

Heathrow Local Focus Forum – Tuesday 23rd April 2019**6.30pm – 8.30pm Compass Centre – FINAL Meeting Notes**

Name	Borough/Organisation
-------------	-----------------------------

Attendees- Members

Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Cllr Wendy Matthews	Iver Parish Council
Elaine Mells	Pavilion Association
Nigel Mells	Pavilion Association
Eilish Stone	HASRA – Harmondsworth Resident
Phil Rumsey	Friends of the Great Barn
Veronica Rumsey	HASRA / Friends of the Great Barn
Kathleen Croft	LFF Representative at HCEB
David Blackett	Heston Residents Association
Peter Hood	Colnbrook Residents Association
Cllr Pujja Bedi	Chair, Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council
Jane Taylor	HASRA Chair – Sipson Resident
Christine Taylor	HASRA – Harlington Resident
Stan Woods	Longford Residents Association
Mike Rayner	Colnbrook Resident
Peter Jeffery	Chair, Stanwell Preservation Action Group
Anup Babuta	Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council
Rob Gray	Community and Stakeholder Director, Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Head of Community and Stakeholder Engagement, Heathrow
Elizabeth Beale	Community Relations Manager, Heathrow
Kaimi Ithia	Head of Community Impacts and Engagement

Attendees-**Guest Speakers**

Marc Wolman	Head of Property Operations
David Banks	Residential Property Manager
Dr Charlotte Clark	Noise and Health Assessment, Arup
Ben Cave	Director, BCA
Sue Thomas	Environmental Assessment Manager: Noise and Health, Heathrow

Apologies

Cllr June Nelson	London Borough of Hillingdon
Sean Kelly	Chair, Colnbrook Residents Association
Marian Rough	Stanwell Community Group

1 Welcome and apologies

- 1.1. Rob Gray (RG) welcomed members and noted the above apologies.

2 Matters arising from the meeting notes

- 2.1. RG told members that Armelle Thomas (AT) had requested an amendment to item 6.7 of the March 2019 meeting notes, regarding the provision of Post Offices in the Heathrow Villages. This has been amended.

3 Property

- 3.1. RG welcomed Marc Wolman (MW), Head of Property Operations, to update members on the Land Referencing process. He added that Marc had been invited as a response to members having questions about the process.
- 3.2. MW explained that land referencing is a requirement of Heathrow's DCO application and that Heathrow must give every opportunity for those affected to participate in the statutory consultation, planned for this summer.
- 3.3. MW said that his colleagues had been out door knocking in the CPZ area over the last few weeks to explain what Heathrow was doing, and to offer help to complete the Land Interest Questionnaire (LIQ). MW explained that LIQs were sent wider than the CPZ/WPOZ because of the potential impact of noise and airspace changes. He added that LIQs are an important way of ensuring that we are inviting the right people to take part in our consultation and attend the events.
- 3.4. Peter Hood (PH) raised his concern that the land referencing information stakes were not appropriately constructed with MW. MW explained that these stakes are positioned in places where land registry does not know the owner of this land. He added that the stakes are inspected once a week to ensure that they are still in place. **ACTION** – MW to confirm how much longer the stakes will be in place (or if they should have been removed), and whether they need to be assembled differently¹.
- 3.5. Veronica Rumsey (VR) said that there is a piece of land in Harmondsworth which they have been trying to find out who owns and wondered if through the land referencing process, Heathrow would be able to tell them who owns this. MW explained that for GDPR reasons, Heathrow would not be able to share this information, however basic details would be published in the Book of Reference.
- 3.6. Graham Young (GY) asked whether Heathrow has a choice over what questions are asked in an LIQ, as, in his opinion, they felt very intrusive. MW explained that it was important that Heathrow knew the level of interest people held in the property, and that it is a requirement of the DCO to demonstrate that Heathrow had worked to understand the impact expansion will have. GY suggested that the questionnaire could have had an option to say 'no' to some/all of the personal questions, that way he wondered whether there would have been an increased rate of response.
- 3.7. RG welcomed David Banks (DB), Property Operations Manager, Heathrow, to provide an update on the Hardship and Statutory Blight schemes.

DB talked through slides three to 13 of the presentation, which can be found at: <https://www.heathrow.com/company/community-and-environment/community/local->

¹ Some land referencing stakes need to remain in place, where no land owner has yet been identified.

[focus-forum](#). This is the same presentation that will be referenced throughout the meeting notes.

- 3.8. VR said that she had heard both John Holland-Kaye, and Chris Grayling, state that Heathrow would be offering 'World Class Compensation'.
- 3.9. Mike Rayner (MR) asked DB if he could clarify what he meant by "Efforts to sell – market for a minimum of 3 months and did not receive an offer within 15% of the unaffected value" (slide 10). DB explained that one of the criteria for the Hardship scheme is that the homeowner must demonstrate that they have been unable to sell their property for within 15% of what the property is deemed to be worth, after having had the property on the market, for at least three months.
- 3.10. VR asked whether Heathrow has compared their Hardship and Statutory Blight schemes, because in her opinion, she feels that those applying for Hardship are receiving a better deal. DB explained that under the Hardship scheme, if a resident living outside the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) boundary makes a successful application, Heathrow will buy the property at today's unaffected market value, with no home loss payment. However, for properties within the ANPS boundary eligible applicants would receive a 25% home loss payment. Under the statutory blight scheme, homeowners who make a successful blight claim would receive a 10% home loss payment.
- 3.11. PH said that he felt that the unaffected market value should take into consideration more than blight from the threat of a third runway, as he believes properties in Colnbrook have been suffering from airport related blight for many years, and therefore the calculation should be taken back to the point at which the person bought the property.
- 3.12. VR asked who the independent members are that sit on the Hardship panel. DB explained that are people who have done a similar role for HS2. **ACTION** – to find out whether names are public, and therefore whether they can be shared with members².
- 3.13. Stan Woods (SW) asked which villages the applications for Hardship and Statutory Blight were from. **ACTION** – DB to confirm locations³.
- 3.14. VR asked whether the properties purchased under these schemes will be rented out by Heathrow. DB said that this was correct and would be done in a similar way to that of the existing estate of residential properties. VR asked what date the unblighted value is calculated from. DB explained that this would be the date on which the valuation takes place. Cheryl Monk (CM) clarified that Statutory Blight could be applied for, from the day the NPS was designated, this however, is not the same date which would be used to calculate the unaffected market value.
- 3.15. Phil Rumsey (PR) shared his concern that he felt there was no guarantee that you could buy a like-for-like property. Eilish Stone (ES) said that she agreed with Phil, and asked whether there is an appeal process if the homeowner does not agree with the value given to the property. DB explained that if the two valuations given are within 10% of each other, the midpoint is used, and if not a third valuation will be undertaken (at no expense to the property owner).

² The names of panel members will be shared at the next meeting.

³ Blight: 2 x Longford and 2 x Harmondsworth. Hardship: 1 x Brands Hill, 5 x Colnbrook, 5 x Harlington, 11 x Harmondsworth, 12 x Longford, 3 x Sipson, 1 x Stanwell Moor

- 3.16. PH asked if there were any differences between the bond scheme for the CPZ and the WPOZ. MW explained that the CPZ scheme will finish earlier, as those in the WPOZ can still sell their property to Heathrow for up to one year after construction finishes.
- 3.17. Christine Taylor (CT) questioned why Heathrow was still purchasing properties under the previous Property Market Support Bond (PMSB) Scheme. CM explained that the Bond came into effect when Heathrow announced its intention to apply for planning permission for a third runway. Since the previous Bond had not been tied to the scheme from 2009, Bond holders were now eligible to redeem the Bond.
- 3.18. MW explained that during the summer consultation, all property policies will be consulted on. He added that Heathrow will consider the feedback it receives **ACTION** – bond scheme on LFF agenda once information is available⁴.

4 Health & Night Flights

- 4.1. RG explained that Health and Night Flights features on the agenda at the request of members. RG introduced Ben Cave (BC), BCA Director.
- 4.2. BC explained that he would be giving an overview of the links between noise and health, whilst Dr Charlotte Clark, will then give further detail on noise.
- 4.3. BC covered slides 18 to 27 of the presentation. He explained that an Environmental Impact Assessment is an important part of Heathrow's DCO application. The Environmental Impact Assessment will include a chapter looking at the effects on human health.
- 4.4. WM asked what the definition of 'significant is' (Slide 25 - "*Some topics are covered in the health chapter but are not considered likely to have a significant effect*"). BC explained that the definition will differ depending on the topic. He explained that the topics list on slide 25 (e.g. aviation fuel) had been deemed to be less significant because tight regulations for them already exist. WM asked how 'population' is being calculated/defined. BC explained that this also differs per topic, but the 'general population' will be used (a geographical measure), and then vulnerable people or those with specific characteristics will also be accounted for, depending on the topic.
- 4.5. CT asked how the baseline will be calculated and whether the impacts under a 2-runway airport and those under a 3-runway airport will be compared. BC explained that this will be set out in the DCO application, where a 'current' baseline will be compared to the expansion proposal which is detailed in the application.
- 4.6. PH identified that BC had included 'Community Cohesion' within the scope of the Health assessment. He asked how this would be calculated when there is being compensation offered allowing some people to move away (WPOZ). BC acknowledged that this is a challenge and welcomed any comments members have on this.
- 4.7. RG welcomed Dr Charlotte Clark (CC).
- 4.8. CC explained that she works for Arup and is a consultant for Heathrow. CC talked through slides 29 to 36 of the presentation.

⁴ This has been included on the agenda for the next meeting (Tuesday 25th June 2019).

- 4.9. MR, in reference to slide 34, said that the graphs don't show that some sources of noise affect more people than others, adding that he believes that the noise from an aircraft affects far more people than the noise from rail or road. CC explained that the graphs show the noise heard indoors in the bedroom. She added that indoor levels are beneficial because they represent the noise exposure in the bedroom and when you examine this, there is little difference in terms of biologically assessed awakenings between aircraft, road traffic and railway noise. This does not discount individual differences in sensitivities to different noise sources.
- 4.10. VR referenced the 40dB, which is the WHO guideline for target night time noise exposure (slide 35), and asked therefore, why Heathrow only provided double glazing for those within the 65dB noise contour. The 40dB level set by the WHO guidelines represents a LOAEL value – a lowest observed adverse effect level. This is the level at which noise effects on sleep are thought to begin as opposed to a level that is considered to have a more serious effect on sleep. Insulation schemes aim to protect from these more serious effects on sleep and therefore, the noise level which triggers the offer of insulation is higher and is often related to a SOAEL level – a significant adverse effect level.
- 4.11. CT said that she had been woken on Easter Monday by what she thought was engine testing at 2am and 3am, and that there had been a high number of late aircraft the previous night. CM explained that there are now very few flights after 11:30pm. **ACTION** – to share stats on number of late flights⁵.
- 4.12. GY said that he appreciated hearing about the links between noise and health, and said he had concerns that facts would be removed because the findings were unpopular. CC explained that she was appointed by Heathrow as an independent advisor, and it is important that noise and health feed into the DCO application. RG reassured GY that this would not be the case and explained that therefore Heathrow has chosen to work with people like CC, because it is important that Heathrow has the best people to advise on this area.
- 4.13. Kathleen Croft (KC) asked why CC has used 'L Max' figures when Heathrow use LEQs. CC explained that research using biological awakenings uses L Max, but self-reported awakenings use LEQs. CC added that you would not awaken because of the average noise over a night, but because of specific occurrences of peak noise for an aircraft noise event and that it is why it is more appropriate for the L Max figures to be used. The noise and health assessment for the DCO Project will examine both metrics and their impacts on sleep disturbance in the Environmental Statement.

5 AOB

- 5.1. VR asked whether in future, large agenda items could be put on separate agenda items. RG said he understood that today's agenda did have two substantial items on it, but because they were both the request of members, it was felt that they could not be postponed.

⁵ TO NOTE: There were no late flights after 23:30 over the Easter weekend. An engine run took place at 02:10 on the Sunday morning (21st April)

Date of next meeting

Tuesday 25 June 2019, 18:00-20:30, Kuala Lumpur/Johannesburg, The Compass Centre