

Heathrow Local Focus Forum – Tuesday 25th May 2019**6.30pm – 8.30pm Compass Centre – DRAFT 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
David Blackett	Chair, Heston Residents Association
Mangal Chudha	Vice-Chair, Heston Residents Association
Peter Hood	Colnbrook Residents Association
Jane Taylor	HASRA Chair – Sipson Resident
Stan Woods	Longford Residents Association
Peter Jeffery	Chair, Stanwell Preservation Action Group
Gurpal Viridi	Cranford Resident
Clair Roser	Secretary, Stanwell Moor Residents Association
Sarah Spencer	Stanwell Moor Residents Association
Andrew Spencer	Stanwell Moor Residents Association
Rob Gray	Community and Stakeholder Director, Heathrow
Elizabeth Beale	Community Relations Manager, Heathrow
Kaimi Ithia	Head of Community Impacts and Engagement
Rhiannon Hill	Interim Head of Strategic Partnerships
Attendees- Guest Speakers	
Alistair Maxwell	Senior Project Manager, Heathrow
Andrew Lawson	Head of Residential Property
Apologies	
Cllr June Nelson	London Borough of Hillingdon
Sean Kelly	Chair, Colnbrook Residents Association
Mike Rayner	Colnbrook Resident
Kathleen Croft	LFF Representative at HCEB
Puja Bedi	Chair, Colnbrook Neighbourhood Action Group
Christine Taylor	HASRA – Harlington Resident
Cllr Sue Doran	Ward Councillor, Stanwell North – Spelthorne Borough Council

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 asked members for any comments on the meeting notes.
- 2.2. RG said that Veronica Rumsey (VR) asked for item 3.8 to be added to the meeting notes.
- 2.3. Wendy Matthews (WM) asked for the actions of the last meeting to be covered.
 - 2.3.1. Item 3.4 – Members said that the stakes had not been removed, KI explained that the stakes had to remain where no land owner had been identified. The meeting notes will be updated to reflect this.
 - 2.3.2. Item 3.12 – Andy Lawson (AL) said that he has received permission from the 8 independent hardship panel members to share their details. He read out the names of the panel members and a brief background about each person. He added that these details will be circulated with the meeting notes.
 - 2.3.3. Item 3.13 – The meeting notes have been amended to include a footnote listing the locations of Hardship and Blight applications, 14 of which have been successful. Eilish Stone (ES) asked if members could have the locations of the successful applications. AL explained that due to the confidential nature of the scheme, this would not be possible. ES asked what Heathrow plans to do with two properties she believes are vacant on Hatch Lane, as she has presumed that Heathrow has purchased these under the hardship scheme¹. AL said that he would need to look into this case, but explained that usually when a residential property is purchased under the hardship scheme, it is managed on Heathrow's behalf and rented out.
 - 2.3.4. Item 3.18 – The bond scheme is covered by today's agenda ('Property Update').

3 Heathrow Expansion Consultation

- 3.1. RG gave a brief introduction to the consultation, explaining that it began on Tuesday 18th June 2019, and will run until Friday 13th September 2019. RG covered slides 3-5 of the presentation. *This is the same presentation that will be referenced throughout the meeting notes, and can be found here: <https://www.heathrow.com/company/community-and-environment/community/local-focus-forum>.*
- 3.2. RG invited Alistair Maxwell (AM), Senior Project Manager, Heathrow Expansion, to give members a brief overview of Heathrow's preferred masterplan.
- 3.3. AM began by giving a quick introduction to the Expansion scheme, covered in slides 7 and 8. He explained that the majority of off-airport construction is scheduled to be completed by 2026, and that most construction after this (up to 2050) would take place within the airport perimeter.

¹ Due to the confidential nature of the scheme, Heathrow cannot confirm if either of the properties were purchased under the hardship scheme.

- 3.4. AM explained that slides 9 to 15, represent different features of the masterplan (e.g. roads, rivers etc.), and that they build up in layers to a complete picture of the preferred masterplan (they do not show phasing).
- 3.5. Nigel Mells (NM) asked whether Heathrow plans to build over the M25. AM explained that in the preferred masterplan, the M25 would need to be relocated approximately 150m to the West. AM added that this construction would take place offline, whilst the current section of M25 was still in place in order to minimise local road disruption. VR asked who would be paying for the relocation of the M25. AM explained that Heathrow would be covering this cost.
- 3.6. ES said that residents needed access via the A3044 to remain, and asked how this would be possible under the expansion proposal. AM explained that Heathrow would reprovide the A3044 and that this is shown on image 9 (slide 13).
- 3.7. WM asked whether the new runway in the preferred masterplan would be raised up. AM explained that there would be minimal elevation.
- 3.8. EM shared her concern, that if Heathrow proposed to lower the M25, that this may cause flooding. AM explained that there would be a drainage system in place. He added that Heathrow is working closely with Highways England on the design, and that it is not in Heathrow's interest for the road to be flooded.
- 3.9. VR asked where Heathrow plans to move the Immigration Removal Centre (IRC) to. RG explained that Heathrow is working closely with the Home Office and the London Borough of Hounslow, and a preferred site has been identified. AM highlighted that the location is shown on slide 16 (number 21). Clair Roser (CR) asked for the exact location of the IRC as she felt that this is not clear on documentation she has seen so far. **ACTION** – confirm exact location of the site in the preferred masterplan for the re-provided IRC².
- 3.10. Peter Jeffery (PJ) asked for clarification on the green boundary, shown in slides 9 to 15, around Stanwell Moor. AM explained that this is a 'green loop', for active travel (walking, cycling etc.) and is one of the ways that the masterplan has responded to feedback from earlier consultation.
- 3.11. NM asked if the River Colne was being re-routed through a disused tip, and if so, how it was being sealed off. AM explained that Heathrow is working closely with the Environmental Agency on this. **ACTION** – confirm details about the re-routing of River Colne³.
- 3.12. VR said that she felt Heathrow should be attending planning application meetings to object to the building of new residential units in LB Hillingdon which could shortly be removed to make way for new hotels and offices as she felt this would be unfair on the people moving in to those homes. RG said that whilst Heathrow has a good dialogue

² The exact location of the re-provided IRC can be found here:
<https://aec.heathrowconsultation.com/plans/phase-1/> (slide 2).

³ Details showing the re-routing of the River Colne can be found here:
<https://aec.heathrowconsultation.com/topics/landscape-and-water-environment/>.

with other local authorities, to help them facilitate their local plans, we cannot do this with Hillingdon, as they choose not to engage.

- 3.13. Andrew Spencer (AS) said that he felt that Heathrow was having an impact on the value of his property, which he believes has fallen by £35,000 prior to Expansion taking place. RG explained that the inclusion of a property in the WPOZ is on the basis that it will receive new noise (66db), and that Heathrow cannot find evidence to show Stanwell Moor will receive new noise. RG added that there will however be a package of measures available, including home relocation and assistance, new noise insulation packages for all of Stanwell Moor, a revised hardship policy, and the introduction of the Community Fund. RG said that he would be happy to continue this conversation with AS, and to please send him any evidence of house prices falling. CR said that she believed the noise calculations were based on 2017 data, and she felt that the flight paths had changed since then. **ACTION** – to clarify how the noise data is calculated.
- 3.14. WM asked what development was taking place north of the M4. AM explained that flood storage areas have been identified, green areas are to be enhanced, and that most of the work will be landscaping. WM asked for clarification on what is meant by flood areas. RG explained that this will be covered in the Local Area Document. **ACTION** – clarify what a flood storage area is⁴.
- 3.15. Graham Young (GY) asked if a member of the Heathrow team could meet with the Richings Park Residents Association, so that they were informed to be able to brief residents. **ACTION** – organise meeting.
- 3.16. David Blackett (DB) asked whether the land proposed for the IRC was owned by Heathrow. RG explained that this is London Borough of Hounslow land, and that Heathrow is working closely with the council and Home Office. **ACTION** – send Local Area Document to David.
- 3.17. DB asked what the proposal to relocate Waterside (British Airways offices) is. RG explained that the relocation is not part of the Heathrow Expansion Consultation or DCO application. He added that Heathrow is working closely with BA, and that there will be a separate town and country planning application submitted by them.
- 3.18. DB asked if the same slides presented at the LFF will also be presented at consultation events. RG explained that this would not be the case but that all of the content is available within the consultation documentation. He said that Heathrow is trying to make the consultation events as accessible as possible. RG said that, like usual, the LFF slides will be available on the website with the meeting notes.
- 3.19. CR said that she felt that there were discrepancies between difference pieces of consultation material. RG asked CR to please send through details of this to the community email address (communityrelations@heathrow.com).

⁴ 'Flood storage' is defined as 'Water which is temporarily stored within the river channel and its floodplain during flood events in order to alleviate the magnitude of floods that are passed downriver.' More details about flood storage areas can be found here: <https://aec.heathrowconsultation.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2019/06/23-Volume-1-PEIR-Chapter-21-Water-Environment.pdf> (pages 21.34-21.35).

- 3.20. AM gave a brief introduction to construction (slide 17) and signposted members to the Construction Proposals Document on the Heathrow Expansion Consultation website, if they wished to find out more.
- 3.21. AM explained 'phasing' to members, covered on slide 19. He said that the plan is for the runway to open in 2026, new terminal facilities by 2030, and 'end state' circa 2050.
- 3.22. VR asked how many additional car parking spaces there would be. AM explained that the number of car park spaces would be broadly similar to the number today but would be consolidated into the Southern and Northern parkways. RG explained that this means that Heathrow will have to have a significant reduction in colleague travel.
- 3.23. AM reminded members that there is further information for individual areas available in the Local Area Documents on the Heathrow Expansion Consultation website. ES asked if hard copies were available. KI explained that documents will be at consultation events and at documents inspection locations. RG added that Heathrow is trying to take a sustainable approach to documentation, but if anyone would like a hard copy, they will be available shortly, and can be posted to members.
- 3.24. PR asked if the expansion plans include a 4th runway. RG said that Heathrow has publicly said that it agrees with the Airports Commission's recommendation against a 4th runway.
- 3.25. RG gave an overview of the main consultation documents (slide 25).
- 3.26. RG explained that as part of the consultation, Heathrow needs views on how the Community Fund should be spent. CR asked if RG could give an example. RG said he could not because the fund has not been set up yet.
- 3.27. CR asked if Heathrow was only consulting on certain aspects of expansion. RG said that Heathrow is specifically consulting on areas which can change or where Heathrow would like feedback, however, there is space for general feedback on the response form, and asked members to put any additional comments they had there. RG said that Heathrow must be able to demonstrate that it has taken into account feedback received, for the DCO application.
- 3.28. ES asked whether she would be able to complete her consultation response in sections on the website, as this had not been possible for her, during the previous consultation. KI said that Heathrow had taken this feedback on board and ensured that this was possible for this consultation. CR said that she had experience that this was the case.
- 3.29. RG encouraged members to attend their consultation event.

4 Property Update

- 4.1. RG welcomed Andy Lawson (AL), Head of Residential Property, to provide an update on the residential property policies, including the bond scheme.
- 4.2. AL explained that the property policies include a set of discretionary schemes in addition to the statutory compensation. He told members that if they wanted to find out more, or comment on the policies by responding to the consultation, he would

recommend that they had a look at the 'Property Policies Information Paper' available on the Heathrow Expansion Consultation website.

- 4.3. AL explained that one of the ways Heathrow has responded to previous feedback, is by introducing a discretionary scheme for business in the WPOZ.
- 4.4. AL talked through the map (slide 33) which highlights the border of the CPZ, WPOZ and Draft Development Consents Order Limits. AL explained that the 'Draft Development Consents Order Limits', refers to the area that Heathrow currently understands as the extent of land where DCO powers may need to be exercised for the construction or operation of the project, as outlined by the preferred masterplan.
- 4.5. AL said that the Hardship Policy has been in existence since early 2017. He said that so far there have been 38 applications, 14 of which have been successful. He added that the scheme is designed to help those most in need, and therefore is in place before the bond scheme starts. AL said that the Hardship scheme had five criteria, they are: proximity, demonstrating effort to sell, evidence of hardship, a qualifying interest and a 'no prior knowledge' date of December 2013.
- 4.6. AL told members that one of the changes to the policy, to take account of feedback, was that the 'proximity' criteria has been altered from 'proximity to the North West runway' to 'proximity to the North West runway and other components of Expansion'. CR asked if residents had to be in the CPZ or WPOZ to apply for hardship. AL confirmed that anyone can apply for hardship (properties do not have to be located in the CPZ or WPOZ).
- 4.7. AL explained that the CPZ has approximately 760 properties that Heathrow will need to acquire to implement the current preferred masterplan. He added that Heathrow would like to acquire these through agreement, and that exercising powers of compulsory acquisition will be a last resort.
- 4.8. ES asked if only certain residential properties in the WPOZ are eligible for the bond scheme, as she felt information so far had been misleading. AL said that not every residential property in the WPOZ can sell to Heathrow, and that the main example of this would be a tenanted property, owned by a landlord. AL clarified that the WPOZ is aimed at owner-occupiers. **ACTION** – send Eilish further details of the WPOZ criteria.
- 4.9. AL explained that the Contact Request Form has been sent to properties eligible for the Home Purchase Bond, in the CPZ, as well as being available on the website. AL said that this form was to allow residents to express an interest in the scheme, and would allow Heathrow to provide them with further information.
- 4.10. AL said that one change to the bond scheme, has been an amendment to allow owners to appoint their own valuer. He added that the Heathrow panel is still available as an option, but that Heathrow will now also cover the cost for residents to appoint their own valuer.
- 4.11. AL said that Heathrow does not know when the bond scheme will be launched and that this will depend on responses to both the Heathrow Expansion Consultation, and the Contact Request Form. He explained that Heathrow is looking to launch the bond scheme in stages, to make sure that there are the resources available. AL said that the bond scheme would be open until the acceptance of the DCO, allowing as much time

for residents to respond as possible, however this is less imperative for properties in the WPOZ, which are likely to have longer to respond.

- 4.12. ES asked whether, if the DCO is unsuccessful, there would be a situation where properties were still purchased under the bond scheme. AL explained that the bond launching, and the redemption of properties are two separate stages, and that Heathrow wants to try and avoid purchasing properties unless expansion is taking place. AL added that the bond scheme policy is based on the purchase of properties once Heathrow has consent.
- 4.13. AL explained that Heathrow is looking at ways to assist residents with home relocation, and that it is asking the public for suggestions on this at part of the Heathrow Expansion Consultation. VR said that she felt her Freedom Pass which provides her with access to bus, train and underground services should continue to be provided by Heathrow, if she decided to purchase a property outside of London (where only free bus passes are provided). AL said that Heathrow would consider any suggestions provided as feedback to the consultation.
- 4.14. AL said that Heathrow is asking for Contact Request Forms to be returned by September, however, he said that there would be further opportunities to complete one.
- 4.15. Stan Woods (SW) shared how one of his considerations is the location of the higher education his granddaughter attends, as the family do not want her to have to move once she's embarked on her course, but that he felt he did not have enough information to be able to make an informed decision. RG agreed that the lack of certainty is not helpful.
- 4.16. VR explained that she lives in the CPZ and asked what would happen if she did not find anywhere to relocate to. AL explained that Heathrow would want to avoid this situation by helping residents find somewhere to relocate to.

5 AOB

- 5.1. Elaine Mells (EM) asked if the next meeting could include an update on Private Hire Vehicles (PHVs) and HGVs. **ACTION** – schedule on next agenda.
- 5.2. CR shared her frustration with the occurrence of fly-parking in Stanwell Moor. EB explained that Heathrow has recently introduced Heathrow Community Rangers, one of which will cover the area of Stanwell and Stanwell Moor. She explained that whilst they will not solve this problem, they will be monitoring activity in the local area and working closely with the local councils, which should help to reduce it. EB added that their main responsibilities will include litter picking, gardening, advertising the Authorised Vehicle Area to PHVs, and monitoring HGVs. **ACTION** – EB to send CR/SS/AS further details about the Heathrow Community Rangers.
- 5.3. PH asked for an update on the Arora Group's consultation and proposed DCO, as in his opinion, he thinks this will delay Heathrow Expansion, as the minister will have more information to consider. RG said that he feels the Arora Group's DCO proposal, known as 'Heathrow West', is unhelpful, but they are entitled to do this. RG assured members that it will not delay Heathrow from submitting its DCO application. He added that Heathrow does not endorse their plans, and that he regrets the confusion that it has caused. RG encouraged members to make their views known. PH asked how Heathrow is responding to Arora's plans. RG explained that Heathrow has offered to

work with him, and previously has had an innovation partners scheme, but that Arora refused to engage with Heathrow. RG said that Heathrow stands by the belief that splitting up the airport is not best for passengers.

- 5.4. RG asked members to let EB know of any future agenda items they would like to request.
- 5.5. RG asked members to note the change of date for the October meeting (now 5th November). *All members received a copy of the remaining 2019 dates.*
- 5.6. RG thanked members and closed the meeting.

Date of next meeting

Tuesday 10th September 2019, 18:00-20:30, Kuala Lumpur/Johannesburg, The Compass Centre