



Meeting note

Project name	Expansion of Heathrow Airport (Third Runway)
File reference	TR020003
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	27 February 2018
Meeting with	Heathrow Airport Ltd (HAL)
Venue	Planning Inspectorate offices
Attendees	See Annex A
Meeting objectives	Project update meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Consultation 1 update

The Applicant provided an update on its non-statutory consultation phase, stating that it had held 29 of the scheduled 40 exhibitions and briefly explained the level of attendance and feedback. The Applicant noted that 1700 responses had been received to date, electronically via the online feedback form, and pre-empted further responses nearer the end of the consultation period.

The Applicant set out how the exhibitions had been split up into the two consultations for both airspace and expansion and provided a flavour of the key issues that had been raised at events so far. The Applicant did note that initially some attendees at the exhibitions had expressed confusion between the Department of Transport's draft National Policy Statement consultation and Heathrow's Consultation 1, although they had made sure that attendees were clear as to what was being consulted on.

The Applicant explained the level of local authority and Statutory Consultation Body engagement during Consultation 1, noting that responses from the latter were expected near the end of the consultation, following ongoing dialogue. The Applicant explained the different tools used at the exhibitions such as sound demonstrations, using noise data from comparative locations and aircraft models, and videos (which are now available on YouTube) to illustrate how the airport currently operates and to provide information on airspace change related issues.

The Applicant invited the Inspectorate to visit the offices of Arup for a demonstration of the noise demonstration technology used during the Consultation 1 exhibitions.

The Applicant briefly outlined its approach to determining which elements of the proposals might be considered 'the core infrastructure' and Associated Development and thus included within a Development Consent Order (DCO) and elements that might be delivered through different regimes.

The Applicant briefly explained that it was in the process of procuring construction logistics hubs in different regions of the UK with the aim of ensuring that the construction benefits of the project were felt more widely across the UK. The Inspectorate queried whether the hubs would be included within the DCO and whether they needed to be assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES). The Applicant stated that the hubs, which were expected to be existing facilities, would therefore be outside the scope of the DCO. The Applicant noted that this would likely be a procurement matter but that it would consider whether it would be appropriate to seek to secure such partnership working arrangements within the DCO.

The Inspectorate provided feedback on the accessibility and navigability of the consultation material. The Inspectorate acknowledged the proposed mitigation set out within it, querying whether the Red Line Boundary (RLB) would be refined further ahead of Scoping. The Applicant confirmed that although the mitigation had already been considered, it would follow the Scoping process to ensure all effects are assessed and appropriate mitigation secured.

Approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping

The Applicant introduced its environmental consultancy team and provided an update on the progression of its Scoping Report (SR) ahead of submitting a Scoping request in May 2018. The Applicant stated that the SR would be based on the options that were currently being consulted on in Consultation 1 and that it was looking to agree the appropriate assessment methodologies with the consultation bodies.

The Applicant confirmed it was drafting the SR in line with the requirements of the Inspectorate's Advice Note Seven: EIA: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information. The Inspectorate emphasised that the SR needed to meet the requirements of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 and have due regard to Advice note three: EIA consultation and notification.

The Applicant stated that for certain land parcels identified in Consultation 1, the end-use was not yet established and would evolve with the project design, meaning that scoping would be based on options. The Inspectorate advised that having options for land-use on certain land parcels within the SR, rather than a defined end-use could lead to uncertainty regarding the appropriate EIA scope of assessment, since the end-use might dictate the assessment requirements. The Inspectorate suggested that it might be more beneficial to undertake scoping once the options had been narrowed down. The Applicant stated that the methodologies for assessment of environmental effects are likely to be the same for most options and therefore maintained that it was appropriate to seek to agree the methodologies for assessment at this stage. The Applicant stated that the programme for preparation of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) in time for its Statutory Consultation phase (Consultation 2) was driving the requirement to scope at this point in time and that it was confident that this could be undertaken robustly at this stage. The Inspectorate requested further explanation regarding plot changes for the next meeting.

The Applicant noted that as all options for the scheme were still under consideration, further evolution of the scheme might result in a desire to undertake further scoping. The Applicant suggested that either a further Scoping request might be submitted in 2019 or a means of agreeing different approaches to baselines/methodologies/aspects to be scoped out might be explored with relevant parties. The Inspectorate stated that the requirement for a subsequent Scoping request would depend on the materiality of any change. The Inspectorate advised that a reduction in footprint of the development would be less likely to trigger the requirement for a subsequent Scoping request. Where the Applicant wished to amend the assessment method in the absence of a subsequent Scoping request, the Inspectorate advised that the ES should clearly evidence the evolution of that method and agreement with the consultation bodies. Particular attention would need to be given to evidencing any scoped out aspect/matters.

The Inspectorate advised that the shapefile of the plan sufficient to identify the land should be provided at least ten days prior to the Scoping request and that Heathrow's list of pre-established contacts for consulting the Statutory Consultation Bodies would also be helpful. The Inspectorate noted that members of the public were not consulted at Scoping. The Inspectorate advised that if the Applicant wanted guidance from particular non-statutory consultees, with regards to methodologies within the ES, it should contact them privately. The Inspectorate advised that the SR should include a description of the functions of the Civil Aviation Authority in respect of the Airspace Space Change Process and aerodrome licensing to provide clarity regarding the relative responsibilities for the overlapping processes.

The modelling of noise impacts from different runway arrangements was discussed and the Applicant stated that the Arup Soundlab had been used to demonstrate different aircraft types at fixed positions around Heathrow. The Applicant offered to arrange a visit to the Soundlab.

The Inspectorate queried how the Applicant would assess the effects of various phases cumulatively and advised that a Cumulative Effects Assessment should be included based on key development phases (to be defined). The Applicant noted that the SR would include a chapter on cumulative effects and that it would consider the matter further ahead of the next meeting.

The Inspectorate briefly noted the overlapping requirements of the Habitats Regulations, the Water Framework Directive and other required assessments. The Applicant advised the ES would include a chapter that identified all assessments that overlapped with the EIA.

There was discussion regarding submission of the SR via email and whether it should be broken down into multiple files to meet the 50MB threshold for email attachments. The Applicant noted that the size of the SR is significantly larger than 50MB and would review internally and advise an appropriate way to submit the document. The Applicant queried whether the Inspectorate would accept the document in parts. The Inspectorate stated its preference for a single document, noting that the recommended limit for documents on the website is 50MB.

Stakeholder and community engagement

The Applicant provided a brief overview of the Consultation Bodies and other stakeholders it had engaged with, which included: Historic England (HE), with regard to heritage assessments and historic area assessment methodology and receptors such as the Tithe Barn; Natural England (NE) with regard to HRA work and ecology assessment; Transport for London (TfL) with regard to transport assessment methodologies; Colne Valley Regional Park with regard to ecological and land ownership issues; Network Rail and Highways England on surface access matters; Civil Aviation Authority and Environment Agency (EA) with regard to the River Thames scheme, WFD, flood risk modelling and the required permits.

The Applicant highlighted that service-level agreements had been entered into for some of the above key Statutory Consultation Bodies, and that further such agreements were expected to be entered into as the project progressed.

The Applicant provided an update on its engagement with the Heathrow Strategic Planning (HSPG), noting that the group was in the process of establishing a 'core' team to coordinate the running of the group and represent the HSPG members (local authorities and LEPs); the Applicant had taken a secondary role with the group given its scheme promoter status but would continue to fund the group's input into the DCO. The Applicant briefly set out HSPG's upcoming workshops and explained how beneficial previous events had been.

The Applicant provided a brief overview of the Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB) that is in the process of being set up. The Applicant noted that a chair for the board would be appointed in spring and outlined the role of Planning Aid in assisting the group to secure independent consultant support.

Resourcing

The Applicant explained that it was looking into additional resource following the increase of engagement with community representatives and recent progression of both the HSPG and HCEB and engagement with statutory bodies.

The Inspectorate discussed the Environmental Services Team that will be handling the Scoping and encouraged the Applicant to inform the Statutory Consultation Bodies to respond to the Inspectorate's Scoping consultation within the 28 day deadline, as no extension of time is given to this deadline. The Inspectorate emphasised that there is no statutory requirement to have regard to responses received after the 28 day deadline and they do not form part of the Secretary of State's Scoping Opinion.

The Inspectorate provided a brief update on the process of handling the s53 applications.

AOB/ Next steps

It was agreed that a further meeting to discuss Scoping will be scheduled for 28 March 2018.

It was agreed that the next project update meeting would be scheduled for the first week of May in advance of the Applicant's SR, in which it could provide further feedback on Consultation 1.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The Applicant will provide the Inspectorate with one hard copy of a number of Consultation 1 documents.
- Both parties to look into potential dates for a site visit.
- The Inspectorate to contact the Applicant if it wished to attend a Soundlab demonstration at the offices of Arup.
- The Applicant to arrange for updates from the HSPG to be provided to the Inspectorate.

Meeting attendees

Organisation	Name	Role
The Planning Inspectorate	Richard Price	Case Manager
	Susannah Guest	Infrastructure Planning Lead
	Richard Hunt	Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor
	Conor Rafferty	EIA and Land Rights Advisor
	Nicola Mathiason	Legal Advisor
	Paul Hudson	Examining Inspector
	James Bunten	Case Officer
Heathrow Airport Ltd	Ian Frost	Head of Planning
	George Davies	Head of Sustainability and Environment
	Fiona Ross	Legal Team
	Toby Gibbs	EIA Task Director (Wood)
	Suzanne Burgoyne	EIA Task Project Manager (Wood)
	Robbie Owen	Partner (Pinsent Masons)
	James Good	Partner (BLP)