



Meeting note

Project name	Expansion of Heathrow Airport (Third Runway)
File reference	TR020003
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	28 March 2018
Meeting with	Heathrow Airport Ltd
Venue	The 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.

EIA Scoping

The Applicant provided an update on progress with its DCO application and outlined its intention to submit a Scoping request to the Inspectorate in respect of the application in May 2018.

The Applicant tabled a plan showing the predicted maximum extent of the Proposed Development and Associated Development, and noted it was largely the same as the information provided for its non-statutory consultation (Consultation 1). The Inspectorate queried whether the plan reflected the likely DCO order limits. The Applicant explained that it was currently considering what airport related development, such as hotels, offices and warehouses, might need to be included within the order limits and what could be consented separately under different planning regimes (eg Town and Country Planning applications). The Applicant explained that the development footprint was still being refined but was likely to reduce in size before submission of the application, the current plan being a worst case. The Applicant stated that the plan would comprise the 'plan identifying the land' required to be submitted under Regulation 10 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). The Applicant confirmed that this would be set out in the Scoping Report.

The Inspectorate highlighted its non-statutory advice regarding the formats for provision of information relating to Scoping requests and Regulation 8 notifications as set out in Advice Note 7¹ (AN7). The Inspectorate noted its preference for the provision of a redline

¹ Advice note Seven: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements

boundary (RLB) plan but acknowledged that the EIA Regulations do not specify a particular format for submission of a plan identifying the land.

The Inspectorate emphasised the importance of providing the GIS shapefile of the Proposed Development at least 10 days in advance of the Scoping request and in the format highlighted in AN7. The Inspectorate requested that the Applicant provide details of its contact list, to assist the Inspectorate in preparing its Scoping consultation list.

The Inspectorate provided feedback on Scoping requests relating to other projects, noting that submission of illegible plans with incorrect labelling had been the cause of previous delays to commencement of the 42 day consultation period. The Inspectorate also emphasised the need to use a single, consistent definition to describe the site boundaries from which study areas are proposed within the Scoping Report. This is to avoid inconsistent understanding of the full extent of the proposed study area for assessment.

The Applicant set out how it was progressing drafting of the Scoping Report following its Consultation 1. The Applicant explained how particular chapters would be structured, and noted that the figures illustrating the Proposed Development in the Scoping Report would be consistent with the figures provided in its Consultation 1. An example air quality chapter was tabled during the meeting, which due to time constraints, the Inspectorate was unable to provide substantive comment on. The Applicant noted that each aspect chapter would be supported by an appendix of figures and baseline data. The Inspectorate noted that consultation bodies would only have 28 days to review the Scoping Report and emphasised the need for the Scoping Report to be as concise as possible. The Inspectorate queried whether baseline data not essential to establishing the scope of assessment could be removed from the Scoping Report for this reason. The possibility of hosting such data online and providing hyperlinks within the Scoping Report was discussed. The Inspectorate queried what controls on age of data would be applied. The Applicant stated that data would be gathered in accordance with relevant guidance.

The Applicant noted that the Scoping Report would explain whether proposed methodologies had been agreed with relevant Statutory Consultees, or whether an agreement had not yet been reached. The Applicant noted that Natural England had signed off the approach to baseline data gathering for the biodiversity chapter of the Scoping Report.

The Inspectorate asked the Applicant to ensure that the Scoping Report provides a description of the different regulatory role and functions fulfilled by the Inspectorate and the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). As an example, the Inspectorate requested that details of the CAA's ongoing Airspace Change Process (ACP) were provided. The Applicant confirmed that this would be set out in the Scoping Report, in particular within the Noise technical chapter.

The electronic submission of the Scoping Report was discussed. Due to the large size of the documents the Applicant proposes to break the report down into three files: the main text, the figures and the appendices. It was agreed that the Applicant would look into the architecture of the Scoping Report file structure and confirm this at the next meeting.

The requirement for Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment was briefly discussed. The Applicant stated that a WFD assessment would accompany the DCO application and that reference to WFD assessment would be included in the Scoping Report.

The Applicant stated that it was currently considering the potential for significant transboundary effects to arise from the project but was not yet able to confirm whether it would be able to provide any specific conclusions about effects as part of the Scoping Report.

The Inspectorate outlined its approach to consideration of transboundary effects noting that the duty to consider transboundary effects was ongoing but that specific transboundary screening was conducted following adoption of a Scoping Opinion and following submission of an application if accepted for examination. The Inspectorate explained that its transboundary screening documents are published on the project page of the National Infrastructure website. The Inspectorate advised that if the potential for significant transboundary effects is identified, the Inspectorate is required to notify affected Member States and invite them to register as Interested Parties during the Pre-examination stage. The Inspectorate encourages early engagement with States where transboundary effects are considered likely.

The Applicant set out its intended approach to assessing cumulative effects, including scheme-wide cumulative effects and cumulative effects from other, non-scheme related developments. The Applicant explained that it would follow the process set out in the Inspectorate's AN17: Cumulative Effects Assessment and that it was in the process of refining a long list of over 2000 other projects for consideration.

The Applicant suggested that consideration of cumulative effects on local plans would be excluded from the assessment. The Inspectorate advised the approach should be consistent with the requirements of the draft Airports NPS and focus on likely significant effects.

The Applicant outlined that due to scale, nature and duration of the Proposed Development the ES would be based on a range of scenarios requiring the establishment of a number of future baselines for assessment. The approach to scenarios would be set out in the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate advised that the Applicant should consider scenarios including any major changes in operation of the airport due to the Proposed Development as well as addressing major stages of construction.

The Applicant briefly explained how it proposed to assess waste and noted that the Scoping Report would not include a standalone waste chapter. The Inspectorate advised there is no specific requirement to include a separate waste chapter but that sufficient information should be provided to satisfy the requirements of Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations and that signposting to waste related assessments at an aspect level should be provided. The Applicant noted that waste proposals would be fully explained in its waste management strategy.

There was discussion regarding the revised requirements of the EIA Regulations in relation to consideration of 'major accidents and/or disasters' and the treatment of sensitive information relating to the airport infrastructure and operations. The potential for Applicant's to rely on third party processes to control and/or mitigate any such

effects was discussed. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to review recent Scoping Reports for other projects on the National Infrastructure website, to see how other applicants had addressed this aspect of assessment, and referred the Applicant to [Annex G](#) of Advice note eleven² with regards to Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH).

The Applicant explained that there may be small changes to the scheme and/or proposed methodological approaches following Scoping, noting that any changes were likely to be non-material. The Applicant queried the process for re-scoping assessment methodologies. The Inspectorate explained that a new Scoping request would need to be submitted if the Applicant wished to obtain a new scope of assessment, however it would be possible for the Inspectorate to issue s51 advice in respect of specific matters if the Applicant wished to obtain clarification regarding the scope of assessment. However, the Inspectorate advised that small, non-material changes from the Scoping Opinion would be acceptable as long as they were fully justified within the ES. The Applicant stated that the ES would document the basis for any evolution of the Scoping methodologies.

Consultation and engagement

The Applicant provided an overview of the level of response to its' Consultation 1 phase, which closed on 28 March 2018. The Applicant outlined the level and demographic of attendance to the scheduled exhibitions.

The Inspectorate queried whether there had been a response from the relevant local authorities to Consultation 1. The Applicant stated that it had received a letter on behalf of a number of relevant local authorities who did not support the proposals advising that the application was premature due to the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) yet being designated; the letter had been accepted as a response to the consultation. The Applicant confirmed that other relevant local authorities had responded constructively to the consultation.

The Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB) was briefly discussed. It was agreed that the Applicant would provide the Inspectorate a contact for the HCEB in order to receive further direct updates. The Applicant noted that the HCEB had been consulted as part of Consultation 1 and would be consulted on the draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).

AOB

There was brief discussion regarding the current status of the Applicant's s53 applications. The Applicant noted that there were no further s53 applications planned at present.

There was discussion regarding the logistics for a site visit to view the full extent of the Proposed Development to be submitted at Scoping stage. The Applicant also extended an invitation to attend an aircraft noise demonstration at the Arup SoundLab. The Inspectorate stated it would look into appropriate dates and would advise in due course.

The Applicant noted it had commissioned drone surveys of the site and surrounding area and could make these accessible to the Inspectorate.

² Advice note eleven: Working with public bodies in the infrastructure planning process

The Applicant confirmed it was proposing to submit its Scoping request in May 2018.

There was discussion regarding likely agenda items for the next meeting scheduled for 4 May 2018.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The Applicant to confirm the proposed architecture of the Scoping request file structure ahead of the next meeting.
- The Applicant to provide a contact for the HCEB.
- The Applicant to provide details of its contact list for consultation bodies.
- The Applicant to provide access to drone survey images.
- The Inspectorate to provide suitable dates for the site visit and SoundLab demonstration and to confirm attendees.

Post meeting note

Following the initial meeting on 28 March 2018, the Inspectorate held a teleconference with the Applicant on 19 April 2018 to clarify matters of detail arising from the initial meeting. Where relevant the initial meeting note has been revised to address the content of that discussion.

Meeting attendees

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