so on Manston, the concern might be for me from a stakeholder engagement point of view is that, when you eventually get to the public consultation phase and stage three, in essence, you've already you know, you've been through your statutory obligation in terms of the consultation process and come up with a very shortlisted preferred options. Now, the hope is that parish councils and city councils and districts are representing the electorate views in order that when you come out with that shortlisted version, they're the right ones. And I guess the you know, the concern might be and it's not a concern from this parish but it just probably gives me a sense of concern that at stage three when you're engaging with the public in the public consultation phase, that actually it's a little bit more of a fait accompli rather than, the you know, the wider list.

██████████
Not at all, ████████, not at all.

██████████
Okay. I'll go with your confidence on that. I'm just slightly concerned that it appears that way.

██████████
If out of consultation in that term in 2021, I'd like to think we've gone through a process that we have gone from a very wide spectrum to a narrow spectrum. I'd like to think that our spectrum was so wide at the beginning of stage one, the net was cast so wide, that we've captured every potential option that was there. If, if something does come up in after consultation that we haven't considered and the CAA think it's worth consideration, then that goes back into the option mix.

██████████
Okay.

██████████
So it's by no means a done deal at all, ████████.

██████████
I'm not, you know, I'm really looking out from your side of the fence not mine.

Yeah, yeah, of course you're seeing it from the other side. And it's a very valid comment. Absolutely right, and I'm sure you'll hear me repeat that in 2021 to people in the public consultation say no, it's not a done deal. Again, we're now gathering more and more thoughts. I would be disappointed as a professional and so would some of the team I think, if we if there was something we really had missed. There maybe nuances, which is great and that's why we consult.

██████████
Yeah.

██████████
It's certainly not a done deal ██████████

██████████
Yeah, I guess then that on the basis that you're engaging with the CAA but I'm sure on all of the discussions that you've had up to this point in terms of attracting freight air carriers to the party that those flight options the long list, there's got to be some recognition that the planes, freight planes particularly, can only do certain things, they can only turn in certain directions at certain speeds and at certain altitudes. I think I'm hoping that that's a very layman's description of Air Flight but there's only so many things you can do. And I assume, also the fact that the options that you were coming to reflect the fact that some of that airspace is already crowded by the use of London City or was it South End or Biggin Hill, I can't remember.

██████████
But that's absolutely right, ██████████ And these routes, again, options have been presented to the local aviation stakeholders yesterday. And we've been engaging with them all through the process as well in parallel. So those aspects particularly Southend, Gatwick, and London City, Biggin Hill to a degree, their procedures are taken into account as well. You may know that's one of the reasons we've not got a lot of options over to the northwest over the slightly higher Thames Estuary because of interactions with City and South End traffic.

██████████
Yeah.

██████████
But also one of the other reasons were and it was a little bit of a bone of contention, shall we say in the DCO process that we highlighted a number of times that this is all, were fully integrated into the FASI South program. Future airspace strategy implementation run by the oversight, oversight shall I say by the Department for Transport, but run in a regulatory process by the CAA. So we're fully integrated into that as well. And those design options take into account what the National Air Traffic service provider thinks the airspace around above 7000 feet will be like in the southeast of England as well in the future.

██████████
Okay.

██████████
██████████ sorry. ██████████ here again, I might add. ██████████ can we go to slide nine please.

██████████
Certainly.

██████████
And ██████████ just to, to put a bit of meat on the bones of what you were just saying here with the the way the aircraft can fly. The lines that we designed, are effectively the worst case so they've all been, they've not been procedurally designed, but a procedure designer has looked at and come up with, exactly as you said, the aircraft can only do certain turn radius, certain speeds, certain heights, and these are technically the worst case. And a lot of people imagine that because we're doing performance based navigation, we work with a GPS, that aircraft can thread the needles and sort of dot to dot places easily. And this slide I think is a good example that, for instance, I mean, you guys know the area better so St Nicholas-at-Wade, the turn shown on the screen all try and turn to keep the east of St Nicholas-at-Wade. But someone could say, well, why not go around the back of St Nicholas-at-Wade and go through the marshes area to the East of Herne Bay, it seems to be less populated. That would involve a heavy aircraft starting to turn left to avoid St Nicholas-at-Wade and then starting to turn right. The turn radius of that would take it so far west that the impact you could never...

██████████
Yeah, yeah.

██████████
...like that. So there are certain aspects that we can't do, as you alluded to with the aircraft performance in particular straight after takeoff. Because they are heavy. Yes, they can turn but it's a standard turn, turn rate, and depending on how heavy they are the radius of the turn changes

██████████
Yeah, it's an oil tank not a racing one.

██████████
Exactly. A lot of people think because it's GPS, you can do like wheeling a car in and out of cones. You can't do that with a 400-ton aircraft. They will go within reason where we want and all the procedures will be designed to the worst case of the aircraft (inaudible). Certainly, the climb gradients that are indicated on this map are all based at 6% which is about three and a half degrees, we were told that the majority of aircraft would actually be able to do that. And another one of the planning constraints is that we never assume an aircraft is more than 15 feet at the end of the runway. So all these heights are based on them crossing the end of the runway, at only 15 feet.

██████████
Okay.

██████████
You've been, most people have been to an airport you know, an aircraft is already at 2, 300 feet by the time to get to the end of the runway.

██████████
You'd like to think so.

██████████
Exactly yeah. But this is the worst case, that if they have a problem, they might only be 500 feet pointed indicated on the map. In reality, they'll already be at 500 feet just after the end of the runway, and they will be able to climb at a gradient rate. So these are the worst case heights. In reality, the 500, feet, they're probably going to be already at two, two and a half thousand feet as they cross the coast if not higher, but it's all that worst-case scenario.

██████████
Okay.

██████████
And the same goes for turn radius as well. So you're absolutely right. You alluded to it. They will be designed accurately. These are the best representation in it, but they are worst case representation.

██████████
Thanks very much, ██████████ We've got another question from ██████████. So, if we go to ██████████ next.

██████████
Hi, just a quick question really following up from one of ██████████ comments. If one of the constraints is the flight paths associated with other airports, if in order to get optimum flight paths here that avoid the problems that we've identified, is there also scope for as part of this process for other airports to have their flight paths in any way altered? Is that part of this process?

██████████
It is ██████████ yes, precisely. And that's why, that is what the future space strategy implementation team are doing. There will be checks and balances between airports because there will be slightly competing demands. And then there may be areas where there is a negative impact on one airport. But the overall benefit may be say, let's say a good example is between Luton and Heathrow at the moment where the heavier traffic is into Heathrow. So you have to have more traffic over a route and that you would perhaps have a better routing system for the Heathrow on that particular option than you would for Luton option as less traffic on that option, so, the overall benefit for the whole will be better to optimize the Heathrow option rather than, for example, a Luton option. So, there are going to be subtle interactions throughout the process as you would expect in any system of systems.

Well, I suppose, but my question is more whether the environmental factors, so the noise issue will also be part of that consideration, because obviously, from a safety point of view, there might have to be compromises made, but will there be compromises made that that allow for an optimum flight path arrangement for Manston as part of that consideration?

██████████
There might be I don't see it because Manson is on the periphery of the London TMA but there may be.

██████████
Okay, thank you.

██████████
Okay thanks to ██████████ for those questions. That's been very helpful. Let's pause for a moment to see if anyone has any further questions. Happy to hear from those who have spoken again and right on cue, Tim, I'll come to you. ██████████, if you could unmute ██████████.

██████████:
Yeah, obviously, just been discussing the out the outgoing. Could you talk us through the in incoming flight pathways please?

██████████:
Certainly. The incoming flight paths, short range from the aerodrome, again, dictated really by safety and the design, regulations and requirements of the International Civil Aviation Organization. So the incoming aircraft generally have to stick to a straight in leg of a minimum of eight nautical miles. And that's directly to the runway and that is really indelible, that can't be moved. So that that's the short-range aspect of the designs entry to the airport, shall we say. The arrivals from the west as shown on this diagram, we've come either from the north or from the south. All designs need to have a hold in them as an option, just in case there's a problem at the airport to hold the aircraft. And in the approaches to runway 10 or runway one zero, we found two options one overland and one over sea for the hold, but you'll see that the state straight in approach go cut starts from out to the north of Whitstable and comes in a straight line into the runway. Similarly, you could take almost a mirror image of that for the approach to runway 28 or runway two eight from the east going in a straight line over the southern part of Ramsgate to land on the runway, but predominantly that procedure or those associated procedures will be all over the English Channel/the Thames and only that short distance of a mile and a half over the southern part of Ramsgate will it be overland prior to the runway.

██████████:
Okay, thank you.

██████████
██████████ also can I just add, and I think ██████████ mentioned it. Obviously on this side as ██████████ said, the distance you have to be to land the runway is inevitably going to mean the aircraft will over fly Herne Bay on this approach. If you look at the map that's shown there, the FAP, that's the point at which the

aircraft start descending. So normally three degrees, and we don't have any leeway on that, it's one of the requirements of the regulatory documents. So for the FAP, two and a half thousand feet, they will start descending down to the runway, they'll do a continuous descent. If we quickly [REDACTED], go to slide 16, please. On this one, the FAP is just a little bit further west and the aircraft for 3000 feet. So the starting height you think oh that might be a better option. But all that means is they will, still because the glide slope will be the same angle, they will still reach two and a half thousand feet at the same point as the previous slide.

[REDACTED]
Right, thank you.

[REDACTED]
So there's very little you can do and you can't give them a steeper approach angle. I mean, yeah, if they start at 3000 feet, they're a bit higher, gravity might help them but in honesty the one with two and a half thousand feet, they might still be at 3000 feet as indicated on this slide as well, it's just at that point is the nominated start to descent. They may already be in descent at that point anyway, following this line, so there's actually very little difference in terms of the height over Herne Bay, the aircraft will be between the two and a half and 3000 foot. You could say, the 3000 foot one, this one, they'll be descending from three and a half thousand feet, whereas technically the previous one, they may already be at two and a half thousand feet at the 3000 point foot here. So this option could have them starting 500 feet higher, but ultimately, at that point where they're both reach two and a half thousand feet, because it's the same glide slope they'll both be the same height that there's no scope in making them higher, unless you increase the natural angle of descent which we're not allowed to do

[REDACTED]
In due course, if I've got this right, and possibly I haven't, but I would wonder whether the prevailing winds, clearly have an influence on the incoming and outgoing particular pathway being used. And is there any sort of information that would give a comparison of likely westerly takeoff or easterly takeoff? So I know in the past there have been different views on this matter. I don't know whether it's a valid point but just trying to understand the capacity for different directional approaches.

[REDACTED]
If you recall, [REDACTED] we did go into a lot of detail on that particular aspect during the DCO process, and yes, there is on an operational basis, you would have the opportunity we think from analysis and that's borne out by history as well to do 73% of operations to and from the west. So you're using the wind direction...

[REDACTED]
Yeah.

[REDACTED]
... to minimize the noise effect overland to the west of the airport, so that you're potentially landing with a tail wind, into, Manston from the from the west, with a very, very gentle westerly winds. So then

avoiding approaches over the southern part of Ramsgate. And similarly, maybe with a tail wind from the east rather than taking off to the east, we'd be able to operationally allow aircraft to take off again to the west, avoiding the south end ... the southern tip of Ramsgate.

██████████
Thank you.

██████████
Okay, thank you. I'll just pause again, just for any final questions, we're coming up towards an hour. So it's been a very helpful session from our point of view. So thanks to all who've asked questions, and I hope those who haven't found it useful too. And I will just remind you while waiting for any kind of last bits for comments or questions, I'll just take the opportunity to remind you of the

details for sending your considered comments and views following this workshop. So the email again is manstonairspace@communityrelations.co.uk. And the deadline for responses is Friday the 14th of August. So again, just to reiterate, we are still very keen to hear from all of you who've attended today. Please do take the time to write in with your comments that will be extremely helpful and much appreciated. So in the absence of any further questions, I'll just hand back to ██████████ just to summarize, but from my point of view, thanks for everyone who's taken part. It's been a very useful session for us.

██████████
Thanks very much, everybody. They were very pertinent questions. And I'm confident we're going to get some good and usable procedures out of this to take walk towards the CAA and then to assess on a more qualitative, quantitative basis for the consultation phase of the process. I'd reiterate really what ██████████ has just said don't be afraid to put in any further comments if you have if there's something you've forgotten by the deadline date, and of course, this is not an open and shut case. There's still the consultation next year as well. Where again, views and opportunities will be taken where they appear. Thanks very much guys for coming along.

██████████
Okay, thank you.

██████████
Thank you everyone. Enjoy the rest of your afternoons.

██████████
Okay.

Unidentified speaker:
Thank you very much.

██████████
Thank you.


Thank you, bye bye.