



## Expansion of Heathrow Airport (Third Runway)

### Section 51 Advice Log Version: 17 February 2026

There is a statutory duty under ['section 51 \(s51\) of the Planning Act 2008'](#) for The Planning Inspectorate to record the advice that it gives in relation to an application or potential application, and to make this publicly available.

This document comprises a record of the advice that has been provided by The Planning Inspectorate to the applicant (Heathrow Airport Limited) and their consultants during the pre-application stage. It will be updated by The Planning Inspectorate after every interaction with the applicant during which s51 has been provided. The applicant will always be given the opportunity to comment on The Planning Inspectorate's draft record of advice before it is published.

The applicant will use this advice log as the basis for demonstrating regard to s51 advice within the application.

<b>Expansion of Heathrow Airport (Third Runway) s51 Advice Log - Index</b>	
<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Meeting overview</b>
<a href="#"><u>4 June 2025</u></a>	Project Update Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scoping</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>27 October 2025</u></a>	Update to Pre-application Prospectus
<a href="#"><u>8 December 2025</u></a>	Project Update Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Scoping Opinion</li> <li>• Assessment methodologies</li> <li>• Baseline data</li> <li>• Primary Service Issues Tracker template</li> <li>• Programme Document (post-meeting note)</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>14 January 2026</u></a>	Project Update Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation</li> <li>• Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations</li> <li>• Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS)</li> <li>• Local communities</li> <li>• Airspace change process</li> </ul>
<a href="#"><u>17 February 2026</u></a>	Email Advice

<b>Project name - s51 Advice Library</b>	
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Meeting date: 4 June 2025</b>
Use of scoping addendum to supplement the scoping report of 2018	<p>The applicant received a scoping opinion for the proposed development in 2018. Further design changes were made prior to a pause in project design in 2020. The applicant confirmed that it now intends to proceed with the application. It explained that the proposal has not changed significantly since the 2018 Scoping Report, although noted that the proposed draft Order Limits have been amended. The applicant confirmed that it intends to submit an addendum to the 2018 scoping report in July 2025 to reflect the revised proposals, current legislation, policy, guidance and assessment methodologies. The addendum would also be informed by engagement undertaken since the 2018 Scoping Report.</p> <p>The applicant highlighted that a scoping addendum approach was employed for the proposed Wylfa Newydd Nuclear Power Station. The Inspectorate agreed that an addendum to the scoping report is acceptable in principle, and that it had accepted such an approach previously for Wylfa Newydd, but noted that it had also advised against the approach elsewhere.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that when determining whether an addendum approach is suitable, the applicant should consider the scale and complexity of changes and the resultant volume of material. It advised that the larger the addendum, the higher the potential for confusion and queried whether a standalone scoping would be easier to understand. The applicant confirmed that in its view the changes since the 2018 scoping report are not sufficient to warrant a new standalone scoping report.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that if the applicant decides to implement an addendum based approach, then the combination of the original scoping report and opinion, and the scoping addendum should ensure that there is absolute clarity for the Inspectorate and consultation bodies regarding the changes to the proposed development, the scope of assessment and the basis for the proposed scope. It advised that if the scoping report addendum is difficult to understand or to read across with the previous scoping report and opinion, then it may not be able to agree to some matters.</p>

	<p>The Inspectorate advised that the addendum should reflect the structure of the original scoping report to provide consistency and make the information easy to access for all stakeholders. It advised that a summary table at the start of the scoping report addendum would be useful to identify the changes and how they affect certain aspects / matters. The addendum should clearly set out all relevant changes including but not limited to changes to the proposed development, the baseline (and future baseline taking into account projections), the legislative and policy context, relevant guidance, and case law. It should clearly set out which parts of the original scoping report remain valid and those which no longer apply. For each change identified, the addendum should clearly explain and justify whether this results in a change in the proposed scope, and what the proposed scope therefore is.</p> <p>The Inspectorate explained that the scoping opinion will generally focus on the areas of change, however the opinion may also address other matters depending on the information provided, the latest understanding of the project and any comments received from consultation bodies.</p>
<p>Consultee List for Scoping</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017 require the SoS to consult with bodies prescribed in the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) (APFP) Regulations. The APFP Regulations were amended in April 2024 by the Miscellaneous Provisions (MP) Regulations 2024. The transitional provisions state that the revised APFP Regulations do not apply to any proposed application for an order granting development consent where the applicant has started to consult under section 42 (s42) of the Planning Act 2008 before 30 April 2024.</p> <p>The applicant undertook statutory consultation under s42 between June and September 2019. The Inspectorate advised that for the purpose of preparing and adopting a scoping opinion, it would therefore identify statutory consultation bodies for the latest red line boundary applying the APFP Regulations <u>not</u> amended by the MP Regulations 2024. It noted that since the original scoping consultation body list was compiled, some of the bodies may have changed due to boundary changes or the abolition/ creation of new bodies. It also noted changes to the red line boundary</p>

	<p>or the likely effects of a revised proposal could result in the identification of new consultation bodies.</p> <p>The Inspectorate asked if the applicant intends to submit a Regulation 8 notification alongside the scoping report addendum. It explained that in the absence of a notification, the applicant would not be provided with a Regulation 11 list of consultation bodies with contact details, although confirmed that the consultation bodies names would be identified in the scoping opinion. The applicant confirmed it would inform the Inspectorate of its decision in due course.</p>
--	--

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Update to Pre-application Prospectus</b>
--------------	---

<p>Update to Pre-application Prospectus</p>	<p><b>IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT UPDATES TO OUR PRE-APPLICATION SERVICES</b></p> <p>Following a 6-month review of our services, our Pre-application Prospectus has been updated: <a href="#">2024 Pre-application Prospectus</a>. The update log at the bottom of the page summarises the changes and clarifications that have been applied.</p> <p>As an applicant with a live project at the pre-application stage of the process, please familiarise yourself with the update and consider how it might affect your pre-application programme and interaction with our services.</p> <p>Please note in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the establishment of land and rights negotiations tracking as a primary service feature – this means it is now expected for <b>all applicants</b> to develop and share a land and right negotiations tracker in 1 of 2 available templates, irrespective of the service tier they have subscribed to</li> <li>• clarified expectations of applicants when preparing to interact with the Inspectorate at meetings – including clarified rights for the Inspectorate to delay or refuse service where pre-meeting expectations are not upheld e.g. an updated programme document or issues tracker is not provided, on time, to inform a meeting agenda.</li> </ul>
---	--

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Meeting date: 8 December 2025</b>
--------------	--------------------------------------

<p>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)</p>	<p>The Inspectorate informed the applicant that, on past applications, being clear on where enabling or associated works permitted outside of the DCO application affect the capacity of the airport, and how this in turn impacts the baseline, should be identified in the EIA.</p>
<p>Scoping opinion</p>	<p>The Inspectorate highlighted that health stood out in the scoping consultation responses as a key matter, particularly for local authorities. It noted that health is a complex matter for assessment and that, as set out in the scoping opinion, this matter should be discussed further with consultation bodies.</p>
<p>Assessment methodologies</p>	<p>The Inspectorate recommended that where agreement is not reached on assessment methodologies, this should be clearly set out in application documents. Understanding both sides of the argument is useful for the Inspectorate. The Inspectorate also highlighted that disagreements on methodologies can have a significant impact on the examination and therefore urged the applicant to seek agreements with relevant parties to support as smooth an examination as possible.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that socio-economic matters in the Gatwick application were disputed by a number of parties due to differing opinions on assessment methodology and assessment conclusions. The Inspectorate encouraged the applicant to be proactive with parties that may raise issues, to avoid the need for these matters to be resolved during the examination. The Inspectorate suggested that even if agreement is not reached, undertaking the work before examination would still be beneficial.</p> <p>Post-meeting note:</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that the Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (ISEP) guidance on social impact assessment was published post-adoption of the scoping opinion and is available here: <a href="#">Placing people at the heart of Environmental Impact Assessment: ISEP launches new guide on Social Impact Assessment</a>.</p>
<p>Baseline Data</p>	<p>The applicant asked the Inspectorate if it had any comments on it updating their baseline biodiversity data and whether reflecting this within an issues tracker is advised. The Inspectorate confirmed that tracking such issues is useful for understanding potential examination matters. It advised that</p>

	<p>it is important that the applicant demonstrates how it has had regard to interest groups requests for additional survey work. The Inspectorate emphasised that securing agreements with the statutory advisors is critical, as unresolved issues would need to be considered during the examination.</p>
<p>Primary Service: Issue Tracker Template</p>	<p>The applicant asked the Inspectorate if the purpose of the “Issue Tracker” was only to reflect environmental issues or whether it should also reflect non-environmental issues.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it should include all issues that arise during pre-application, which are of significance to the delivery of the proposed application. However any matters relating to compulsory acquisition or land rights should be reflected within the “Land Rights Tracker” and if there is an inter-relationship between these matters, the applicant should signpost accordingly between these components for any future reader to understand.</p>
<p>Programme Document <b>Post-meeting note</b></p>	<p>The Adequacy of Consultation Milestone will need to be programmed into the timetable for submission. It is helpful if this is provided to the Planning Inspectorate at least three months prior to submission.</p> <p>The Development Consent Order anticipated submission date will need to specify a month rather than a quarter date.</p> <p>It is advised that the programme document reflects the relevant local planning authorities with whom the applicant has Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) and/ or is discussing PPAs. PPAs may be structured to include joint working arrangements with other local authorities and/ or part of the NSIP process e.g. pre-application stage, with the view to discuss future PPAs following acceptance of an application.</p> <p>It is recommended that section 4 of the programme document be updated to reflect what parties the applicant is engaging with and possibly include a list of the main statutory bodies and local authorities affected by the application, including how the applicant is engaging with these parties.</p> <p>It is advised where possible that details of any recurring meetings with these parties also be reflected. Any issues can be captured in an issues tracker and/ or this information can then be used to update components 2, 3 and 8 of the enhanced tier components.</p>

	<p>Detailed in the Inspectorate’s pre-application prospectus <a href="#">Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: 2024 Pre-application Prospectus - GOV.UK</a></p>
	<p>The programme document suggests that it is likely only one additional round of consultation will take place. The inspectorate would ask if September to October adequate time for consultation due to the size of the project affecting not only local residents. The applicant should confirm if a Statement of Community Consultation will be produced or if engagement with local authorities to determine appropriate means of consulting will take place.</p>
	<p>The programme documents should detail the activities to support intended design approach. It would be useful to have a separate table to ‘Table 1’ that reflects individual components that are intended under the enhance tier and detail the progress, if any, on these documents.</p>

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Meeting date: 14 January 2026</b>
Consultation	<p>The Inspectorate encouraged the applicant to apply the principles of “statutory consultation” outlined within the Planning Act 2008, prior to recent amendments to any future consultations it intends to carry out, noting that these principles would serve as a good baseline.</p>
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations	<p>The Inspectorate reminded the applicant that any future changes to the Planning Act or associated infrastructure legislation must continue to align with the requirements of the EIA Regulations, as those regulations set the framework that must be met</p>
Joint Evidence Base and Infrastructure Study (JEBIS)	<p>The Inspectorate advised that the level of interaction between the Environmental Statement and JEBIS should be the deciding factor when considering whether the applicant should include the study within the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. The Inspectorate also noted that if the JEBIS is not included in the DCO application, interested parties will be unable to comment on it in their relevant representations.</p>
Local Communities	<p>The Inspectorate encouraged the applicant to actively manage relationships with local communities to minimise the risk of social issues arising and emphasised the importance of maintaining clear and consistent communication.</p>

<p>Air Change Process</p>	<p>The Inspectorate acknowledged that there is likely to be some uncertainty about flight paths/ envelopes during the examination of the application. However, the Inspectorate advised that the applicant, in consultation with all relevant consultees, should do all it can to ensure that the envelopes are as small as practicable. This would allow as much certainty as possible to local communities and help all parties to understand the likely significant effects of the project. The Inspectorate also advised that it is very likely that the examining authority would base its conclusions on the worst-case scenario.</p>
---------------------------	---

<p><b>Topic</b></p>	<p><b>Email date: 17 February 2026</b></p>
<p>Programme document (intended design approach)</p>	<p>It would be useful for the table to include airfield layout, terminals, car parks, associated development (offices/ hotels etc), M25 improvements and landscaping across the application site. The table should also be produced having regard to the 'Criteria for 'good design' for airports infrastructure' section of the current ANPS.</p> <p>Also, a table comprising 'component/ document, purpose, expected delivery, status, dependencies' would respond to the request.</p>