



RiverOak Strategic Partners

Response to ExA's Rule 8(3) Letter dated 03.04.19

TR020002/D5/TANote

Examination Document

Project Name:	Manston Airport Development Consent Order
Application Ref:	TR020002
Submission Deadline:	5
Date:	05 April 2019

Technical note:

Manston Airport – Addendum TA and Transport ES Chapter – ExA Omissions Response

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 This Technical Note (TN) has been prepared to provide a narrative of Woods response the Examining Authority (ExA) omissions set out in the letter of the 3rd April 2019 (Ref – TR0100).
- 1.1.2 These comments have been made regarding two documents;
Revised Transport Assessment: Environmental Statement Addendum – Transport Chapter; and
Transport Assessment Addendum and Appendices
- 1.1.3 The following section will set out a table for the two documents setting out the omissions to be addressed and the response from Wood. The Wood response will set out the location of the change and a narrative of the change.
- 1.1.4 This TN has been prepared to support a resubmission of the documents with the omissions addressed.

1.2 Environmental Statement Addendum – Transport Chapter

- 1.2.1 Table 1.1 sets out a table of the omissions and response by Wood for the Environmental Statement Addendum – Transport Chapter.

Table 1.1 Environmental Statement Addendum – Transport Chapter – Omissions and Response

Reference	ExA Omissions	Wood Response
i	The figures referred to in the assessment of effects on receptors for links 14 (paragraph 14.10.3) and 15 (paragraph 14.10.4) do not appear to follow that in Appendix 14.3.	These are typographical errors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 14.10.2 should be Link 14 and has been relabelled Paragraph 14.10.3 should be Link 15 and has been relabelled Paragraph 14.10.4 has been deleted
ii	Appendix 14.3 indicates that Link 13 does not need to be considered, but it has been.	As set out above, this was a typo and the paragraph should have been labelled Link 14. This has been corrected.
iii	Link 20 (at paragraph 14.10.8) does not include all the % increases set out in Appendix 14.3.	As set out in paragraph 14.8.3, the Rule 1 threshold from the Guidance on Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (GEART) is an increase of traffic of more than 30%. The 30% increase should not have been highlighted. The table in Appendix 14.3 has been corrected.

Reference	ExA Omissions	Wood Response
iv	Table 14.20 identifies link 34 as needing further consideration (so does Figure 14.9), but it is not considered further in section 14.10.	This has been added to section 14.10
v	The 'AM peak all vehicle' % increase for link 39 Manston Road north of NGA link is highlighted in red (22%) in Appendix 14.3, but this is not reflected in Table 14.20 of the main document and has not been considered further.	The 22% increase in Appendix 14.3 should not have been highlighted and has been corrected.
vi	There are some missing data points in the table in Appendix 14.3. Should these all be 0?	These should be 0 and have been added.
vii	The 'Rule' for Shottendane Road north east of the junction with Park Lane (Link 11) in Appendix 14.3 does not match that set out in Table 14.17 of the main document.	This is a typo in the Appendix 14.3 table which has been corrected to read Rule 1.
viii	There are a number of other references to figures and tables in the text that appear to be wrong. All references should be checked before re-submission.	Noted. References have been checked and any errors identified have been corrected.
ix	The Technical Note - Revised Road Traffic Data and Air Quality Assessment at the end of the document was not included in the original Deadline 5 submission and does not appear to be complete. Include a complete version.	Noted.

1.3 Transport Assessment Addendum and Appendices

- 1.3.1 Table 1.2 sets out a table of the omissions and response by Wood for the Transport Assessment Addendum and Appendices.

Table 1.2 Transport Assessment Addendum and Appendices – Omissions and Response

Reference	ExA Omissions	Wood Response
i	The paragraph numbering in the Transport Assessment Addendum (March 2019) (the TA Addendum) does not follow the heading numbering towards the start.	<p>The paragraph numbering of the following chapters has been reviewed and revised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 2 • Chapter 3 • Chapter 4 <p>A wider review was undertaken of the whole document which resulted in two further paragraph references being updated.</p>
ii	Junction 2 (Table 6.3) – the difference in average queues has not been added up	Table 6.3 has been updated with the correct calculations in the Addendum TA Resubmission.

	correctly.	
iii	Junction 4 (Table 6.7) – the difference in scenarios has not be added up correctly. The 2039 Baseline scenario figures have brackets when they should not and the 2039 Baseline 'Average Queue PM Peak' figures are exactly the same as the 2039 with Development 'Average Queue AM Peak', which is hard to understand.	<p>Table 6.7 has been updated.</p> <p>The correct results for the PM peak in the 2039 scenario have been entered.</p> <p>The comparison figures between the scenarios for queues have also been reviewed and amended where necessary.</p>
iv	Junction 6 (Table 6.11) – difference in scenarios has not be added up correctly (A299 East).	<p>Table 6.11 has been updated.</p> <p>The comparison figures between the scenarios for queues on the A299 East in the AM Peak has been amended.</p>
v	Junction 8a (Table 6.15) – difference in scenarios has not be added up correctly.	<p>Table 6.15 has been updated.</p> <p>The comparison figures between the scenarios for queues on the A28 South and Station Road in the AM and PM Peaks have been amended.</p>
vi	Junction 16 (tables 6.29 and 6.30) – difference in scenarios (MMQ AM Peak) has not be added up correctly.	<p>Table 6.30 has been updated.</p> <p>The comparison figures between the scenarios for queues in the AM have been amended.</p>
vii	Junctions 21A and 21B (Table 6.34) – some of the difference brackets are missing.	<p>Table 6.34 has been updated.</p> <p>The comparison figures between the scenarios for queues in the AM and PM have been amended.</p>
viii	It is unclear why mitigation has been considered in section 6.30 for Junctions 21A and 21B and not within section 7 as for all other junctions requiring mitigation.	<p>This is set out in paragraph 6.3.16.4.</p> <p>A mitigation scheme has been required at this junction, but unlike the other junctions this mitigation scheme results in only a requirement to change the signal stage timing not any infrastructure changes to the junction. As such the results of the mitigation are set out in table 6.34 and not taken forward to the mitigation section (7)</p>
ix	Junction 27 (Table 6.38) – the difference in scenarios has not be added up correctly.	<p>Table 6.38 has been updated.</p> <p>The comparison figures between the scenarios for queues in the PM peak have been amended.</p>
x	Table 7.2 (Junction 4) – the differences in brackets do not tally up with the figures in Table 6.7.	<p>Table 7.2 has been updated.</p> <p>The comparison figures between the scenarios for queues in the PM peak have been amended.</p> <p>It should be noted the RFC figures in the PM peak for the 2039 + Development have also been amended from one zero decimal places to 2 decimal places.</p>
xi	Table 7.5 and Table 7.6 (Junction 12) both have a footnote saying "Figures in brackets are the difference between the 2039 baseline (existing layout) and 2039 + Development (mitigation layout)". However, the 2039 baseline (existing	<p>Table 6.22 has been supplemented with the 2039 Base results for Junction 12. Paragraphs 6.3.11.2 and 6.3.11.3 have also been revised to reflect this additional information.</p> <p>Table 7.5 and 7.6 have also been updated with the latest</p>

	layout) figures are not presented in section 6.3 for Junction 12 (only 2017 Base - Peak Hour Modelling Results). It is therefore not possible to make a comparison. In addition, the figures in the brackets of Table 7.5 and Table 7.6 seem very high, are these correct?	comparisons between the scenarios. The numbers are very large as the junction is well above capacity (and results can be treated with some caution) in 2039 and the mitigation scheme return the junction to a performance that it is considered acceptable in 2039 _ Development traffic.
xii	Table 7.7 (Junction 15) – the differences in brackets do not tally up with the figures in Table 6.26.	Table 7.7 has been updated to reflect the correct results and comparisons to queuing in 2039 Base.
xiii	It is not clear how the figures in Appendix F should be interpreted. Clear guidance should be provided within the document.	Figure 1.1 has been provided setting out the name of each of the zones which should assist in interpretation. 4.7.1.6 to 4.7.1.8 have been prepared to give further context to the matrix development.
xiv	The list of zones and their names associated with Appendix F should be provided, otherwise it is not possible to understand where the movements are taking place.	Figure 1.1 in Appendix F has been revised to provide a list of the zone number and where these zones are based on the list provided by KCC/Amey when matrix development was undertaken.
xv	Paragraph 5.2.1.3 of the TA Addendum refers to a DMRB compliance sheet being provided in Appendix H. This is not included in Appendix H.	This has now been provided.
xvi	Section 1.1 refers to Traffic and Transport DCO Plans. There are not any in the appendices.	The DCO plans have not been updated as a result of any of the changes to the development assessment and as such are not included. Only documents effected by the assessment have been included in the resubmission.

Issued byGlyn Price
.....**Approved by**Bev Coupe
.....**Copyright and non-disclosure notice**

The contents and layout of this report are subject to copyright owned by Wood (© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited 2019) save to the extent that copyright has been legally assigned by us to another party or is used by Wood under licence. To the extent that we own the copyright in this report, it may not be copied or used without our prior written agreement for any purpose other than the purpose indicated in this report. The methodology (if any) contained in this report is provided to you in confidence and must not be disclosed or copied to third parties without the prior written agreement of Wood. Disclosure of that information may constitute an actionable breach of confidence or may otherwise prejudice our commercial interests. Any third party who obtains access to this report by any means will, in any event, be subject to the Third Party Disclaimer set out below.

Third party disclaimer

Any disclosure of this report to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by Wood at the instruction of, and for use by, our client named on the front of the report. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. Wood excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage howsoever arising from reliance on the contents of this report. We do not however exclude our liability (if any) for personal injury or death resulting from our negligence, for fraud or any other matter in relation to which we cannot legally exclude liability.

Management systems

This document has been produced by Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited in full compliance with our management systems, which have been certified to ISO 9001, ISO 14001 and OHSAS 18001 by LRQA.