The Planning Inspectorate

Application by RiverOak Strategic Partners to upgrade and reopen Manston Airport

The Examining Authority's second Written Questions and requests for information (ExQ2)

Addendum - issued on 12 April 2019

On 3 April 2019 the Examining Authority (ExA) made a Procedural Decision[1] to delay the publication of its second Written Questions on **traffic and transport** until such a time as it had had the opportunity to consider and evaluate re-submitted versions of the Transport Environmental Statement chapter and Noise and Air Quality Technical Notes [REP5-022] and Revised Transport Assessment [REP5-021].

Having considered the above documentation, the following table sets out the ExA's Written Questions and requests for information in respect of **traffic and transport**.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word format is available on request from the Case Team: please contact ManstonAirport@pins.gsi.gov.uk.

Responses are due by **Deadline 6** (Friday 3 May 2019) in the Examination Timetable, with the exception of question Tr.2.1 for which a response is requested to be received from the Applicant on or before **23.59 on Tuesday 16 April 2019**.

[1] Available here: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR020002-003856

Abbreviations used

A list of the abbreviations used in this document is provided at **Annex A**.

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/manston-airport/?ipcsection=docs

The Examination Library will be updated at regular intervals as the Examination progresses.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2	**Transportation and traffic**	
Tr.2.1	The Applicant	**The Examining Authority (ExA) request that the Applicant responds to question Tr.2.1 in advance of Deadline 6 and ideally by 23.59 on Tuesday 16 April 2019.** **Alternative Manston-Haine Link** **Junction 2 A299 / A256 / Cottington Link Rd** **Junction 4 A299 / B2190** **Junction 6 A299 / Seamark Rd / A253 / Willetts Hill** **Junction 7 A299 / A28** **Junction 12: Manston Road / B2050 / Spitfire Way** **Junction 15: Manston Road / Hartsdown Road / Tivoli Road / College Road / Nash Road** **Junction 16 Ramsgate Rd / College Rd / A254 / Beatrice Rd** **Highway Safety Improvement at Spitfire Way/Alland Grange Road** **Highway Safety Improvement at Manston Road/Manston Court Road** Section 5 of the Revised Transport Assessment (RTA) submitted on 5 April 2019 [REP5-021] sets out an alternative Manston-Haine link road from that set out in the draft Thanet Transport Strategy. Figure 5.1 shows a Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) compliant alternative link road. This

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		cuts through the radar safeguarding area and some units of the Northern Grass Area (NGA). The RTA submitted on 5 April 2019 [REP5-021] sets out changes to junction mitigation schemes. **i. What changes to the application documents for example, Schedule 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) and revisions to Works Plans, are necessary?** **ii. Do:** **a) the alternative Manston-Haine link road; and** **b) the changes to junction mitigation schemes; and** **c) the removal of mitigation schemes at Junctions 1, 10, 13, 17, 20, 21a, 21b, 26 and 27 as set out in APP-061;** **separately and/or together constitute a material change to the Proposed Development?** The Applicant must fully justify its response. In responding to this question, the Applicant should have explicit regard to 'DCLG Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent' (March 2015), in particular to paragraphs 109 to 115 of that Guidance. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the Planning Inspectorate's 'Advice note sixteen: How to request a change which may be material, v2' (March 2018).
Tr.2.2	Kent County Council (KCC)	**Alternative Manston-Haine Link**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	Thanet District Council (TDC)	**Junction 2 A299 / A256 / Cottington Link Rd** **Junction 4 A299 / B2190** **Junction 6 A299 / Seamark Rd / A253 / Willetts Hill** **Junction 7 A299 / A28** **Junction 12: Manston Road / B2050 / Spitfire Way** **Junction 15: Manston Road / Hartsdown Road / Tivoli Road / College Road / Nash Road** **Junction 16 Ramsgate Rd / College Rd / A254 / Beatrice Rd** **Highway Safety Improvement at Spitfire Way/Alland Grange Road** **Highway Safety Improvement at Manston Road/Manston Court Road** **The removal of junction mitigation schemes at Junctions 1, 10, 13, 17, 20, 21a, 21b, 26 and 27 as set out in APP-061** **Provide any views as to whether these proposals separately and/or together constitute a material change to the Proposed Development?**
Tr.2.3	The Applicant	**Alternative Manston-Haine Link** **Junction 2 A299 / A256 / Cottington Link Rd** **Junction 4 A299 / B2190** **Junction 6 A299 / Seamark Rd / A253 / Willetts Hill** **Junction 7 A299 / A28**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Junction 12: Manston Road / B2050 / Spitfire Way **Junction 15: Manston Road / Hartsdown Road / Tivoli Road / College Road / Nash Road** **Junction 16 Ramsgate Rd / College Rd / A254 / Beatrice Rd** **Highway Safety Improvement at Spitfire Way/Alland Grange Road** **Highway Safety Improvement at Manston Road/Manston Court Road** **The removal of junction mitigation schemes at Junctions 1, 10, 13, 17, 20, 21a, 21b, 26 and 27 as set out in APP-061** **If the answer to question Tr.2.1 above is in the affirmative, the Applicant should submit a material change request.** This should be submitted as soon as practicable but not later than **Deadline 6**. This should include, but not be limited to: a) a tracked change and clean version of the Second Revised 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order [REP5- 002] showing any proposed changes, including those to Schedule 1; b) an updated Revised 2.2 Explanatory Memorandum [REP5-006], in a tracked change and clean version, explaining and justifying any changes; c) an updated version of the revised Works Plans [REP3- 197];

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		d) a revised updated Book of Reference [REP3-194] showing any consequent changes including to the purposes for which relevant land and/ or rights over land are to be acquired; e) a revised Statement of Reasons [APP-012], in tracked changed and clean versions, explaining and justifying any changes to the Book of Reference; f) a report either showing where in the submitted Environmental Statement the proposed link road and changes to junction mitigation schemes have been assessed or an assessment of those proposals; g) a revised Master Plan [APP-079]; and h) a revised Planning Statement [APP-080], in tracked changed and clean versions. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the Planning Inspectorate's 'Advice note sixteen: How to request a change which may be material, v2' (March 2018) in particular paragraph 4 which sets out the information required.
Tr.2.4	The Applicant	**Alternative Manston-Haine Link** **Junction 2 A299 / A256 / Cottington Link Rd** **Junction 4 A299 / B2190** **Junction 6 A299 / Seamark Rd / A253 / Willetts Hill** **Junction 7 A299 / A28** **Junction 12: Manston Road / B2050 / Spitfire Way**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Junction 15: Manston Road / Hartsdown Road / Tivoli Road / College Road / Nash Road **Junction 16 Ramsgate Rd / College Rd / A254 / Beatrice Rd** **Highway Safety Improvement at Spitfire Way/Alland Grange Road** **Highway Safety Improvement at Manston Road/Manston Court Road** **i. Do these proposals include land outside the dDCO Order Limits?** **ii. Do these proposals involve changes to the dDCO Order Land so that additional land will need to be subject to Compulsory Acquisition powers?** **iii. If so, how will this be secured at this stage of the Examination?**
Tr.2.5	The Applicant	**Section 5 Manston-Haine Link** **In what way is cutting across the radar safeguarding area appropriate in aviation safety terms?**
Tr.2.6	The Applicant	**Section 5 Manston-Haine Link** **i. In what ways does the alternative route affect the quantum of buildings in the NGA being sought?** **ii. Provide a table showing proposed floorspace for Works Nos. 15, 16 and 17.**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		iii. Show how any changes in floorspace impact on employment creation estimates for the Proposed Development.
Tr.2.7	The Applicant	**Alternative Manston-Haine Link** **Junction 2 A299 / A256 / Cottington Link Rd** **Junction 4 A299 / B2190** **Junction 6 A299 / Seamark Rd / A253 / Willetts Hill** **Junction 7 A299 / A28** **Junction 12: Manston Road / B2050 / Spitfire Way** **Junction 15: Manston Road / Hartsdown Road / Tivoli Road / College Road / Nash Road** **Junction 16 Ramsgate Rd / College Rd / A254 / Beatrice Rd** **Highway Safety Improvement at Spitfire Way/Alland Grange Road** **Highway Safety Improvement at Manston Road/Manston Court Road** **Provide evidence as to whether or not the inclusion of the link and changes to the junction mitigation schemes affect the costings of the proposed scheme?** **If the response is in the affirmative:** **a) ensure that the updated Funding Statement to be submitted at Deadline 6 includes these implications;**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		b) show and explain any implications for the business model submitted as Appendix F.1.5 of the Applicant's Appendices to Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-187]; and **c) if the above road schemes are proposed to be funded by another body or jointly funded, show how this is secured through the dDCO.**
Tr.2.8	The Applicant TDC KCC	**Manston-Haine Link** **i. Do the TDC draft Local Plan to 2031 and draft Thanet Transport Strategy allow for flexibility of routeing?** **ii. Will the alternative route deliver the same benefits sought by the draft Thanet Transport Strategy?** **iii. Is the alternative route acceptable to KCC and TDC?**
Tr.2.9	The Applicant	**Manston-Haine Link** The Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-195], referring to the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments [APP-010], cites "*Planting within the 45m wide buffer zones along the western perimeter of the business park (Northern Grass Area)*" as providing mitigation for receptors identified as being subject to significant visual impact effects as listed in Section 11.8 Assessment of Landscape Effects in Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, in Environmental Statement Volume 2 [APP-034]. **What effects will the revised proposals set out in the RTA submitted on 5 April 2019 [REP5-021] have on planting schemes?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.10	The Applicant	**Timing of Construction** At the Need and Operations Hearing (21 March 2019) [REP5-024] it was confirmed by the Applicant that it has now programmed to start the construction of the Airport in 2021. **Given this, will 2039 still represent the peak in traffic movements and therefore the worst-case scenario?**
Revised Transport Assessment (RTA) (5 April 2019) [REP5-021]		
Tr.2.11	The Applicant KCC	**Section 3.2 Study Area** Sets out that the study area has been revised and Junctions 1, 9, 14, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 28 have been removed and Junction 29 'End of the Manston to Haine Link Road with the A256 and Haine Road' has been added. **i. Provide an explanation of how this position has been arrived at.** **ii. In the absence of a signed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG), is this agreed by KCC?**
Tr.2.12	The Applicant KCC	**Paragraph 3.2.5** Sets out that the validation of the junctions (Section 5 of the TA [APP-061]) has been checked by KCC's consultants and have been confirmed as satisfactory. **In the absence of a signed SoCG is this agreed by KCC?**
Tr.2.13	KCC	**Section 3.3 Future Year Junctions**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Does KCC accept the Applicant's approach to future year junctions?
Tr.2.14	The Applicant KCC	**Paragraph 4.2.4 (HGV Movements)** Assumes arrivals and departures per day have been evenly split across the 24-hour period, with some slight tailing off in the 21:00 – 00:00 period as may be expected with overnight shift working. **i. Does this include HGV movements for the NGA?** **ii. If so, is such a distribution appropriate for the uses proposed?** **iii. Given that there are now proposed to be no scheduled night flights (Revised Noise Mitigation Plan [REP4-023] states that aircraft cannot take-off or be scheduled to land between 2300 and 0600), is spreading HGV traffic movements evenly across the 24 hour period justified?** **iv. It is now anticipated that a significant number of movements are likely to be associated with a new e-commerce integrator. Would it be reasonable to expect HGV movements to be clustered around the arrival and departure of such aircraft to ensure speed of delivery to the customer?** **v. If so, would this, coupled with the overall night flight ban, not result in a much greater level of HGV movements in the day than in the night, which would need to be tested?** **vi. In light of the commitment for no scheduled night flights, is an even spread across the 24 hour period still agreed by KCC?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		vii. Should HGV movements and their timings be secured in the dDCO, for example, through a HGV management strategy?
Tr.2.15	The Applicant	**Appendix C** Appendix C sets out 'Traffic Generation Tables' for passengers. Table 1.1 identifies that there will not be any passenger departures between 09.00 and 13.00. However, the TA [APP-061] at Table 6.7 shows that similar airports do have departures during these times. As a result of this assumption, Table 1.5 of Appendix C of the RTA shows that there would be no passenger traffic movements associated with departures during the peak am period. **i. Is it feasible that there will be no passenger flight departures between 09:00 and 13:00?** **ii. How is this secured in the dDCO?** **iii. How would it be possible to ensure that there would be no unacceptable impacts from the proposal during the peak am period, if this has not been tested?**
Tr.2.16	The Applicant	**Table 1.7 of Appendix C** Illustrates Total Light Vehicle Traffic for the Passenger Terminal. **i. Does this include staff and any other non-passenger movements?** **ii. If not, why do the figures fluctuate so widely in Table 1.7, when passenger numbers in Tables 1.3 and 1.5 of Appendix C are relatively consistent?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.17	The Applicant KCC	**Tables 4.1 (Passenger Mode Share Estimates Day) and 4.2 (Passenger Mode Share Estimates Night)** Sets out the assumed passenger mode share. **i. How does the commitment to have no scheduled night flights affect such patterns?** **ii. Is this agreed by KCC?**
Tr.2.18	The Applicant	**Section 4.4** States that fuel deliveries are anticipated to arrive in a uniform pattern across a period of 24-hours since the facility cannot accommodate multiple vehicles per hour. **i. How does the commitment to have no scheduled night time flights affect fuel deliveries?** **ii. Is there sufficient capacity to store fuel which is delivered overnight for aircraft departing the following day?**
Tr.2.19	KCC	**Trip generation methodology** **In the absence of a SoCG, do KCC accept the assumptions set out in the TA [APP-061] in terms of:** **i. 10% 'tail to tail' ratio (TA Paragraph 6.4.5);** **ii. Traffic generation data provided by 'the Client' (Paragraph 6.4.4 and Table 6.6);**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		iii. Average loads provided by 'aviation experts' (Paragraph 6.4.17); and **iv. 45% of staff not on site on a particular day (day off, off shift, sickness) (Paragraph 6.4.56)?**
Tr.2.20	The Applicant	**Freight tonnage** KCC in its Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP3-143], Paragraph 4.1.13 states: "*It is forecast that a total of 340,758 tonnes of freight per annum will be reached in Year 20 (Table 6.3 of TA). If this is deemed to be the peak handling capacity of the facility, then an appropriate cap should be placed on any grant of Development Consent to ensure that the trip generation assessment presented in the TA is robust".* **i. What is the Applicant's response?** **ii. If necessary, how would this be secured in the dDCO?**
Tr.2.21	KCC	**Section 4.7 and 4.8** Sets out the anticipated operational airport traffic distribution. **Do KCC agree with the network scope and the anticipated vehicular distribution from all operational sources?**
Tr.2.22	The Applicant	**Figure 1.1 KCC Strategic Model Zones** Sets out the Output Area Zones. However, it is not clear from the labels, for example 'Thanet 006A', where these are located.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Provide a labelled map showing each zone or rename them so that it is clear where each is located.
Tr.2.23	The Applicant KCC	**Section 6.2 Assessment Scenarios** Identifies assessment scenarios based upon output results of testing the Proposed Development using the KCC Thanet Strategic Traffic Model (TSTM). **i. Is the use of the 2031 Do Maximum Scenario as the future baseline justified and is it agreed by KCC?** **ii. Can it be guaranteed that the improvements associated with the draft Thanet Transport Strategy, including Thanet Parkway Station, will be delivered?** **iii. What would be the consequences if such improvements were not delivered?**
Tr.2.24	The Applicant KCC Network Rail	**Thanet Parkway Rail station** **i. Is there a realistic likelihood that the Thanet Parkway Rail station will be delivered and has the identified funding gap (KCC's response to the ExA first written question Tr.1.20 [REP3-139]) been resolved?** **ii. What is the latest position with the planning application?**
Tr.2.25	The Applicant	**Paragraph 6.2.2** Introduces a scenario: *2031 Do Maximum (partial Manston Haine Link) + Manston Airport DCO*. This assumes the Year 20 traffic generation and that the section from Manston Court Road to Manston Road through the NGA is

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		not provided. However, this scenario does not feature in the junction capacity assessments in Section 6.3. **Therefore, what is its purpose?**
Tr.2.26	KCC	**Table 6.1 '2031 – 2039 Growth Rates'** Contains growth rates for years 2031-2039, calculated from TEMPRO and Paragraph 6.2.1.5 sets out the methodology for calculating the future years scenarios. **Does KCC agree with these assumptions?**
Tr.2.27	KCC	**Thanet Parkway Railway Station 2031 to 2039** KCC in response to the ExA First Written Question Tr.1.13 [REP3-139] stated: "*The Transport Assessment for the proposed Thanet Parkway railway station has, to date, reviewed impacts on the highway network for opening year and year 10, which is 2031. No assessment has been carried out on 2039 flows and based on forecast car parking demand the station car park will need to have been extended to prevent a constraint on demand in that timeframe. However, the economic modelling for the station appraises demand over a much longer time period. It is possible for the applicant to commission the economic consultants to provide the spreadsheet model of demand for 2039 and for the transport consultants used on the Thanet Parkway transport assessment to assign that demand on the highway network to ensure a consistent approach. This could then be used in the DCO transport assessment.*"

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		In 'Comments on Third Party Responses to First Written Questions [REP4-029]' the Applicant stated that: *"The proposed Thanet Parkway Railway Station would be used by Airport passengers and staff for rail services and not for parking. It is anticipated that an Airport shuttle bus service would run on a basis to meet trains arriving and departing at the station. This would not create a significant volume of traffic (up to 4 an hour) to warrant additional work."* **i. Is this accepted by KCC?** **ii. Who would fund this bus service, at least initially?**
Tr.2.28	KCC	**Section 6.3 Junction Capacity Assessments** Sets out the junction capacity assessments for Junctions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8A, 8B, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21A, 21B, 26, 27 and 29. **Does KCC agree with these assessments?**
Tr.2.29	The Applicant	**Table 6.3 Junction 2 – 2039 Peak Hour Modelling Results** Sets out that the '2039 with Development Scenario' reduces AM peak average queues (17 vehicles) at the A299 Hengist Way (E) from the '2039 Baseline'. At this stage of the assessment no mitigation measures are taken into account. **Explain why, with the additional traffic associated with the Proposed Development, there is a queue reduction?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.30	KCC	**Junction 8: A28 / Park Ln / Station Rd (Three-Arm Mini Roundabout and Left in/Left out Priority Junction)** **Based on the new modelling undertaken, do KCC still disagree that mitigation is not required for Junction 8A?**
Tr.2.31	The Applicant	**Table 6.26 Junction 15 - 2039 Baseline - Peak Hour Modelling Results and Table 6.27 Junction 15 - 2039 Baseline Development - Peak Hour Modelling Results** The results in these tables are significantly different to that in the previous version of the RTA, dated 29 March 2019. **Explain why.** Furthermore, Table 6.27 shows that with the addition of development traffic some MMQ, DoS and PRC values improve over the 2039 Baseline. At this stage of the assessment no mitigation measures are taken into account. **Explain why, with the additional traffic associated with the development, there is an improvement in some of these values?**
Tr.2.32	The Applicant	**Table 6.30 Junction 16 - 2039 Baseline + Development - Peak Hour Modelling Result** The 2039 Baseline + Development scenario sets out a reduction in MMQ and DoS PM Peak result against the 2039 Baseline for College Road B2052 (WB) (6/1). At this stage of the assessment no mitigation measures are taken into account. **Explain why.**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.33	The Applicant KCC	**Junction 26: Newington Road / Manston Road (Three-Arm Mini Roundabout)** Table 6.36 shows that the 2039 With Development scenario improves average queues in the PM Peak (31 vehicles at Newington Road North) and AM Peak (9 vehicles at Manston Road). At this stage of the assessment no mitigation measures are taken into account. **Explain why.** In addition: **Does KCC agree that no mitigation is required for this junction?**
Tr.2.34	KCC	**Junction 27: Newington Road / High Street (Three-Arm Mini Roundabout)** KCC in response to the ExA First Written Question Tr.1.28 [REP3-139] stated: *"…it is evident that there would be significant vehicle/queue interaction between the B2014 Newington Road/Manston Road junction and the adjacent A255/B2014 Newington Road roundabout in the PM peak following the implementation of the proposed scheme of mitigation, with enhanced queue lengths on the B2014 (south) arm arising from the proposed development. This is not considered to be acceptable and should be addressed, with the two junctions assessed within a network model."* **Given the new modelling data, does KCC agree that no mitigation is required for this junction?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.35	The Applicant KCC	**Junction 29: Manston to Haine Link Road / Haine Road / A256 (Four-Arm Standard Roundabout)** Table 6.39 shows that the 2039 With Development scenario improves average queues in the PM Peak (5 vehicles at New Haine Road). At this stage of the assessment no mitigation measures are taken into account. **Explain why.** In addition: **Does KCC agree that no mitigation is required for this junction?**
Tr.2.36	KCC	**Section 6.4 Site Access Assessments** Sets out the proposed site accesses for the cargo facility, NGA, Passenger Terminal and NGA South Access Junctions. **Does KCC accept the results, including the associated swept path assessments (Figures 6.1 to 6.3)?**
Tr.2.37	The Applicant KCC	**Table 7.1 Junction 2 (A299 / A256 / Cottington Link Rd (Four-Arm Standard Roundabout))** This shows that with the mitigation scheme there will still be significant PM Peak Average Queues on the A256. **Is a 'nil detriment mitigation scheme' considered acceptable in these circumstances? Provide justification.** Furthermore, KCC's LIR [REP3-143] set out that:

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		"*Should the proposed scheme of mitigation for the A299 / A256 roundabout be taken forward, it will require refinement as the lane markings on the A256 northbound approach to the junction are potentially confusing and do not cater for right turning movements. The ARCADY assessment should be updated accordingly. Additionally, swept path analysis should be undertaken to demonstrate that the three proposed circulatory lanes would operate safely*". The Applicant provided the following response to KCC's LIR, submitted for deadline 4 on 8 March 2019 [REP4-028]: "*DMRB Volume 6 Section 2 Part 3 TD 16/07 states "8.28 The use of right pointing arrows on lane dedication signs or as markings on the road is not permitted on roundabout approaches (except at mini-roundabouts). This is to avoid confusing drivers, particularly those from overseas, over which way to proceed around the roundabout. Where a right hand lane is dedicated to a specific destination, it should be associated with an ahead arrow on the approach. A right pointing arrow may be used on the circulatory carriageway." For this reason, no right turn arrow has been located on approach. That aside, lane marking will be refined through the detailed design process and as such are subject to change".* The proposed mitigation in the RTA is consistent with that in the TA. **Does KCC accept the Applicant's response on this matter?**
Tr.2.38	The Applicant KCC	**Table 7.2 Junction 4 (A299 / B2190 (Four-Arm Standard Roundabout))**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		This shows that with the mitigation scheme there will still be significant AM Peak Average Queues at Tothill Street and the B2190(N) and PM Peak Average Queues at A299(W) with an RFC value of 1.00. **Is a 'nil detriment mitigation scheme' considered acceptable in these circumstances? Provide justification.** Furthermore, KCC's LIR [REP3-143] set out that: "*It is not considered that the proposed schemes of mitigation for the A299 / B2190 and A299 / A253 roundabouts will deliver practical benefits to the capacity of the junctions, in view of the limited flare lengths proposed. There are potential highway safety implications arising from these short flare lengths, particularly on the A299 exit arms".* The proposed mitigation scheme to Junction 4 has been revised in the RTA. **Does this overcome KCC's concern?**
Tr.2.39	The Applicant KCC	**Table 7.3 Junction 6 (A299 / Seamark Rd / A253 / Willetts Hill (five-arm standard roundabout))** This shows that with the mitigation scheme there will still be significant PM Peak Average Queues on the A253 Canterbury Rd with an RFC of 1.07. **Is a 'nil detriment mitigation scheme' considered acceptable in these circumstances? Provide justification.** Furthermore, KCC's LIR [REP3-143] set out that: "*It is not considered that the proposed schemes of mitigation for the A299 / B2190 and A299 / A253 roundabouts will deliver practical benefits to the capacity of the junctions, in view of the limited flare lengths proposed.*

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		There are potential highway safety implications arising from these short flare lengths, particularly on the A299 exit arms". The proposed mitigation scheme to Junction 6 has been revised in the RTA. **Does this overcome KCC's concern?**
Tr.2.40	The Applicant KCC	**Table 7.4 Junction 7 (A299 / A28 (Five-Arm Standard Roundabout))** This shows that with the mitigation scheme there will still be significant AM Peak Average Queues on the A28 (East) and PM Peak Average Queues on A299 (West). **Is a 'nil detriment mitigation scheme' considered acceptable in these circumstances? Provide justification.**
Tr.2.41	The Applicant KCC	**Table 7.5 Junction 12 (Manston Road / B2050 / Spitfire Way (Four-Arm Staggered Priority Junction)** **i. Does this illustrate that a signalised layout is preferable to a roundabout layout (Table 7.6)?** **ii. Does it represent the best long-term solution?** **iii. Will the scheme of mitigation impact upon the footprint of the RAF Museum?** Furthermore, KCC's LIR [REP3-143] set out that: "*The Local Highway Authority has significant safety concerns with the proposed scheme of mitigation for the B2050 / Manston Road / Spitfire Way*

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		junction, in view of the incorporation of uncontrolled right turns and intervisibility splays between arms which appear to cross third party land". The proposed mitigation scheme to Junction 12 has been revised in the RTA. **iv. Does this overcome KCC's concern?**
Tr.2.42	The Applicant KCC	**Table 7.7 Junction 15 (Manston Rd / Hartsdown Rd / Tivoli Rd / College Rd / Nash Rd (Five-Arm Signalised Junction))** This shows that with the mitigation scheme there will be an increase in the AM Peak MMQ and DoS at College Road Lane 1 (3/1), with all arms of the junction still operating well over capacity. **Is a 'nil detriment mitigation scheme' considered acceptable in these circumstances? Provide justification.** Furthermore, KCC's LIR [REP3-143] set out that: "*Further information is required detailing how the apparently modest scheme of mitigation for the Manston Road / Hartsdown Road / Tivoli Road / College Road / Nash Road junction (comprising a new signal head and stage sequence and new white lining) will take the junction from significantly over-capacity operation to generally within capacity outside of the PM peak hour, as this is not considered plausible on the basis of the details provided".* The proposed mitigation scheme to Junction 15 has been revised in the RTA. **Does this overcome KCC's concern?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.43	The Applicant KCC	**Table 7.8 Junction 16 (Ramsgate Rd / College Rd / A254 / Beatrice Rd (Five-Arm Signalised Junction)** With the exception of the A254 (SB) Ramsgate Road (9/1) and (9/2), this shows all arms of the junction still operating well over capacity. **Is a 'nil detriment mitigation scheme' considered acceptable in these circumstances? Provide justification.** KCC in response to the ExA's First Written Question Tr.1.27 [REP3-139] stated: "*The proposed scheme of mitigation for the Ramsgate Road/College Road/A254/Beatrice Road junction would appear to result in a highly unconventional junction layout, which is unlikely to be acceptable to the Highway Authority, not least due to the lack of inter-visibility between the stop lines".* The mitigation scheme for this junction does not appear to have altered in the RTA. **What is the Applicant's response?**
Tr.2.44	KCC	**Paragraph 7.3.4 - Spitfire Way/Alland Grange Road & Paragraph 7.3.6 Manston Road/Manston Court Road** These propose mitigation schemes (Figures 7.8 & 7.9) to overcome highway safety concerns. **Is KCC content with the mitigation schemes?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.45	The Applicant	**Off-Site Infrastructure Improvements** KCC set out in their LIR [REP3-143] at Paragraph 4.1.24: "*Whilst the proposal to include 2.0m footways along the widened sections of Spitfire Way and Manston Road is welcome in principle, it is important that continuous and direct walking routes to local trip generators are provided where possible. It is notable in this respect that it is not proposed to provide such routes to local residential areas (notably Manston village), which is considered necessary in order to promote sustainable transport accessibility to the site by staff in particular. This could further encourage inappropriate pedestrian activity within the carriageway to the detriment of highway safety".* In response (submitted for deadline 4 on 8 March 2019 [REP4-028]) to KCC's LIR, the Applicant has stated: "*Consideration can be given to alternative footway provision subject to feasibility".* **i. Has the Applicant given it any consideration?** **ii. Is it considered necessary?**
Tr.2.46	The Applicant KCC	**Timing of Mitigation Works** KCC in response to the ExA First Written Question Tr.1.31 [REP3-139] stated: "*…the Transport Assessment appears to set out no defined trigger points for the proposed mitigation strategy, which is not considered to provide*

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		adequate clarification or safeguarding over the proposed delivery timescales of any of the mitigation or works." In response to this, the Applicant stated in their 'Comments on Third Party Responses to First Written Questions [REP4-029]': "*Further dialogue will be conducted with KCC regarding the mitigation requirements and trigger points based on the revised Transport Assessment which will be submitted at Deadline 5".* **The RTA does not include such information. What is the latest position on this matter (including those schemes required to improve highway safety)?**
Tr.2.47	The Applicant	**Emergency Access Points** KCC in response to the ExA First Written Question Tr.1.18 [REP3-139] stated: "*KCC still requires details of any emergency access points onto the existing highway network".* In the Applicant's 'Comments on Third Party Responses to First Written Questions [REP4-029]' it was stated that: "*Details of any emergency access points onto the existing highway network will be included as part of the revised Transport Assessment to be submitted at Deadline 5".* However, this does not appear to be set out in the RTA. **Provide at Deadline 6.**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.48	KCC	**Infrastructure requirements within the Thanet Transport Strategy** KCC in response to the ExA First Written Question Tr.1.22 [REP3-139] stated: *"Please note that the Highway Authority considers that as the proposed development subject to the DCO will build out over the period of the submitted Thanet Local Plan, it should proportionately contribute towards infrastructure requirements within the Thanet Transport Strategy, either through physical improvements or appropriate financial contributions. The Highway Authority considers that the emphasis for funding the necessary changes to infrastructure apportionment should be borne by the applicant".* **What is the Applicant's response?**
Tr.2.49	Highways England	**Section 8 - Highways England Network Impacts** Considers the impact on the strategic highway network. **i. Are the likely trip generation and distribution figures presented in Section 8.2 accepted by Highways England?** **ii. Is the Applicant's conclusion that there would be a negligible impact on the strategic highway network at peak hours accepted by Highways England?**
Tr.2.50	The Applicant	**Section 8 - Highways England Network Impacts** Does not refer to staff trip distribution associated with the NGA. Table 8.1 shows that 23.6% of staff (presumably passenger terminal staff) are likely to come from Dover using the A229 - A256.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		i. Given this, would it not be reasonable to anticipate that some staff of the NGA would come from Dover utilising the strategic highway network? **ii. If so, should this not be included in the modelling?**
Tr.2.51	The Applicant	**Table 8.2** This sets out the anticipated passenger trips distribution for the strategic highway network. An Interested Party [REP3-152] raises the following concerns regarding Table 8.2 which has not changed in the RTA. *"The key issues are:-* *(a) the omission of trips from the Medway local authority area (which has a greater population than any other local authority area in Kent). This is a clear error and requires rectification.* *(b) the inherent unlikelihood that there will be fewer passengers from London (and all points around it outside Kent, such as Surrey and south Essex, which are not accounted for separately) than from Dover District. I find this counter-intuitive and it requires explanation – for example, by producing passenger origin data from previous operational periods.* *(c) the assumption that all Swale traffic will leave the M2 at junction 6 and use the A251. This cannot be true – the great majority of population in Swale District is in Sittingbourne and Sheerness, not Faversham, and thus most of the Swale traffic would route via the M2 junction 5 and the A249. Few people use junction 6 and the congested and slow A2 to reach Sittingbourne from the east."*

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		What is the Applicant's view?
Tr.2.52	The Applicant	**Tables 8.3 and 8.4** An Interested Party [REP3-152] raises the following concerns regarding Tables 8.3 and 8.4, which have not changed in the RTA. *"Tables 8.3 and 8.4 assume that all West and South London HGV traffic will use the M2 to its end, then the A2 and the A282 to reach the M25 towards Surrey. This route is not only fictitious (as in fact one does not use the A282 at all, since there is a direct junction between the A2 and the M25) but also is a minority choice, as it is several miles longer than the more common choice which is M2 – A249 – M20 – M26 – M25. Therefore the impact on the A249, and the substandard M2 junction 5, have been underestimated.* *Tables 8.3 and 8.4 further assume that there will be negligible traffic to/from freight distribution and servicing sites throughout Kent, other than Ashford. This ignores the fact that there are more warehousing/depot facilities in the Swale and Aylesford areas than in Ashford, yet these do not figure at all. For this reason, more trips are likely to occur along the M2 as far as junction 5 than estimated".* **What is the Applicant's view?**
Tr.2.53	The Applicant	**Wider Committed Development** An Interested Party [REP3-152] has raised the following concern: *"Moreover, none of the TA appears to take account of committed developments which will load additional traffic, especially HGVs, onto the M2*

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		/ A249. Of these, the resumption of ferry services at Ramsgate Port is the most significant, as this would place a new volume of HGVs onto these roads which have not existed for many years, during which time other traffic has increased enormously. The newly-adopted Canterbury District Local Plan 2017, with large-scale residential proposals in Canterbury, Whitstable, Herne Bay and Sturry, is the other principal factor that has not been reflected. These need to be built in, because they will themselves mean that the M2 and A249 perform significantly worse than they do today." **What is the Applicant's view?**
Tr.2.54	Canterbury City Council (CCC)	**Canterbury** CCC stated in their LIR [REP3-246] at Paragraph 4.9: "*The transport modelling appears to be silent on the impact on CCC's district. The localised modelling is limited to junctions surrounding the airport only, while the work undertaken for Highways England does not address passenger, staff and HGV movements within the district. The latter shows a 10% increase in HGV movements on the M2 (J5-6), which they regard as not significant. However, this same traffic will be (a) navigating Brenley Corner (J7,) which we understand is at capacity, and (b) using the A299 through CCC's District. Consideration also needs to be given to the potential impacts of the Lower Thames Crossing. Given the absence of passenger and staff modelling for the CCC's District, it is unclear what the scale of the impact on the A28 to Canterbury will be either".* In response (submitted for Deadline 4 on 8 March 2019 [REP4-028]) to CCC's LIR the Applicant has stated:

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		"*The study area for the Transport Assessment submitted in support of the DCO was initially scoped with KCC Highway and Transportation. In the Pre-Examination period, the Applicant undertook consultation with KCC and further assessment of the Development has been carried out using KCC's Thanet Strategic Transport Model. KCC has not identified the need to extend the study area beyond the modelled area. The traffic distribution set out in Section 6.5 of the Transport Assessment submitted in support of the DCO includes distribution assumptions to Mid Kent and the traffic flows are present in Figures 6.6 – 6.29. A revised Transport Assessment is being prepared which will the KCC Thanet Strategic Transport Model flow outputs. This is expected to be provided for Deadline 5. The Applicant is liaising with Highways England regarding the traffic impacts at M2 J7 (Brenley Corner)".* **Does this response and the RTA overcome CCC's concerns?**
Tr.2.55	The Applicant	**Lower Thames Crossing** Several Interested Parties have set out that a Lower Thames Crossing could result in more traffic in Kent, which should be taken into account in the Transport Assessment. **What is the Applicant's view?**
Tr.2.56	The Applicant KCC	**Stage 1 Road Safety Audits** For the proposed site accesses, are provided in Appendix J of the RTA. **i. It is set out that they do not include drainage information. Is this critical to the assessment?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		ii. They include recommendations for works such as lighting and speed limits and swept path analysis. Are these provisions already included in the Proposed Development but not provided to the RSA team and have they been assessed in the ES? **iii. The RSAs suggest that signing details and swept path analysis were not provided. Given that Figures 6.1 to 6.3 of the RTA show this information, why was this the case?** **iv. Does KCC accept their findings?**
Tr.2.57	The Applicant	**Stage 1 Road Safety Audits** Have been undertaken for the access junctions. Table 14.9 of the Revised Environmental Statement Chapter and Noise and Air Quality Technical Notes (5 April 2019) [REP5-index number to be allocated] says that Stage 1 Road Safety Audits will also be undertaken for the off-site mitigation proposals. However, these are not included in the RTA. **i. Provide these at Deadline 6. These should be based on latest design (including signage and swept path analysis).** **ii. In response to the findings of the RSA already undertaken (See Question Tr.2.56) and to be commissioned, the ExA requests the Applicant's design team's response to the recommendations. This should also be summarised in a tabular format setting out for each junction, the comment made, the Applicant's response and any action required and how this is to be achieved.**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.58	KCC	**Appendix B KCC Comments on Manston Airport TA** This sets out several tables showing the Applicant's response to concerns raised by KCC. **i. Does KCC wish to comment any of the information, particularly the latest iteration 'Technical note: Wood Response to Kent County Council Comments on Manston Airport TA. Version 3'?** **ii. Where it says agreement has been reached, is this the case in all instances?**
Tr.2.59	The Applicant	**The draft Framework Travel Plan** Table 4.1 sets out staff modal split targets. At Year 20, this includes a target of 87% Car, 6% Bus, 3% Walking or Cycling and 4% Rail (with bus link). Paragraph 4.2.5 states that this is comparable to the targets set out in the Draft Masterplan (2012) for Derry Airport. However, the comparable targets at Derry Airport are for 2019. **i. Is this an appropriate comparison given there is more than a 20 year time period between them?** **ii. Do you consider that Table 4.1 set low targets and should more challenging ones be set?**
Tr.2.60	KCC TDC	**Framework Travel Plan** **Do KCC and TDC consider the updated draft Framework Travel Plan to be sufficiently robust and does it overcome KCC previous concerns?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.61	The Applicant	**The Car Parking Management Strategy** Paragraph 2.2.15 identifies a need for passenger parking spaces of 1,815. Paragraph 2.3.2 sets out that once recovered ground from the contractors' compounds after construction Phase 4 is taken into account there would be 2,966 spaces. **i. Is such a large overprovision justified?** **ii. Would this help to achieve the modal shift targets set out in the draft Framework Travel Plan?**
Tr.2.62	The Applicant	**Section 3.2 'Masterplan Staff Parking Allowance' of the Car Parking Management Strategy** Does not set out how many car parking spaces are provided on-site for staff. **Provide this information.**
Tr.2.63	The Applicant	**Section 4 'Northern Grass Area Car Parking' of the Car Parking Management Strategy** Identifies a need for 990 spaces for B1 uses and 1,115 for B8 uses. It is not clear if this provision is made in the masterplan. **Provide this clarification.**
Tr.2.64	The Applicant	Paragraph 5.1.4 of the Car Parking Management Strategy refers to a need 729 parking spaces for terminal staff. **Should this be 279, as identified in Paragraph 3.1.7?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Tr.2.65	KCC TDC	**Do KCC and TDC consider the updated Car Parking Management Strategy to be sufficiently robust?**
Tr.2.66	The Applicant	**Airport Surface Access Strategy** At Paragraph 4.7.1 states that it is proposed to enhance the bus service provision by: • *"Increasing the frequency of services to the Proposed Development;* • *Extending bus operating times; and* • *Introducing new routes and extending existing provision to service the Proposed Development".* **i. What evidence is there to suggest that this is feasible?** **ii. How will this be secured?**
Tr.2.67	KCC TDC	**Do KCC and TDC consider the updated Airport Surface Access Strategy to be sufficiently robust?**
Tr.2.68	The Applicant	**Preliminary Construction Traffic Management Plan (PCTMP)** The Applicant in oral evidence at the Compulsory Acquisition issue specific hearing set out that if the dDCO is granted, construction will not commence until 2021 and would be compressed into a shorter time frame, with operations beginning from quarter 1 of 2022.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		i. Will this affect the volume of construction traffic in Years 1 and 2? **ii. If so, does the PCTMP need to be updated?**
Tr.2.69	The Applicant	**Appendix I** The diagrams on pages (of the pdf): 389, 390, 394, 430, 439, 654, 659, 689, 698, 873 and 878 are not completely visible. **Provide complete versions at Deadline 6.**
Revised Transport Environmental Statement chapter and Noise and Air Quality Technical Notes (5 April 2019) [REP5-022]		
Tr.2.70	KCC	**Table 14.2 Summary of Traffic Surveys and Data Information** Sets out that the traffic count surveys were undertaken in March 2017 and October 2017 and the locations these were undertaken are set out in Paragraphs 14.4.13 to 14.4.16. **Do KCC accept the timing, locations and results of these surveys?**
Tr.2.71	The Applicant KCC TDC	**Table 14.17 Summary of Highway Links Where Receptors Have Been Identified** Illustrates highway links that contain sensitive receptors. **i. What was the methodology applied to identify highway links and receptors identified?** **ii. Were these agreed with KCC and/or TDC?**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		iii. Do KCC and TDC agree with highway links included?
Tr.2.72	The Applicant	**Table 14.18 Magnitude of Each Transport Effect - Thresholds Used** Sets out the thresholds used for the magnitude of each transport effect. **Provide further justification for the thresholds selected for pedestrian amenity and delay, fear and intimidation.**
Tr.2.73	The Applicant	**Paragraph 14.9.6** Sets out 3 scenarios: *"Scenario 1 - 2039 Baseline – KCC 'Do Maximum' with Manston Haine Link through the NGA;* *Scenario 2 - 2039 Baseline – RiverOak Alternative Alignment* *Scenario 3 - 2039 With Development – RiverOak Alternative Alignment"* **It is not clear how the Applicant has forecast traffic flows associated with Scenario 2. Provide clarification.**
Tr.2.74	The Applicant KCC TDC	**Paragraph 14.9.8** States: "*The links which have exceeded the percentage increase of traffic threshold for their respective sensitivity under the GEART guidelines have been identified based on the comparison between Scenarios 3 and 2".* **i. Provide justification why it is considered appropriate to compare Scenarios 3 and 2 to assess the effects of the proposal.**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		ii. Does the comparison of Scenarios 3 and 1 at Appendix 14.3 result in greater differences and potential effects? If so, explain why this should not be considered in the assessment. **iii. Do KCC and TDC agree with the approach taken in this regard?**
Tr.2.75	TDC KCC	**Section 14.10 Assessment of Effects** This section sets out the assessment of effects for those links that are considered to need further assessment (Links 14, 15, 18, 20,21, 24, 25, 33, 34, 35 and 36, 37 and 38). **Do TDC and KCC agree with the conclusions for each link?**
Tr.2.76	The Applicant	**Links 35 and 36 – Manston Road east and west of Preston Road** **Explain why these links been assessed together.**
Tr.2.77	The Applicant	**Paragraphs 14.10.20 & 14.10.24** **Do these refer to the Manston-Haine link road in the draft Thanet Transport Strategy or the alternative link road proposed by the Applicant?**
Tr.2.78	The Applicant	**Operation Stack/Brock** The Town and Country Planning (Manston Airport) Special Development Order 2019 at Article 3(2) states:

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		"*The planning permission granted by paragraph (1) ceases at the end of 31st December 2020 and immediately thereafter the land reverts to its previous lawful use"*. At the Need and Operations Hearing (21 March 2019) it was confirmed by the Applicant that they have programmed to start the construction of the Airport in 2021. **Does this overcome any potential conflicts with Operation Stack / Brock?**

Annex A

CCC	Canterbury City Council
DCO	Development Consent Order
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
DoS	Degree of saturation
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
HGV	Heavy goods vehicle
KCC	Kent County Council
LIR	Local Impact Report
MMQ	Mean Maximum Queue
NGA	Northern Grass Area
PCTMP	Preliminary Construction Traffic Management Plan
PRC	Practical reserve capacity

RFC	Ratio of flow to capacity
RTA	Revised Transport Assessment
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
TA	Transport Assessment
TDC	Thanet District Council