

## Heathrow Local Focus Forum – 26th June 2018

### 6.30pm – 8.30pm Compass Centre – meeting notes

#### Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Cllr Puja Bedi	Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council
Cllr Anup Babuta	Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council
Cllr June Nelson	London Borough of Hillingdon
Peter Hood	Colnbrook Residents Association
Sean Kelly	Colnbrook Residents Association
David Blackett	Heston Residents Association
Stan Woods	Longford Residents Association
Colin Dyer	Longford Residents Association
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Marian Rough	Stanwell Community Group
Eilish Stone	HASRA
Christine Taylor	HASRA, Harlington representative
Jane Taylor	HASRA
Veronica Rumsey	HASRA / Friends of the Great Barn
Phil Rumsey	HASRA/ Friends of the Great Barn
Nigel Mells	Pavilion Association
Elaine Mells	Pavilion Association
Mike Rayner	Colnbrook resident
Gurpal Viridi	Cranford resident
Kathleen Croft	LFF representative at HCEB
Guido Liguori	Chief of Staff, HCEB
Rob Gray	Director of Community & Stakeholder Engagement, Heathrow
Nigel Milton	Director of Communications, Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Head of Community Relations, Heathrow
Kaimi Ithia	Senior Community Relations Manager, Heathrow
Jonathan Deegan	Head of Acquisition & Compensation, Heathrow
Chris Joyce	Head of Surface Access, Heathrow
Beverley Savage	Community Relations Manager, Heathrow

#### Apologies

Jean and Philip Purcell	Longford
Laura Jones	Community Relations Manager, Heathrow

## 1 Welcome & apologies

- 1.1 Rob Gray (RG) welcomed members and noted the above apologies. He introduced Guido Liguori (GL), Chief of Staff from the Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB). GL advised that the HCEB Chair Rachel Cerfontyne (RC) was unable to attend as she was at an all-party parliamentary group meeting. RG added that she would attend a future meeting.
- 1.2 RG congratulated David Blackett (DB) for Heston Residents Association receiving the Queen's Award for Voluntary Service on 2<sup>nd</sup> June in the Queen's Birthday Honours.
- 1.3 RG explained there was no formal agenda for the meeting as the intention was to discuss the previous day's Parliamentary vote to approve the Airport's National Policy Statement (NPS). He explained that the meeting will cover the next steps and the information that local residents will receive from Heathrow over the coming days and weeks.
- 1.4 RG asked if there were any comments on the previous meeting notes. Peter Hood (PH) advised that he had already passed on his corrections. Mike Rayner (MR) added that he had some comments and hoped to submit these before the next meeting.
- 1.5 RG asked if members had any other comments before the meeting continues. MR felt that Heathrow expansion was no more certain now than it was before the Parliamentary vote. He thought there was a lot of hollow evidence being put forward by the industry and was concerned about warehouse development on pervious ground which could cause flooding problems.
- 1.6 Cllr June Nelson (JN) was concerned that some residents in Cranford Cross were unclear about which properties would be purchased. Jonathan Deegan (JD) advised that the maps that are available on our website clearly showed which areas were covered by Heathrow's property policies. JN asked when the properties would be purchased and JD explained this would not happen until Heathrow had received development consent, which was not likely to be before 2021. CM added that she would send JN details showing which part of Cranford Cross was covered. **ACTION CM**

## 2 Heathrow expansion update

- 2.1 RG gave an update on Heathrow expansion. The presentation is attached to these notes. He advised that the Government had voted on 25<sup>th</sup> June to approve the Airports NPS and there would now be a six-week period for those who want to challenge the Government through judicial review. He ran through the projected timeline, advising that a second consultation would take place next year before Heathrow submitted its Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Secretary of State (SoS) for approval. Following approval, construction would be expected to begin in 2021 and the new runway could open in 2026.
- 2.2 Eilish Stone (ES) asked if legal challenges could affect the timeline. RG advised that Heathrow would continue with its work, consultation and community engagement until instructed otherwise.
- 2.3 Veronica Rumsey (VR) asked how much money Heathrow had spent promoting the third runway, lobbying MPs and attending conferences. NM advised that a breakdown of the figures was not available and Heathrow would not provide it.

- 2.4 Stan Woods (SW) asked if Heathrow's flight paths would still have to change if expansion did not go ahead. CM confirmed that airspace modernisation was required regardless of Heathrow expansion, in line with the Government's Future Airspace Strategy.
- 2.5 Peter Hood (PH) was concerned about the timeline, noting that some residents could inadvertently move to an area only to find it will be overflowed by new flight paths. CM advised that Heathrow's next consultation in 2019 would present the broad areas where the new flight paths would be. She explained that the first consultation earlier this year had sought to establish the principles needed to design flight paths. The second consultation will use these principles to establish the broad areas or "design envelopes" where flight paths will be located. Following this, a third consultation will show proposed flight paths.
- 2.6 RG noted that 5,332 people had attended Heathrow's 40 consultation events between January and March 2018, with 1,830 responding to the Airspace Principles consultation and 4,582 responding to the Airport Expansion consultation. JN asked if a breakdown of attendance by geographical area was available. RG responded that this was not available yet but would be published in due course. PH asked what the key findings were. RG advised that Heathrow was currently going through the details, noting that there was a whole range of issues that would need to be taken into account to build an integrated plan. He added that the HCEB would be working with Heathrow to make sure engagement continued to improve.
- 2.7 Graham Young (GY) proposed that the questions for the second consultation should be circulate in advance. Kaimi Ithia (KI) acknowledged that Heathrow was in the process of learning how to improve engagement for the second consultation and was grateful for the feedback.
- 2.8 JD advised that now that the Airports NPS had been designated, property owners within an area set out in the Airports NPS may now be eligible to serve what is known as a 'Statutory Blight Notice' asking the Secretary of State for Transport to buy their property. This area is known as the Annex A Boundary and is broadly similar to the CPZ area (*please note that there are some differences and property owners are advised to check which area their property is located in - a map can be found by visiting the compensation pages on **Heathrow.com/localcommunity***).
- 2.9 He explained that if a Blight Notice is accepted, the property would be purchased and property owners would receive the unaffected market value of the property plus a payment of up to 10% of this value (*Please note this is depending on the type of property and subject to various statutory caps*). JD explained that the Secretary of State for Transport has legal responsibility for any statutory blight caused by the designation of the Airports NPS, however Heathrow has agreed that it will meet the costs of successful claims.
- 2.10 Many members were unhappy about the fact that some properties could now be sold to Heathrow. Phil Rumsey (PR) explained he was anxious that property values would drop when people start moving out of the area and JN concerned that many residents did not know what to do. JD reiterated that this was the Government's statutory compensation, not Heathrow's.

- 2.11 VR asked how the unaffected value would be calculated and when blight started from. JD explained that each property will need to be valued individually to establish its unaffected open market value. The process will look at whether there are longer term effects from previous runway proposals, as well as those arising from the current proposal. JD explained that each property would be valued by two independent qualified members of the RICS (Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors), one appointed by Heathrow and one appointed by the homeowner. The valuers will be chosen from a panel of independent valuation firms put together by Heathrow. The average of these two valuations would then become the offer price. If these differ by more than 10%, a third valuer would be appointed by HAL and the offer price will be the average of the closest two valuations. Christine Taylor (CT) said that the stamp duty payment would not be enough to buy a more expensive property in another area. JD confirmed that the stamp duty paid is based on the value of the property sold.
- 2.12 CT was concerned that many elderly people would not understand the complex process of DCO, NPS and blight notices and needed support. KI responded that Heathrow was working on how best to make the information accessible and would be running information events during July. These will take place in Stanwell Moor, Colnbrook, Cranford, Longford, Harmondsworth, Sipson, Iver and Longford.
- 2.13 GY recalled that when the M25 was widened, surveying companies had approached residents and worked on their behalf to get the best deal. He suggested that Heathrow should find a way to work with homeowners to do the same thing. KI responded that it was through these types of conversation that Heathrow can start to shape a package to support people. PH added that he had raised the need for a resettlement team in one of his consultation responses.
- 2.14 GL advised that the HCEB was independent of Heathrow and would challenge the airport to make sure it had fulfilled its commitments. The HCEB hoped to be present at the upcoming information events. CT wondered if this would make the HCEB look less independent, noting that HCEB had recently sent out a letter with purple branding that looked like it had come from Heathrow. She was concerned that the HCEB was engaging with Heathrow on how to engage with the community rather than asking the community. GL explained that the information events would help the HCEB to understand what is happening, adding that they would also hold their own events as the expansion process progresses. ES thought that many residents would not attend these events and asked how the HCEB would reach those people. GL acknowledged that these discussions were useful to help the HCEB understand how to reach everyone.
- 2.15 JD reminded the group that the Compulsory Purchase Zone (CPZ) covered the properties that Heathrow needed to acquire, while the Wider Property Offer Zone (WPOZ) covered those in close proximity to the airport boundary who would not be required to sell but would receive the same compensation offer if they wished to move. VR thought that the CPZ offer should be greater and include relocation assistance.
- 2.16 JD explained the process of land referencing, advising that Heathrow needed to identify all those with an interest in the land that will be affected and invite them to the consultation. Those who may experience changes in noise levels due to airspace changes would also need to be consulted. MR thought the area went out further than necessary and asked what the policy was for which land to include. JD explained that it would look wider than expected because it included anyone affected by changes including roads, rivers and noise levels.

- 2.17 GY suggested asking the Citizens Advice Bureau to help with advising residents, but CT was concerned their expertise was too generalised and suggested the HCEB should look to appoint somebody with specific training. GL confirmed that the HCEB was currently looking for the best approach to provide specialists to offer the right advice.
- 2.18 ES was concerned for those in rental properties who might throw the information away. JD advised that Heathrow would write to both the property address and the landlord more than once and if there was no response they would visit the property.
- 2.19 KI advised that ground investigation works were being carried out to look at soil quality. VR noted that many residents were upset that these surveys had encroached on bridleways and some had been asked to dismount bicycles on Accommodation Lane. KI committed to look into this. **ACTION KI**
- 2.20 Kathleen Croft (KC) observed that residents had been concerned about recent 24-hour security on the M25 Junction 14 roundabout. JD was not aware of this but suspected it was not connected with Heathrow, noting that sites often required security to stop fly tipping.

### 3 Terms of Reference

- 3.1 Cheryl Monk (CM) observed that the LFF previously had no Terms of Reference (ToR) and there had been general agreement that some should be introduced. A draft had been circulated prior to the meeting for comments.
- 3.2 PH thought the draft was very good and almost ready. KC was pleased that Heathrow wanted to listen to residents. PH added that while he did not necessarily agree with what Heathrow was doing, he believed in the sincerity of the Heathrow community team.
- 3.3 JN thought there should be regular communications sent to residents including letters for those without internet or email access. She acknowledged that Heathrow engagement had come a long way and stressed that everyone wanted the best for their communities.
- 3.4 GY suggested that while allowing each organisation a maximum of two members, a substitution should be allowed if one of those members was not able to attend. He thought that sanctions should only apply when an organisation does not attend, rather than when an individual does not attend. ES asked how a limit of two members would apply to HASRA who currently have more than two members representing different villages. CM stressed that the intention was not to stop people coming but to keep the meeting from becoming unwieldy and that since they represented different villages, it was fine for there to be a number of HASRA representatives. MR asked whether the limit applied to organisations or areas, noting there were six people from Colnbrook at the last meeting. CM explained that some of those had been councillors while others were from residents' associations.
- 3.5 Nigel Mells (NM) suggested the ToR should require members to respect the chair.
- 3.6 It was agreed that any changes to the ToR should be agreed by a majority of forum members.

### 4 AOB

There was no other business.

## **Date of next meeting**

Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> September 2018, 6.30pm – 8.30pm, Compass Centre