

From: <XXXX@baa.com>
To: <XXXX@dft.gsi.gov.uk>
Date: 09/09/04 15:50:14
Subject: Re: URGENT - HOSS Booklet - version 1

XXXX, many thanks for this it is very helpful. We are adopting all of your suggestions and will aim to get a final draft back to you tomorrow (Friday) as it is going for printing on Monday.

Many thanks again for your help.

XXXX
Director of Stansted Generation 2 Project
XXXX

<XXXX@dft.gsi.gov.uk> on 08/09/2004
17:49:13

To: <XXXX@baa.com>
cc: <XXXX@dft.gsi.gov.uk> ,

Subject: Re: URGENT - HOSS Booklet - version 1

XXXX

Thank you for sending this. I can confirm, as you suspected when we met, that DfT would not be happy with wording referring to DfT's endorsement of your proposed scheme.

We would prefer instead that you use the following text: "DfT has confirmed that this scheme is consistent with the Government's policy on voluntary blight schemes, as set out in the Government's White Paper, The Future of Air Transport." We would also suggest that your guidance say that applicants to the scheme should take their own legal advice before completing the application form.

I hope that this is helpful. We would very much like to see a final version of the text before it goes to the printers. I appreciate that your timings are tight: if your colleagues were able to show it to XXXX he will be able to turn it around more quickly than I.

Regards

XXXX

>>> <XXXX@baa.com> 09/07/04 12:54pm >>>

XXXX, following this mornings meeting I attach a current draft of The HOSS document. As you will se there are references to the DfT's Position (one in Terry's introduction and a few others later in the report). As I said earlier I recognise that these references are not appropriate at present but rather than me re-drafting it I would appreciate it if you could put it in the terms which you would prefer. We can always revert to
.....it is our understanding if we need to.

If you could get back to me within a day or so I would appreciate it as We are finalising the text this week.

XXXX
Director of Stansted Generation 2 Project
XXXX

To: XXXX/Group Planning and Environment/LGW/BAA@BAA,

Subject: HOSS Booklet - version 1

Please find attached the first version of the HOSS booklet as designed By Terry Williams. His email arrived just a short time ago and I am afraid I have not had a chance to proof read the text as I had hoped.

The text and the design will prompt many issues and questions and There will be all kinds of changes that will need to be made.

I should appreciate your comments on Monday. Terry will then be able To prepare version 2 for the Acquisitions Board to consider on Wednesday.

Many thanks

(See attached file: HOSS A4 v1.pdf)

XXXX

Tel: XXXX

PS I believe that XXXX missed a section of text which you will find In this attachment. (See attached file: What you said....doc)

From: XXXX
To: XXXX@baa.com
Date: 9/3/04 6:18pm
Subject: Re: Stansted Home Owners Support Scheme

XXXX

Thanks for this email, and for Tim's separate one about the prospective appointment of Professor Kennerley as the complaints commissioner for it.

We have considered here the draft consultation document that you sent to us: thank you also for drawing out the key elements of this in your email. Your proposed scheme fits well with White Paper references to operators bringing forward schemes that address the problem of generalised blight. We note that you have based this scheme on that in place for the CTRL, and have embellished this in places to address the circumstances at Stansted. We note the advantages of basing this scheme on the 66LEQ contour published by this Department.

We also note the advantages of appointing a Commissioner to adjudicate on special cases arising from the application of the scheme. The DfT view is that Professor Kennerley has performed this role well in relation to the CTRL scheme and we have no problem in you approaching him to do the same at Stansted. You will - of course - need to check that he has the time available to perform both roles.

Yours

XXXX

XXXX
Airports Policy Division, DfT

>>> <XXXX@baa.com> 08/24/04 10:44am >>>

XXXX,

When we spoke a couple of weeks ago I informed you of our intention to announce our second blight scheme for Stansted on 16 September 2004 (this date is not yet known publicly). I also said that I expected third parties to seek the DfT's views on whether our proposals satisfy Government policy as set out in the aviation White Paper. In particular, paragraph 12.16 of the WP talks the government making arrangements for non-statutory schemes to be brought forward locally by the airport operator to deal with the problem of generalised blight.

I attach a draft copy of a booklet which we are proposing to publish on 16 September. Although this is still a relatively early draft and is not yet fully accurate in its description of the scheme, I believe it is close enough to being accurate to allow you to take a view on whether our two schemes taken together (the existing Home Value Guarantee Scheme and now the Home Owners Support Scheme) satisfy the Government's policy on this issue.

Some points which I would draw to your attention are:

- the HOSS scheme goes beyond the CTRL and HA schemes in that it offers both a property guarantee exercisable once confirms its intention to construct following a Planning Inquiry and an option of early sale to BAA if the guarantee on its own has not fully supported the market value;
- the boundary of the scheme goes out to the 66leq contour published by

the DfT earlier this year but no further (I understand this to be comparable to HA and CTRL schemes). If the size and position of the contour changes based on our further work we will honour the guarantee to those who get it now and include those who qualify in future. Note that this is not a point which the present draft adequately captures. we believe this is the most generous scheme offered so far in the UK (if you have better knowledge than us on this point it would be useful to know). Our belief is based on: the proposition that both a guarantee and an option to purchase is included; that a "sweetener" is provide for those who wish to sell in the meantime but who are unable to demonstrate that property values have dropped by as much as 15%; that we are providing a "floor" if property values drop below the June 2002 valuation; that at present we are proposing to have a Complaints Commissioner who will also make recommendations to us with regard to Special Cases (referred to incorrectly in the attached draft as a Hardship Fund); that in relation to HVGS we include disbursements and a 10% exgratia payment at the time we confirm our intention to construct. There are some other more minor points too.

we are also preparing material on how we would propose to deal with generalised blight at our other airports (to be announced on the same day) and I will arrange for you to see these in advance too. where I believe we will be open to most critical comment is in three areas.

Firstly, that we have not widened the boundary beyond the 66leq contour. There has been a great deal of local media coverage and amongst pressure groups about us dividing communities (mostly Takeley but others too). Here there are strong suggestions that we should choose a wider noise contour or that we should adjust the boundary to include whole communities such as Takeley.

Secondly, the consultation has brought to our attention around ten cases in which those concerned consider themselves to be Special Cases. The Reasons given typically relate to health, family distress such as needing to move closer to family members or divorce. We are currently considering the question of whether we should appoint a Commissioner to draw our attention to cases which he/she consider merit further consideration.

Thirdly, there appears to be some evidence at present of generalised blight over an area wider than the 66leq contour (especially for the more expensive properties) but these would not qualify unless they do so under any Special Cases provision in which a combination of both a demonstration blight and additional circumstances such a health enabled someone to qualify.

I would be grateful if you could get back to me with you views as soon as possible. In the meantime I will continue to send udpated drafts and feel free to call me if you wish.

Many thanks

(See attached file: HOSS Booklet. Draft 23 August.doc)(See attached file: HOSS process.xls)

XXXX

Director of Stansted Generation 2 Project

XXXX