



## Meeting note

<b>Project name</b>	Expansion of Heathrow Airport (Third Runway)
<b>File reference</b>	TR020003
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	The Planning Inspectorate
<b>Date</b>	5 September 2019
<b>Meeting with</b>	Heathrow Airport Limited
<b>Venue</b>	Planning Inspectorate offices, Bristol
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>The Planning Inspectorate</b> <b>Heathrow Airport Limited</b>
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Project update meeting
<b>Circulation</b>	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.

### Statutory Consultation update

The Applicant provided an overview of the level of engagement so far during its Statutory Consultation, known as 'Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation', which opened on 18 June 2019: the 43 events had a total of 7,100 attendees and at the time 4,615 responses had been received via email and completed feedback forms.

The Applicant outlined some of the key themes already identified from responses in both support for and opposition of the scheme. The Applicant explained that some queries received during this Statutory Consultation, such as proposed flight paths, were more relevant to the airspace change process.

The Inspectorate queried whether there were still key Statutory Consultees that had yet to respond. The Applicant confirmed there were and envisaged those missing would be submitted in the final week.

There was discussion regarding the scheduling of technical sessions alongside the project update meetings to aid better understanding of certain technical matters which had featured in the consultation material.

The Inspectorate queried when the masterplan design would reach a stage that would allow the drafting of the Environmental Statement chapters to begin in earnest. The Applicant anticipated that it would assume a scheme for EIA purposes later in autumn 2019.

There was discussion regarding other development within the study area. The Inspectorate reminded the Applicant of the advice set out in the Inspectorate's Advice

Note 17<sup>1</sup> regarding the approach to certainty of other development considered in the assessment. There was ensuing discussion regarding the extent to which the Heathrow West scheme would be addressed within the Environmental Statement for Heathrow Airport Limited.

The Applicant provided an update on its ongoing airspace change processes, noting engagement with relevant airlines, the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and affected communities in line with CAP1616 running between 12 September to 18 October 2019. Further targeted consultation on its airspace change application would likely be conducted in 2020.

The Applicant provided an overview of the approach to identifying land parcels and the due diligence to understand ownership and land rights. The discussion noted the complexity of the process and the need to verify that all Affected Persons (APs) with whom they must undertake Statutory Consultation had been identified.

The Inspectorate queried whether further s53 applications were anticipated. The Applicant noted no further s53 applications at present.

### **Stakeholder Engagement update**

The Inspectorate highlighted media reports which indicated that a host local authority may be moving away from a position of supporting the scheme. The Applicant briefly outlined the level of engagement it had established with the relevant local authorities via bi-lateral meetings and the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG) and noted it did not envisage any change to its current engagement programme or to the existing mechanisms. The Inspectorate advised that HSPG would have no statutory status within the PA2008 regime once the Examination begins.

The Applicant advised it had held five rounds of engagement with HSPG on its proposed masterplan which included sessions on the masterplan, the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and spatial planning and noted future sessions would focus on the proposed changes in light of the responses to Statutory Consultation, the EIA and associated mitigation.

The Applicant set out ongoing engagement with Natural England (NE), Historic England (HE), Highways England (HiE) and the Environment Agency (EA) and noted it had a dedicated team engaging with the relevant agencies in addition to their attendance at some HSPG meetings. The Applicant highlighted NE's interest in the European Protected Species licensing and landscaping, monthly meetings with HE, progress on proposed works to the M25 and the M4 Spur with HE and planned discussion regarding landfill operations with EA. The Applicant provided an overview of the permit regimes on which work was being progressed.

The Inspectorate identified the Western Rail Link to Heathrow scheme (WRLtH) and queried its interrelationship with the expansion scheme. The Applicant explained where the two scheme's boundaries joined and noted ongoing discussions with Network Rail (NR). The Applicant noted it would likely submit a Relevant Representation in relation to the WRLtH DCO application but anticipated entering into an agreement with NR to limit

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Advice-note-17V4.pdf>

the amount of further engagement at Examination. The Applicant advised it would provide an update at the next project update meeting.

The Inspectorate queried if the Applicant was still working on agreeing a 'Statement of No Impediment' with the CAA. The Applicant confirmed it was, or something equivalent, and that it had briefed the CAA at the EIA Scoping stage and on its PEIR in advance of the Statutory Consultation.

## **Application documents**

The Applicant queried whether it was required to submit a hard copy set of the application documents at submission. The Inspectorate advised that although the legislation requires one paper copy is provided alongside the electronic copy, it has recently successfully trialled moving to electronic-only submissions. The Inspectorate noted it may still request a paper copy of some documents should it be deemed necessary.

The Applicant confirmed that it would be using exclusively electronic deposit locations and queried whether this was acceptable. The Inspectorate noted that it was a matter for the Applicant, however the Inspectorate explained that other applicants had used a similar approach and explained that the Inspectorate itself now used electronic deposit locations when facilities were available in the local area.

The Applicant displayed its proposed application document structure which categorised the application documents into five 'families'. The Inspectorate noted that the document structure differed to the categories used on the Inspectorate's project webpage; however, the Inspectorate explained that it was looking at upgrading its website in due course but was not certain whether it would be ready on submission of this application.

There was brief discussion on the submission of draft documents pre-application. The Applicant advised that due to the scale of the application, submission of draft versions of documents would likely be staggered instead of as part of a suite.

The Applicant explained that it had been considering the structure of its Consultation Report against the advice in Advice Note 14<sup>2</sup> and the multiple-staged consultation activity. The Inspectorate queried whether the Consultation Report had been discussed at the HSPG meetings in respect of the Adequacy of Consultation Representations. The Applicant confirmed it had not to date.

## **Other matters**

The Applicant outlined the preliminary earth works that it was proposing to secure permission for through the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 regime and noted it had recently submitted its application to London Borough of Hillingdon (LBH) for earth works trials. The Inspectorate asked whether the Applicant knew the status of the application for a replacement Lakeside Energy from Waste facility. The Applicant advised that an application was submitted by the developer to Slough Borough Council in June; an update on discussions with the developer would be provided at the next project update meeting.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Advice-note-14v2.pdf>