

**THE LONDON RESORT
DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER
CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDICES
Reference: BC080001**

5.1 Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 (12 of 14)

**THE LONDON RESORT
DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER**

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDICES

Reference: BC080001

Appendix 5.30

Summary of responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

Issue ref	Organisation	Topic/ chapter/ paragraph number	Issue summary	Regard had to response
AW 1.1	Anglican Water	Water resource and flood risk	<p>Anglian Water has previously provided a pre-planning report for a connection to the public sewerage network. It would be helpful if Anglian Water’s advice could be referenced in the Flood Risk Assessment and associated foul and surface water drainage strategy.</p>	<p>The surface water drainage strategy has been updated to refer to the Utilities Statement (Document Reference 7.6). The Utilities Statement describes connection into the existing sewer and refers to the Anglian Water pre-planning report PPE-0097995.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment has been updated to describe connection to the existing sewer and refers to the Anglian Water pre-planning report PPE-0097995.</p>
AW 1.2	Anglican Water	Water resource and flood risk	<p>Figure 17.8 of the PEIR refers to a ‘proposed sewer’ to connect to Tilbury Water Recycling Centre. As written, this appears to suggest a new public sewer is required to serve the Essex site. However, we have previously provided advice about a suitable connection point for foul flows to the existing sewerage network. It would be helpful if the application refers to the existing sewerage network managed by Anglian Water and associated connection point.</p> <p>In relation to surface water our understanding is that a connection is not required to the public sewerage network for the Essex site. It would therefore if the proposed method of surface water management for the Essex site forms part of the overall surface water strategy.</p>	<p>The Surface Water Drainage Strategy Appendix 17.2 has been updated to refer to the Utilities Statement (Document Reference 7.6). The Utilities Statement describes connection into the existing sewer and refers to the Anglian Water pre-planning report PPE-0097995.</p> <p>The Surface Water Drainage Strategy Appendix 17.2 has been updated to refer to the Utilities Statement (Document Reference 7.6). The Utilities Statement describes connection into the existing sewer and refers to the Anglian Water pre-planning report PPE-0097995.</p>
AW 1.3	Anglican Water	Water resource and flood risk	<p>Plan 8: reference is made highway upgrade/capacity works (Work No. 21b). There is an existing foul sewer located within this area in the vicinity of the A1089. Similarly, there is also existing surface water sewers located within area identified for works to an existing surface water car park (Work No. 22).</p> <p>Plan 9: reference is made to upgrade works to the existing Asda roundabout located on the A1089 (Work No. 21a). There are existing foul sewers located within the area as shown on the plan provided which cross the existing roundabout.</p> <p>Therefore, we would welcome confirmation whether there is a requirement for any diversions or mitigation to existing foul and/or surface water sewers due to the proposed development. If this is the case, we welcome further discussions about the implications for our existing infrastructure prior to submission of the application to the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	<p>At this stage, there are no proposed works to divert or relocate the existing mains in the Essex Project Site. If these mains will be impacted by the works, Anglian Water will be consulted to agree a design and sequencing of works, to mitigate any impacts to existing users. This will be completed under the S185 process for agreement.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

AW 1.4	Anglican Water	Project description	Draft DCO - Article 20 (1) to Article 20 (3) (Discharge of Water): Anglian Water is of the view that article 20 as drafted does not appear to be consistent. Paragraph (3) makes it clear that consent of the owner of the sewerage network is required to discharge water into it (subject to reasonableness); but paragraph (2) states that disputes must be determined in accordance with Section 106 of the Water Industry Act. However, consent is not required as part of the Section 106 process nor can the capacity of the received network which is considered to be a planning issue be taken into account. We would therefore suggest at that article 20(2) (Discharge of Water) of the Draft DCO be replaced with the following wording: “(2) Any dispute arising from the making of connections to or the use of a public sewer or drain by the undertaker under paragraph (1) is to be determined in accordance with the arbitration provisions in article 43 (arbitration)”	The revised draft DCO (document reference 3.1) has clarified the relevant powers
AW 1.5	Anglican Water	Project description	Draft DCO - Article 20 (8): reference is made to deemed consent in respect of any required connection to the public sewerage network. We do not consider it is appropriate in relation to the discharge of water to the public sewerage network and should be disapplied.	The revised draft DCO (document reference 3.1) has clarified the relevant powers
AW 1.6	Anglican Water	Project description	Draft DCO - Schedule 11 (Protective Provisions): We note that the Draft DCO refers to protective provisions for sewerage undertakers which serve the above site including Anglian Water. Anglian Water has previously shared with the applicant’s consultants our standard protective provisions we would wish to see included in the Draft DCO (copy attached). If you would like to make any changes or additions to these provisions, we would be grateful if these could be shared with Anglian Water for comment.	The revised draft DCO (document reference 3.1) has clarified the relevant powers
BBC 1.1	Brentwood Borough Council		Answered via the questionnaire. Supported or strongly supported all questions. Regarding cultural heritage, stated that modern developments should not lose historical context. Stated that the Resort should be made accessible to residents from South Essex and is pleased to see proposed investment at Tilbury.	LRCH notes and welcomes this response
DBC.1.1	Dartford Borough Council	Project Description	The Council appreciates the complexity of the proposal but it is disappointing that there is a lack of clarity on proposals and assessments have not been supplied or completed.	The scheme fulfils the "parameters-led" approach across the Peninsula, accompanied by an indicative masterplan. The parameters are underpinned by a detailed assessment of the technical information on ground conditions, contamination, ecology, heritage and transportation. Workshops were provided on transport, environment and socio-economics before and during the consultaion process, and officers attended webinars. Further clarification on the emerging details is set out in the Design and Access

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				Statement (Document Reference 7.9) and the Design Code (document ref 7.2).
DBC.1.2	Dartford Borough Council	Project Description	<p>It is also disappointing that the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) was completed prior to the Scoping Response from the Planning Inspectorate and therefore has not taken this into account or the comments raised by the Local Authorities. Some of these comments are repeated below as they have not been addressed in the PEIR.</p> <p>The Council reserves the right to comment where the impacts are not clear or have not been assessed at all.</p>	DBC has been involved in discussions on the Resort since the NSIP direction in May 2014, and the launch of the 5 stages of public consultation. There has been significant input provided from DBC over a number of years, and the more recent comments in the Scoping Opinion and the statutory consultation responses have been carefully reviewed. There are no new issues raised by DBC that were not already under consideration.
DBC.1.3	Dartford Borough Council	Project Description	The lack of completeness of the environmental information in the PEIR, including baseline surveys, assessment and modelling makes it difficult for the Council to provide comprehensive comments on the proposed development; its impacts; and potential mitigation. It is also of some concern that the PEIR makes judgements and statements regarding impact without the benefit of survey work, modelling and assessment.	The 2020 PEIR reflected the information that was available at the time of consultation and was an accurate representation of information available at that time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail.
DBC.1.4	Dartford Borough Council	Project Description	It is unclear as to what Gate 2 will comprise as the description for Works No. 2 in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO), which seems to align with the area noted as Gate 2, does not include “events spaces, themed rides, entertainment venues, theatres and cinemas” as set out for Works no 1. It seems to only include retail, dining and entertainment facilities and entertainment venues, all uses which have previously been advised to be outside of a “payline”. Indeed there is no reference to any of these proposals being within a payline and no requirement in the DCO in this regard.	Clarification is provided in the draft DCO submission (document reference 3.1) to explain Gate 2. As has been explained in documentation and the webinars, the conventional approach to the delivery of a global scale entertainment resort (as shown at Disleyland Paris) is that a significant (say two-thirds) of the theme park elements are delivered at the outset and that a remaining element (Gate 2) is held back for around 5 years. This then allows a "new launch" of new rides and facilities. The content of Gate 2 will be similar to Gate 1 and be behind the "payline". The ES contains worst case assumptions on potential impacts such as visual and amenity. The principle of Gate 2 is sought at part of the DCO but the content and details will be for the approval of the local planning authority in due course.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.5	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	RISK: The proposal could become an out of town retail and leisure centre which has different impacts to a “global entertainment resort”. Potential adverse impact on town centres, Bluewater and district centres and potential to undermine mixed use proposals at Ebbsfleet Central which are likely to rely on retail and leisure uses at the core.	The impact of the London Resort on local retail and leisure, including town centres, Bluewater and district centres, as well as mixed-use proposals at Ebbsfleet Central, is considered in the Retail and Leisure Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9). This is summarised in Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7).
DBC.1.6	Dartford Borough Council	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	It is unclear how the development will impact on the delivery of Ebbsfleet Central which is identified for delivery of housing and employment within the Council’s adopted Local Plan and emerging Local Plan.	The effect of the London Resort (both in terms of land take and due to construction of the access road) on the allocated housing and employment sites is considered in Chapter 7 of the ES (document reference 6.1.7). The Resort will considerably improve the prospects for Ebbsfleet Central which has been a stalled scheme for 15 years. The millions of visitors each year who will interact with the Central area will cause significant commercial demands for hotel, new businesses, retail and dining. As a result the likelihood of a successful new "city centre" being delivered is increased significantly.
DBC.1.7	Dartford Borough Council	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	Not only is the construction work for the Resort access road likely to blight and hinder delivery of this housing and employment but the DCO and Works plan indicate that much of the area identified in the Local Plan is proposed to be used for a multi-storey car park, surface car park or alternative car park in the DCO.	See comment above regarding consideration of the effect on allocated housing and employment sites. A new masterplan is being prepared for the Central area which will emerge during 2021, alongside the consideration of the Resort. The new Central masterplan will be a different mix of uses and scale from the existing consent.
DBC.1.8	Dartford Borough Council	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	There is no assessment of these impacts within the PEIR and indeed the land use plan does not indicate this.	As above
DBC.1.9	Dartford Borough Council	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	RISK: Council cannot meet its housing and employment delivery targets, infrastructure is not delivered and development of the Ebbsfleet Garden City is undermined.	The Resort has a clear implementation strategy and phasing plan. The proposals take into account emerging housing and employment information in the adopted and importantly emerging local plans for DBC and GBC.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.10	Dartford Borough Council	Draft DCO	<p>There is no clear phasing or triggers for provision of different facilities, which is critical on a major development site of this complexity.</p> <p>For instance, requirements that the road, people mover, riverboat access, car parking be complete and available for use before Gate 1 is open to the public.</p> <p>Indeed the DCO does not set out any restrictions on how the development comes forward. At present the DCO allows any part of the development to come forward without Works No 1. E.g. the retail, dining and entertainment in Works no 2 could come forward in isolation.</p>	<p>Phasing information is contained in the draft DCO submission (document ref 3.1). This explains the extent of infrastructure needed for the delivery of the Resort.</p>
DBC.1.11	Dartford Borough Council	Draft DCO	<p>The Council considers that this is unacceptable. The references to assessments in the Environmental Statement all assume Gate 1 comes forward first but the DCO requirements are limited and phasing has not been clearly set out in any document.</p>	<p>The feedback on the draft DCO (document ref 3.1) has been reviewed in the latest iteration of the DCO, and discussions are being held with DBC and its legal advisers on these matters to provide clarification.</p>
DBC.1.12	Dartford Borough Council	Draft DCO	<p>Requirement 2 of the draft DCO, setting out a simple time limit for implementation of the proposal of 5 years is unacceptable for a development of this scale and complexity in the Council’s opinion. The time limit condition should set time limits for the implementation of each phase of the development, as would usually be the case with a major outline planning permission. This is necessary, in order to ensure that the development is not implemented by a small “Works package” and then remains an extant permission for many years but without any work coming forward, thus blighting the area.</p>	<p>The feedback on the draft DCO (document ref 3.1) has been reviewed in the latest iteration of the DCO, and discussions are being held with DBC and its legal advisers on these matters to provide clarification.</p>
DBC.1.13	Dartford Borough Council	Draft DCO	<p>RISK: The entertainment attraction will not be delivered in full or as suggested. The development could be implemented and then cease and yet the permission would be extant. A number of risks ensue, for example an-out-of-town retail/leisure complex being developed in isolation, resulting in competition to existing centres, or development of the staff housing in isolation. The large area covered by the Consent could become blighted, unmanaged and undeveloped for a number of years</p>	<p>The feedback on the draft DCO (document ref 3.1) has been reviewed in the latest iteration of the DCO, and discussions are being held with DBC and its legal advisers on these matters to provide clarification.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.14	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	<p>Over the years of gestation of this project, technical consultees and the Council have warned that the development has been “fixed” without the assessments being completed and without meaningful discussions with consultees feeding into the option choices. The concerns raised previously that there would be no ability to influence the design in order to reduce impacts now appears to be borne out. Although it is noted that the proposals provide very little detail on land uses and detailed design and this is still to be developed. However, the Council is concerned that the DCO also contains little ability for the local planning authorities to approve detailed design for many of the proposals. Requirement 4 of the DCO only allows for detailed design of Works 1 and 2 to be agreed.</p>	<p>The parameters approach seeks approval for the principles of many parts of the Resort. The details of buildings, public realm and infrastructure will be subject to approvals. The feedback on the draft DCO (document ref 3.1) has been reviewed in the latest iteration of the DCO, and discussions are being held with DBC and its legal advisers on these matters to provide clarification.</p>
DBC.1.15	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	<p>This omits a number of significant work packages. For instance Works nos 14b and 14d are directly adjacent to residential uses (albeit at a different level). The services and infrastructure buildings covered by these Works numbers is very broad and could have a significant impact on adjacent properties. The Parameters plans consist of height plans showing heights above AOD but as plans of existing levels do not appear to have been provided it is difficult for the Council to consider the impact on adjacent uses and the appearance of the area, particularly given the varied topography in the area.</p>	<p>The Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1) and the Landscape and Visual effects Chapter of the ES, Chapter 11 (document ref 6.1.11) address these points.</p>
DBC.1.16	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	<p>There are significant issues within the Kent project site that require detailed design to ensure adequate mitigation, for instance the road design across the Bakers Pit SSSI, the Scheduled Monument and Northfleet landfill. As well as how the road will integrate with Ebbsfleet International Station and the proposed development in the area. Yet there appear to be less detailed plans of the proposed Resort road and junction arrangements than submitted in 2015.</p>	<p>The people mover route over the SSSI and landfill has been designed to minimise impact on both. The road will sit on shallow lightweight fill embankment on the boundary of the SSSI and landfill. This form of construction means the road could be relocated if required in the future.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.17	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	RISK: Detrimental impact on neighbouring residents and character and appearance of the area as well as prejudicing future development and protected heritage assets.	The effects upon receptors is summarised within ES Chapter 11 (Document Reference 6.1.11) with full detail of assessment at construction contained within Appendix 11.2 (Document Reference 6.2.11.2) and operation within Appendix 11.3 (Document Reference 6.2.11.3)
DBC.1.18	Dartford Borough Council		The Council has some concerns about the reality of the construction programme and the delivery of appropriate mitigation - for example: habitat creation and archaeological evaluation - prior to work starting on the site.	The DCO includes a Construction Method Statement (document ref 6.2.3.1) and an ecological mitigation strategy (document ref 6.2.12.3) which explain these matters.
DBC.1.19	Dartford Borough Council		PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION REPORT (PEIR) The Council acknowledges that the PEIR is a preliminary report on the environmental information but given the absence of much of the baseline surveys, assessments and modelling, it does not contain sufficient depth of information on which the Council can confidently make any judgement with regard to the detailed design and mitigation of the proposal.	The DCO includes a Design Code (document ref 7.2) which provides the principles and approach to each element of the site, and DBC will be welcome to review this. The local planning authority will be responsible for dealing with the details.
DBC.1.20	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	Chapter 7: Land use and Socio-economic effects The Council would request that full consideration is given to the character, nature and use of the associated development, as these will have different socio-economic impacts to the venue itself, particularly the 'conferention centre', e-sports arena, and other venues.	The DCO includes a Design Code (document ref 7.2) which provides the principles and approach to each element of the site, and DBC will be welcome to review this. The local planning authority will be responsible for dealing with the details.
DBC.1.21	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The Council is disappointed that although this chapter seems to cover a lot of information the PEIR however provides no real analysis and there is a reliance on documents for key data where the authors already accept they need updating. Some of the documents referred to are older documents whilst other times using the updated version of the same doc e.g. KCC GIF. Documents relied on include those that have been superseded post 2015 e.g. Gravesham BC has a more recent retail study, or are so out of date that they not credible, such as the Thurrock 5 year housing supply referred to which is more than 5yrs+ out of date.	Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) provides much more detail on many parts of the analysis. The comment regarding out of date documents was noted and, during pre-application consultation, the most recent information was acquired and is included in Chapter 7 of the ES. Examples where Chapter 7 has updated information sources include: Retail studies (the Applicant engaged with GBC to get the more up to date retail study - North Kent SHENA, retail and commercial leisure assessment, GVA 2016), Hotel data (Visit Kent provided more up to date information) and housing data (Thurrock provided the latest 5 year housing supply figures). More detail is provided and analysis undertaken in many areas including: consideration of availability and affordability of accommodation stock, new analysis of growth in the home rental market (acknowledged by Visit Kent to be an emerging area for which estimates are currently very difficult), impacts upon the housing market through a variety of

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				mechanisms, estimates of retail and leisure spending and associated impacts, displacement of businesses and estimates of bad neighbour uses, estimates of peak construction workforces on cumulative schemes, detailed estimates of job distribution.
DBC.1.22	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	It is not clear from the PEIR how the development construction will impact on other development coming forward at the same time. There is no analysis of what other larger scale construction will be happening at the same time, as noted above the proposal is likely to directly impact on the ability of Ebbsfleet Central to be built out and there is no consideration given to the level of demand for construction jobs by competing infrastructure, commercial and housing delivery. This has the potential to delay critical infrastructure and employment floorspaces and could raise construction costs of development sites, which is particularly critical with regard to housing costs for local people and the ability of sites to provide affordable housing and s106 contributions.	The cumulative effects of other construction activity is considered in the assessment of construction employment generation in Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7). This effect considers whether the increase in employment could put additional pressure on the labour market and increase construction and supply chain costs.
DBC.1.23	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	RISK: The objectives and policies of the Local Plan cannot be delivered.	See above comments which detail how consideration has been given to the factors raised as concerns. It should also be noted that a key objective of the Local Plan is the delivery of new job opportunities. This is also considered within Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7). The London Resort would support 16,075 jobs over and above what is currently supported on site by 2038. This represents an 8% increase compared to 2038 future baseline levels of employment in the Core Study Area (Dartford, Gravesham and Thurrock).
DBC.1.24	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The Council notes that a retail and leisure assessment is to be produced and would welcome involvement in the detailed scope of this. There is limited detail within the PEIR with regard to this. Impact on the local town centres, in terms of both leisure and retail, should be addressed. Theatres and social facilities, within the proposed development which are open to the wider public should be considered with regard to impact on local theatres. Both	The unique nature of the content of a global entertainment resort is such that it will not compete with the local centres but add additional provision of retail (themed) and food and drinks (themed) which adds to the offer in the area. The DBC local plan and emerging local plan information is taken into

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>Dartford and Gravesend have local theatres that could Dartford Borough Council be impacted by the proposed theatres within the Gate 1 area and the non-gated 'conferention' centre, and there are further regional theatres in the wider area. The proposal, if successful, is also likely to create demand for new retail and food and drink uses (as well as hotels) seeking to locate close to the site but not forming part of the development itself. The consequences of the proposal in terms of stimulating these types of uses close to the development should also therefore be taken into consideration but does not seem to have been considered in the PEIR. The impact of the proposal on the town centres and planned new retail and leisure floorspace, such as at Ebbsfleet Central and consented extensions to Bluewater Regional Shopping Centre needs to be assessed and the impacts need to be identified clearly. The Council is also concerned about the land use changes in the local area: the impact on local shopping centres such as Swanscombe; and consequent changes on the nature of the offer in the local shopping centres to a visitor-orientated offer, with a loss of their continued ability to serve local needs. Mitigation proposals should be included and the impacts with and without mitigation assessed.</p>	<p>consideration in Appendix 7.9 Retail and Leisure Impact Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9).</p>
DBC.1.25	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	<p>RISK: Lack of understanding and appropriate mitigation of the retail and leisure impacts could lead to undermining of town centres and Bluewater and the communities they support, as well as diversion of investment from the emerging Ebbsfleet Central proposals</p>	<p>As above</p>
DBC.1.26	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	<p>The Council would like to understand the impacts with regard to displacement of employment uses on the proposed site, particularly as these are predominantly "bad neighbour uses". Where is it anticipated that they will go? Will the services they provide still be available to the local communities? What is the consequence of the loss of these local businesses for the local communities, in terms of both employment, the services they provide, as well as impact on the businesses themselves? The PEIR although identifying this as an issue does not consider the types of uses and simply advises that employment land has been identified in the Local Plan. There is no acknowledgement that this identified employment land is there to be the needs of the existing and growing population in Dartford. In addition, the identified sites referred to in the PEIR are not offering land for the warehousing, waste transfer stations and heavy industrial uses located within the project site. The Borough already has significant pressure and impacts from development in the Green Belt where commercial uses, such as those to be displaced from the site, seek cheap accommodation.</p>	<p>Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.4) provides more detail with regard to the displacement of existing uses on site. It considers the loss of employment, the impact on the businesses themselves, and the impact of the loss of services for the residents. It estimates the extent of these businesses which are 'bad neighbour' uses and what impact that would have on local industrial capacity in the context of industrial trends.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.27	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	RISK: Businesses which serve the local population are displaced out of their existing catchment area. There is increased pressure for bad-neighbour uses on unauthorised agricultural land in the Green Belt, creating an urban fringe which result in visual harm to the landscape and undermines the purpose of the Green Belt.	<p>ES Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.4) acknowledges that there are limited alternative sites for some of the existing businesses, particularly the bad neighbour uses. It acknowledges that this could further exacerbate the wider trend of industrial displacement, forcing firms to relocate to other areas and these factors could have implications for neighbouring authorities (and their residents) where they relocate.</p> <p>It is not accepted that there will be pressure on the Green Belt which has national and local policy protection, and reviewed through the development plan process.</p>
DBC.1.28	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The Council is concerned about the lack of understanding of the local housing market and the travel to work market. There is much data provided and comparison at the national level but this does not help in the understanding of the dynamics of the local housing market. Moreover, amalgamation of the data of the three Boroughs, including Thurrock, within the Core Study Area further obscures understanding of the issues and impacts and is misleading. Thurrock is very much larger than Dartford in area and household numbers and, being on the other side of the river, is unlikely to commensurately contribute to labour force and accommodation provision, particularly at the construction phase but also in the operational phase.	The Applicant has consulted with Dartford to seek more information on the local housing market. Additional information is considered in the housing baseline of Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) to understand the local housing market and indicate what and where there are housing pressures in the CSA. Data is also disaggregated by LPA wherever possible. This chapter considers the effect of workers and visitors on the local housing market, both in terms of workers potentially moving to the area and visitors increasing demand in the area through short term lets.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

<p>DBC.1.29</p>	<p>Dartford Borough Council</p>	<p>Land use and socio-economic effects</p>	<p>Data is provided showing that Dartford is doing well in terms of meeting its Local Housing Need requirement, which is the case. However, this data does not provide an understanding of the local housing market. Much of the new housing is being taken up by people moving out of London and is not affordable to many local residents. As noted, the Private Rented Sector (PRS) in Dartford is comparatively small. The shortage of PRS locally is exacerbated by this accommodation being taken up by homeless households from London Boroughs. Despite one of the highest growth levels in the country as compared to existing population, housing pressures in Dartford are already severe. There is no capacity within the housing identified in the Local Plan to meet the needs arising from the Resort from construction workers, workers during the operational phase and visitors staying overnight. The additional demand from the proposal has potential for significant impact on the ability of local people to access new and existing housing. The conclusion of the report that the impact on homes and their residents will be minor adverse (not significant) in 2025 and moderately adverse in 2030 and 2038 (para 7.370) is not credible.</p>	<p>Following consultation with Dartford, detailed information has been provided on the affordability of housing in Dartford and inward migration which is increasing housing pressures in the borough. Chapter 7 of the ES (document reference 6.1.7) acknowledges that despite the borough meeting the housing need requirement, there are housing pressures in the area and homelessness is increasing. It is acknowledged that the housing market (both in Dartford and across the CSA) has limited scope to respond to change and, as such, the receptor sensitivity is high.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the ES concludes that the demand created by the workers and the visitors at the London Resort could have negative implications for residents, homes and visitors through the pressures placed on the housing market. It notes that this would be mitigated by a large extent through the embedded mitigation of accommodation for 2,000 staff on site and 3,550 hotel rooms by 2038, but this mitigation may not be sufficient and there would be some additional demand placed on the housing market. There is expected to be a development response to offset this impact but the assessment takes a reasonable worst case approach and assumes that this response would not be sufficient to offset all the additional demand. Under this scenario, demand is expected to exceed supply and house prices and rents would increase. This would have negative effects on residents and homes. Across the CSA, the effect is minor adverse in 2025 and increases to moderate adverse in 2030 and 2038 as the number of workers and visitors increase. It is moderate adverse, rather than major, due to the embedded mitigation and the likelihood that there will be a development response as the London Resort makes development more viable. Similarly, the effect is not adverse for all residents as some may benefit from an increase in house prices and rents. For example, it would enable them to make money through tourism opportunities, such as renting out their home or spare rooms</p>
-----------------	---------------------------------	--	--	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.30	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The use of existing data on travel to work times to existing employment within the wards covered by the proposal is simplistic and reflects the nature of the existing jobs and the long term relationship that the local communities of Swanscombe and Northfleet have had with the employment areas on Swanscombe Peninsula. The proposed leisure and entertainment attraction will provide significantly different job types and potentially impact on the character of the existing community and housing demands. The assessment of housing pressures should also include consideration of increased rental and purchase prices as a result of pressure on accommodation and changes to the type of residential accommodation in area, such as the need for increased short stay lets and the impact this demand has on the local housing availability. Displacement of local residents from the housing market due to the increased housing demand and increase in prices should be assessed. Holiday and short stay lets cannot generally be controlled outside of London where the character of the property remains a single family dwelling. The increase in these housing types is already causing harm to local residents of Dartford and the increased proliferation of such units should be considered with regard to direct impact on neighbours, and the changing character of communities should be assessed.	The assessment of local jobs in Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) acknowledges that the level of local employment cannot be estimated based on existing commuting patterns to the area, as identified here. The existing commuting patterns reflect the current labour market. The London Resort would fundamentally change the labour market, making the area a much more attractive employment location. The effect of the additional workers and visitors on the housing market, including on short-stay lets, is assessed in a separate effect on the housing market.
DBC.1.31	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	RISK: Increased pressure for short term lets in the surrounding area, which are not controlled under planning legislation. Could result in impacts on neighbouring residents, loss of community cohesion and change in the character of the area.	See above comment. The specific effect on community cohesion is considered in Chapter 8 of the ES (document ref 6.1.8).
DBC.1.32	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	RISK: Increased demand for housing arising from the proposal could mean that the Council cannot provide for local needs, housing prices will rise and local people will be displaced and/or there could be increased pressure to release Green Belt for housing development.	See above comment. These effects are considered in Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7).
DBC.1.33	Dartford Borough Council	Human Health	Although the PEIR advises that a Health Impact Assessment will be carried out and notes there could be an increase in admissions, particularly during the construction periods which are over an extended time, to Darent Valley hospital there is no detailed assessment and no suggested mitigation put forward. There seems to be no reference to discussions with the Dartford and Gravesham NHS Trust	A detailed assessment of the impact on healthcare provision (including A&E) during construction and operation is contained in Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7). This has been informed by consultation with the health teams at KCC and Thurrock, and also informed by discussions with EDC and DBC. The Applicant contacted NHS Kent and Medway CCG to offer a meeting to discuss these matters (among others). No meetings have been held with the CCG so far.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.34	Dartford Borough Council	Human Health	The references in the PEIR to new GP and surgery provision in the area are out of date and over-estimate and in addition this new provision is identified to meet the needs of the existing growth in the area. Surgeries and doctor waiting lists are already over-capacity, as identified in some of the analysis. The development will therefore create additional demand and need for further GPs, both during construction and from staff living in the area at the operational stage. There is no indication of how this additional need can be provided, whether there are sufficient GPs to take up new posts and how additional infrastructure can be funded.	The health baseline data and assessment of the effect on healthcare in Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) has been informed by consultation with local health stakeholders. The effect estimates the additional demand created by the London Resort and the likely effect on the baseline.
DBC.1.35	Dartford Borough Council	Human Health	RISK: Lack of provision of healthcare to meet the construction and operational needs, putting pressure on a healthcare service that is already over capacity in the area.	Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.7) and Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8) of the ES acknowledge that existing healthcare services are over capacity in the local area and as such assigns the receptor sensitivity as high. The effect on healthcare is assessed in this context.
DBC.1.36	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	<p>There is no assessment of the impact on locally provided Council services. Consideration of the impact on all such services and their cost to the Council should be undertaken including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental Health (covering both inspection of food outlets, public health risk assessment of the Resort in the construction and operational phase; responding to complaints from the resident population on noise issues etc.) - Parking Enforcement outside the Resort boundary; - Planning – applications for discharge of conditions, amendments to DCO, details of later phases etc.; as well consequential impacts outside of the application boundary and the need to change planning policy. - Planning Enforcement – investigation of instances where the conditions of the DCO are reported as being breached - Licensing – applications for alcohol licences - Community Safety – investigation and response to instances of public disturbance / increases in theft etc arising as a consequence of the Resort (the Council works in collaboration with the Police on such matters) - Street cleaning – additional litter on street and bins outside the Resort - Housing – additional demand for affordable housing; increased homelessness etc arising from housing pressures generated by the Resort 	Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) considers some aspects of this, including the impacts on public services and community facilities (e.g. GPs, A&E) through increased demand, and the Applicant has consulted with police and emergency services to inform this effect. It also considers the impacts on the housing market. However, the socio-economic chapter (Chapter 7 of the ES) does not assess the impact on parking enforcement, planning and planning enforcement, street cleaning and licensing. This is outside the scope of socio-economic chapters. Chapter 8 of the ES (Health) (document ref 6.1.8) also addresses some of these factors in respect of community safety and community cohesion, as well as housing. DBC has highlighted some of these matters may be considered as S106 requests.
DBC.1.37	Dartford Borough Council	Major accidents and disasters	The detailed design of the Resort is likely to give consideration to terrorist related attack and proposed mitigations to deal with this. The Council suggests this should also be considered within the Assessment, with consideration to the impacts of how heightened alerts levels would affect	The London Resort team has considerable experience operating and delivering global scale high profile facilities and these matters are treated very seriously. The Design and Access Statement (document ref 7.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			operations, queuing etc and how evacuation might impact on the local area, as well as the impacts of the security on the surrounding community.	and Security Statement (document ref 7.8) make reference.
DBC.1.38	Dartford Borough Council	Human Health	The urban areas of North Kent have a poor record of health for a variety of reasons. Obesity is a particular problem in the local area, although the PEIR notes there will be additional walking routes, it does not consider the potential for detriment from increased availability for junk food and passive entertainment. In addition, the potential for a worsening local environment, such as dominance of the car on local roads which discourages walking or cycling; increased density of development and smaller housing types discouraging further activity and reducing access to outside space. In addition the risk resulting from worsening air quality in the area (discussed below) should be considered in more detail.	Acknowledged - Chapter 8 of the ES (document ref 6.1.8) considers the health effects associated with a change in access to healthy food, a change in traffic and active travel conditions, change in air quality, and the provision of on-site accommodation.
DBC.1.39	Dartford Borough Council	Human Health	RISK: Potential for increased obesity, worsening air quality, poor environments impacting on mental health.	See comment above.
DBC.1.40	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	It is disappointing that no details have been provided of the traffic modelling and the current consultation details contain less detail than the draft proposals of 2015.	The 2015 and 2020 PEIRs reflected the information that was available at the time of consultation and followed industry standards for its presentation and content. A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken and is available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). This includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models.
DBC.1.41	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The Council notes that KCC as highways authority have provided comments on the Technical Notes submitted and referred to in the PEIR. But these comments have not been addressed.	LRCH have undertaken additional consultation with KCC to provide further responses to their comments on the Technical Notes. This included a meeting on the 07 October to discuss these comments with the Transport Assessment (document ref 9.1) providing the appropriate additional information. Further transport workshops are programmed for the new year.
DBC.1.42	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The transport chapter concentrates on visitors to the amusement park element of the attraction with no discussion about the nature of the non-gated uses, such as the 'conferention' centre, which will be likely to generate peak vehicle trips.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) covers a range of factors, including the attractions people are visiting – for example Gate 1, or the Water Park, or the entertainment facilities – and how this influences arrival and departure times, and the likely

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				number staying in our hotels, and thus not impacting the transport network.
DBC.1.43	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The proposed Access Strategy is far too simplistic in the Council's view for a proposal of this complexity and variety of trip generators. It concentrates on the main vehicular access, which the Council recognises as a key consideration with a number of constraints. However, there is no discussion about pedestrian and cycle access from the existing road network or how the "local access" may be controlled.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) provides details on the walking and cycling connections proposed as part of The London Resort. The Active Travel strategy identifies any additional improvements required to provide a cohesive network
DBC.1.44	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	There is very little detail provided on access points to the site particularly during the construction stage, but also during the operational phases at a local level and for non-visitor traffic or non-motorised modes. For instance the Works Plans show landscaping and pedestrian walks to London Road (Works no25a) but it is not clear if this is to link with London Road or uses a tunnel under the road to access the staff accommodation area. The location of these access points for pedestrians, although welcome, can create impacts such as drop off and collection by car. In addition the footways along London Road are narrow and there appear to be no proposals for works to London Road itself.	It is expected that approximately 80% of construction materials will arrive via the River and the Port of Tilbury consolidation centre, reducing the impacts on on the local highway network. As part of the TA, we have assessed 75%, with 25% arriving via road for worst case. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) provides details on the walking and cycling connections proposed as part of The London Resort. The Active Travel strategy identifies any additional improvements required to provide a cohesive network.
DBC.1.45	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	It is not clear how staff living on site will access the Resort for work or where they will park their cars.	LRCH has developed a comprehensive, multi-modal transport strategy for visitors and staff. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has taken into consideration staff travel.
DBC.1.46	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	RISK: Impact in highway safety, free-flow of traffic and neighbouring amenity due to attraction of vehicular drop off. Plus inadequate width footways and cycleways along the connecting classified road.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) includes a full personal injury accident analysis, a full highway impact assessment, and details on the walking and cycling connections proposed as part of The London Resort. The Active Travel strategy identifies any additional improvements required to provide a cohesive network.
DBC.1.47	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	Chapter 9 seems to concentrate on the effects of transport and traffic and yet the Transport Notes issued by London Resort assume notable levels of travel by other modes. There appears to be little about: the assessment of these other modes; the impact of the proposal on existing public transport services; capacity of services and infrastructure; and whether it is realistic to assume these alternative modes are useable/accessible. There is therefore	A highway impact and public transport impact (by mode) assessment has been undertaken and strategies have been developed to mitigate against any impacts. These are available in the Transport Assessment. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) provides details on the walking and cycling connections proposed

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			no indication of consideration of the mitigation required to make them viable alternatives to the car; or of the impact on local users of use of these services by Resort visitors/employees.	as part of The London Resort. The Active Travel strategy identifies any additional improvements required to provide a cohesive network.
DBC.1.48	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	As advised by Kent County Council, as local highways authority, in addition to highway capacity it is key that a detailed review of the existing walking, cycling and public transport facilities is undertaken for key destinations such as Greenhithe, Swanscombe and Northfleet stations and surrounding cycle routes to the site. This includes both capacity and quality of routes, with improvements implemented where required.	As above
DBC.1.49	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	There is little commitment to reducing the vehicle arrival modal share. The anticipated mode share of 66% arriving by car is significantly above what the Council would expect for a modern planned development immediately adjacent to international and domestic stations and with access to river transport. This target disappointingly lacks ambition.	The anticipated mode share for cars is 55-60% in opening year (2024), reducing to 35-40% at maturity (2038). The Travel Demand Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1) sets out how LRCH intends to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes.
DBC.1.50	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The PEIR advises that the primary station will be Ebbsfleet International, which may be the case for visitors, but staff are more likely to use the North Kent Line as are more local visitors. The assessment should include the capacity of local stations on the North Kent Line to deal with visitors and staff and the capacity of the North Kent Line services. Peak arrivals and departures of visitors to the Theme Parks and associated development should be considered; existing stations and the surrounding environments, particularly on the North Kent line, may not be able to cope with these peaks. The assessment should include capacity of the station buildings, platforms, stairways, lifts and their external spaces to support peak usage; provision of facilities including ticketing and information, toilets, refreshments etc; and interchange facilities including the capacity of the bus interchanges and capacity for drop-off/s collections as well as the interface with walking and cycling routes. The assessment should consider provision for disabled access. Safety aspects of potentially large crowds within and around the station at peak times, including on platforms, stairways and outside the station co-mingling with vehicular traffic should be considered. The Council requests that rail services and infrastructure are included with the Environmental Impact Assessment.	The Public Transport Strategy details the existing provision and proposes mitigation where demand is likely to impact the networks. LRCH is in discussion with local rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy and determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort; details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information. Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe Station.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.51	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	This is particularly concerning in the light of the proposal to dismiss Swanscombe Station as an option and instead visitors will be encouraged to alight at Greenhithe Station and use either Fastrack or a shuttle bus service to the resort. The Assessment should include consideration of the use of Greenhithe Station and the impacts of this proposal, both with regards to capacity of the station forecourt and bus interchange and also the impact on the residential development (Ingress Park) that lies between Greenhithe Station and the Resort and would be affected by increased services along the Fastrack route. This should be compared with the impacts of using Swanscombe station and the mitigation requirements.	As above
DBC.1.52	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	It is noted that paragraph 9.64 acknowledges the need for infrastructure at other stations, e.g. Swanscombe, to aid movement of people but no further detail is provided. There is limited ability to carry out small-scale improvements to Swanscombe Station to make it safe for a higher level of useage than currently. The Council supports Network Rail proposals to consider a full redevelopment of the existing station.	As above
DBC.1.53	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The proposal is likely to have an impact on the existing rail infrastructure and rolling stock in terms of capacity to deal with the increased demand. The limited capacity on the existing network at peak times is likely to have an impact on the assumptions made with regard to use of the rail network by staff. There needs to be more detailed analysis of where staff will come from and what times (acknowledging that not all staff will arrive immediately before a Park opening, and that not all of the proposals relate to an amusement park with opening times.	As above
DBC.1.54	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The Council notes that paragraph 9.268 acknowledges that HS1 and the North Kent Line (NKL) are close to capacity.	As above
DBC.1.55	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	It is disappointing however, that the PEIR assessment of rail passenger capacity is limited to data for High Speed 1 from 2011. This is shortly after the Ebbsfleet station opened and the pattern of usage of this station and demand from commuters, both from the new housing in Ebbsfleet Garden City as well as commuters driving to the station from the rest of Kent has increased significantly.	An independent study on rail capacity (train and platform) is being jointly commissioned by LRCH, HS1, Network Rail and Southeastern.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.56	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	LRCH will be aware the Government is funding a study (AW2E) into options for enhancing connectivity between Abbey Wood (as the present terminus for the south east branch of Crossrail) and Ebbsfleet. The study is “mode-agnostic” and is focused particularly on the level of development uplift different options could support and how different options might be funded and financed. Extension of Crossrail itself is one of the options under consideration; and whilst LRCH’s transport strategy is designed not to be dependent upon such an intervention, it does not consider any consideration of the additional benefits and access implications of connectivity to visitor and labour markets that such an intervention could unlock.	The transport strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1) has looked at the most feasible and deliverable options in relation to the forecast demand and in order to mitigate against possible highway and public transport impacts. LRCH is liaising with Crossrail and Kennex, among others, to understand how their proposals could link to the London Resort.
DBC.1.57	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	RISK: There will be inadequate passenger capacity on NKL services and station capacity will be inadequate at peak times. This could lead to increased car usage.	The Public Transport Strategy details the existing provision and proposes mitigation where demand is likely to impact the networks. LRCH is in discussion with local rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy and determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort; details are outlined within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information. The Demand Management Strategy sets out how LRCH intends to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes.
DBC.1.58	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The Transport Notes make assumptions about active travel modes but these assumptions would need to be based on the availability of adequate infrastructure in order to be valid. However there appears to be no indication in the Scoping Report, of an assessment of this infrastructure. Actual walking and cycling routes over the mode share trip origin areas and from the public transport and car park arrival points should be assessed and mitigation put forward to demonstrate that the mode share assumptions can be achieved.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) includes a full assessment of the travel modes to the London Resort. Where required mitigation is proposed.
DBC.1.59	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The majority of the pedestrian routes referred to in Chapter 9 are leisure pedestrian routes. There is no assessment of walking routes for staff and local visitors, including users of the Thames Clipper service.	The Active Travel strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1) reviews the opportunities and recommendations for proposed walking and cycling routes and improvements.
DBC.1.60	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	There is no discussion about A226 London Road, as noted above even though part of this falls within the project boundary.	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), which includes assessment of the A226 London Road.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.61	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The assessment should identify the origins and routes of potential Fastrack users and other bus services (TfL bus routes extend into Dartford and there are longer distance buses serving Bluewater). The capacity assessment of local bus services must form part of the assessment to ensure they can meet the demand of the development and to identify where additional capacity is needed and how that will be delivered. The impact on existing users should be assessed.	LRCH is in discussion with local bus operators, including Fastrack. The existing bus connections, the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort and Public Transport Strategy more generally are discussed in detail within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
DBC.1.62	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	Reliance on Fastrack is likely to lead to the need for increased services, reducing the headway between buses. Where service levels are required to be increased, the impact on the local traffic network, junctions and noise and air quality impacts on the local environment should be assessed. In particular, the impact on local traffic of increased delay at signals, given the signal priority afforded Fastrack buses, should be assessed.	The assessment of noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development, including traffic, and proposed mitigations, are available in the noise and vibration chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.15). The assessment of emissions from the proposed development, including traffic, and proposed mitigations are available within the Air Quality chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.16).
DBC.1.63	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	In addition the assessment should include a capacity assessment of the infrastructure supporting the bus services, e.g. bus stops, bus stands, bus interchange facilities and dedicated bus routes.	These are detailed matters that are part of ongoing discussions with KCC (Fastrack). The exact details of these type of infrastructure improvements will be developed as part of the travel demand management plan (document ref 6.2.9.1). The proposed facilities at Ebbsfleet Station and with the Resort have been designed to accommodate forecast demand.
DBC.1.64	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	It appears to be proposed that the main disembarkation station on the North Kent line will be Greenhithe Station, with the Fastrack service providing the final leg of the journey, although this is not set out in the PEIR. However, the Council must highlight that the route between the station and the Resort takes the bus through the quiet residential neighbourhood of Ingress Park, where many families with young children live. This is a pedestrian-friendly residential area where through traffic is discouraged. The impact of the increased frequency of bus services on this area should be assessed, both at peak times for any assumed enhancement of the bus service, as well as peak times for resident journeys. The assessment should include impact on traffic flows through the area; impact on the local environment including noise and air quality and other disturbance; impact on pedestrian and cycle routes in the area; including any potential barrier effect of a high frequency of buses; visual impacts of buses travelling through at a high frequency; and road safety issues. Additionally, consideration should be given to the propensity for Resort visitors/employees to disembark at Ingress Park to take advantage	The demand associated with Greenhithe Station has been shared with all operators, including Fastrack. The Bus Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-V) sets out in detail the impact that this has upon the route to the London Resort from Greenhithe Station. The results indicate that the vast majority of days, no additional public transport provision is required. An alternative route has been identified that does not through Ingress Park should the impact become an issue. Even when operating the additional services, these are not considered to have a material impact upon the local area.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			of the quieter Thames Riverside/parkland environment and any consequent disturbance issues arising.	
DBC.1.65	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The Council consider that Swanscombe Station will be the main point to alight for staff and visitors and this should be assessed fully.	Ebbsfleet International is being promoted as the primary station for rail access. The Public Transport Strategy details the existing provision and proposes mitigation where demand is likely to impact the networks. LRCH is in discussion with local rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy and determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort; details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information. Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe Station.
DBC.1.66	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	RISK: The Fastrack bus services will not be available for local users and commuters which is fundamental to the Council's strategy for modal shift and underpins growth and housing delivery in the area.	Public Transport impacts are being considered as part of the Rail and Bus strategies respectively; these documents and dedicated chapter with the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) will provide a review of demand, impacts and proposed mitigation strategy where applicable. Existing Fastrack routes serve Bluewater and The London Resort. Additional demand will be assessed within the Public Transport Strategy and mitigation options (if required) discussed.
DBC.1.67	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	RISK: The quality of the residential environment at Ingress Park will be undermined/lost impacting on the character of the area and the quality of the environment and accommodation which meets an important need in the area.	See above
DBC.1.68	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	It is disappointing that there is no detail of traffic modelling.	The 2020 PEIR reflected the information that was available at the time of consultation and followed industry standards for its presentation and content. A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken and is available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). This includes assessment of the

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models.
DBC.1.69	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	More detail is required with regard to the different uses proposed within the Project site so that they can be assessed fully. More detail is also required with regard to the “local servicing route” and the potential impacts of this and mitigation to ensure that impacts are limited should be included.	The proposed uses are set out within the Project description included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). All visitor forecasts are set out by the work undertaken by LDP and PrFun, all appended to the Transport Assessment. Servicing is dealt with in detail in the Delivery and Servicing Plan appended to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AE).
DBC.1.70	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The Council would emphasise the request by KCC to carry out an assessment for a weekend peak. There is the potential for flows relating to London Resort to conflict with flows generated elsewhere, particularly in the case of the Bluewater regional shopping centre which also has significant leisure uses, and is another major generator of visitor traffic in the immediate vicinity. Bluewater results in significant flows at weekends and on a seasonal basis, including in association with special events, as well as “off peak” peaks in traffic flow such as the morning opening which may coincide with the morning peak of the leisure resort and afternoon peaks at school pick up time. The Council, as well as the Highways Authority, need to be assured that the assessment provides a worst case scenario of the impacts on local roads particularly when peak trips for Bluewater coincide with high trip levels at London Resort, such as weekends during the run up to Christmas or summer school holidays.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) includes detail assessment of the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The previous traffic modelling identified that the weekday PM peak to be the worst case period, however additional scenarios including weekends are being modelled.
DBC.1.71	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	It is not clear how construction traffic will be considered in the assessment. The commitment to the majority of construction materials travelling by River in the guide to consultation is noted but there do not seem to be commitments to this in the PEIR or suggested controls to ensure this should be included as part of the mitigation. Some construction traffic and construction workers are less likely to arrive by the River, particularly until the wharf is suitable for use, and this impact should be assessed, particularly as the new Resort access road will not be available at the early stage of construction. Detailing phasing of the construction supplied with the ES would be helpful in this regard.	The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) which sits within the Construction Method Statement (CMS) (document ref 6.2.3.1) provides the relevant details on the construction phases.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.72	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	There should be detailed assessment of the construction phasing and the impacts on the local road network as well as consideration of the cumulative impacts that might occur due to other large scale construction projects in the area at the same time, such as Lower Thames Crossing, Ebbsfleet Central and the generally high levels of development taking place in the area. There is no detail of the Construction Phase assessment.	As above
DBC.1.73	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	RISK: Severe impact on local and strategic road network during construction as materials and contractors need to access the construction sites including the Resort road which is in itself a significant piece of infrastructure.	The dedicated Resort road will be built early within the construction phasing and will serve as the haul road. 80% of construction materials will be brought in via the River. The Construction Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.1) covers this in detail.
DBC.1.74	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	It is not clear how parking will be made available to visitors. The Council understands that this will be part of the ticketing for the theme park visitors but it is unclear how parking will be made available to users of the restaurants for instance, outside of the payline? If there is a charge for this parking it will lead to pressure for parking in the local area.	The Active Travel Strategy and Public Transport Strategy, included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), seek to incentivise active or sustainable travel - particularly for local residents. The proposed walking and cycle ways within the vicinity of the Site will improve connectivity within the local area. Free parking would encourage use by private vehicle, which could have knock on effects and minimise uptake of sustainable modes. An off-site parking strategy has been written to outline the management of people parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
DBC.1.75	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	Detailed mitigation proposals with regard to control of off-site parking within the local area and around Fastrack stops, which could be impacted, should be included as part of the assessment. This may need to be addressed through parking regulation and enforcement.	As above
DBC.1.76	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	The parking survey of 2015 is out of date now.	Noted, the parking survey will be updated as part of the continued monitoring as set out within the Off-Site Parking Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-Y). Covid-19 has meant any traffic surveys at this time would not be representative.
DBC.1.77	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	RISK: Adequate on-site parking is not made available or is unattractive to visitors outside the payline. Pressure for parking on local roads.	LRCH acknowledge that car travel will be an important part of the travel choice for visitors, but that too many numbers of car parking spaces will have a negative impact on congestion. The number of spaces has been calculated using the likely mode shares to the Resort. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), alongside Demand Management Strategy, sets out how

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel. The proposed walking and cycle ways within the vicinity of the Site will improve connectivity within the local area. Free parking would encourage use by private vehicle, which could have knock on effects and minimise uptake of sustainable modes. An off-site parking strategy has been written to outline the management of people parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
DBC.1.78	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	It is not clear what mitigation is proposed as there is no assessment or indeed detail of the proposals.	This is dealt with through the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) and Off-Site Parking Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-Y).
DBC.1.79	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	Mitigation should consider the need for a methodology for measures to be introduced as remedial actions post commencement where impacts are outside acceptable limits together with the payment of penalties if the assessed vehicle levels are exceeded so that a pot of money can be created to fund the remedial actions. This methodology of potential toolkit measures to be determined in the future subject to the impacts arising has been developed for other planning permissions in the area supported by penalties for exceedances of traffic numbers above those anticipated.	As above
DBC.1.80	Dartford Borough Council	Land Transport	Assessment of the existing walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure is likely to lead to a need for mitigation and this should be considered with regard to the impact on the existing developed areas as well as planned development and the unintended consequences of such mitigation (e.g. Creation of a direct access which might encourage car parking around this connection).	A highway impact and public transport impact (by mode) assessment has been undertaken and strategies have been developed to mitigate against any impacts. These are available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Transport Assessment provides details on the walking and cycling connections proposed as part of The London Resort. The Active Travel strategy identifies any additional improvements required to provide a cohesive network.
DBC.1.81	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	Some of the “unintended consequences” of the mitigation and the Resort development itself is unlikely to be foreseeable this far ahead and as the entertainment industry will respond to changes both in fashions and impacts such as the Coronavirus pandemic.	Acknowledged. Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) has included monitoring to ensure that future changes and unintended consequences are identified and addressed.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.82	Dartford Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The Council would suggest that consideration is given to a 'local community' fund as compensation for the environmental/disturbance impacts of the development.	DBC has recently suggested such matters may be raised in S106. There is a timeline under discussion with the local planning authorities to produce a draft 106.
DBC.1.83	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	As requested in the scoping response an additional long distance view should also be considered from the higher ground to the south, from the North Downs. Many of the viewpoints in the PEIR are from low points within valleys, there are no viewpoints from the highest points on the Downs directly adjacent to the project site. The site is prominent from the Bean junction area and St Clements Way and as a major road junction and access to Bluewater shopping centre this view is seen by millions every year.	An additional long distance view has been added near Bean junction and near the Cyclopark as agreed with Sonia Bunn at DBC.
DBC.1.84	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	Since there are proposals for development directly to the east and north of Swanscombe, (e.g. infrastructure buildings) the Council consider the visual impacts of these proposals on the residents and occupants adjacent to these areas should be considered but this does not appear to have been taken into account.	The effects upon receptors is summarised within ES Chapter 11 (Document Reference 6.1.11) with full detail of assessment at construction contained within Appendix 11.2 (Document Reference 6.2.11.2) and operation within Appendix 11.3 (Document Reference 6.2.11.3)
DBC.1.85	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	Receptors in the area also include the high numbers of people who drive through the area or visit Bluewater or travel through the area on the train. Consideration should therefore be given to the impacts on these views and the perception of the Borough to visitors and people travelling through it.	The effects upon receptors is summarised within ES Chapter 11 (Document Reference 6.1.11) with full detail of assessment at construction contained within Appendix 11.2 (Document Reference 6.2.11.2) and operation within Appendix 11.3 (Document Reference 6.2.11.3)
DBC.1.86	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	The issue of lighting on the Peninsula at night is something that still needs to be considered in terms of visual impact and any proposals for mitigation.	A Lighting Strategy (Document Reference 7.9) with assessment contained in Appendix 11.2, (Document Reference 6.2.11.2) and Appendix 11.3, (Document Reference 6.2.11.3), summarised in Chapter 11 (Document Reference 6.1.11)
DBC.1.87	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	The current parameter plans provide a great deal of flexibility on what the actual scale of development is and it is important for any assessment to give a clearer idea of what is actually involved and what it might look like. Is it a solid building or a ride that appears more lightweight and as identified above the nature of the uses is very flexible. The Council considers it is difficult to make a realistic assessment without this information.	The photomontages included in Figure 11.14 (Document Reference 6.3.11.14) are based on the Proposed Parameter Plan (Document Reference 2.19), which are contained in Figure 11.14 (Document Reference 6.3.11.14) and are coloured in line with the coloured parameters in Section 4.1 of the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9). The DAS and Landscape Strategy (Appendix 11.7) illustrates the design aspirations of the Proposed Development.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.88	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	Parameter plans imply structure heights of up to 100m AOD. Most of the site in Kent is close to 0 AOD, but there is no detail of existing levels to understand these impacts. The cliffs and chalk spines could provide some screening but it appears from the maximum AODs set out that this is unlikely.	The Parameter Plans and their height references are dealt with in the Design and Access Statement (document ref 7.1)
DBC.1.89	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	The Council is not convinced therefore by the initial judgements made in the PEIR with regard to limited landscape impacts and consider that more detail should be provided with regard to the proposal and the impacts.	The final assessments are summarised within ES Chapter 11 (Document Reference 6.1.11) with the detailed effects at construction contained within Appendix 11.2 (Document Reference 6.2.11.2) and operation within Appendix 11.3 (Document Reference 6.2.11.3)
DBC.1.90	Dartford Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	RISK: Long distance views from high ground will not be assessed, the impacts of the development will not be assessed fully in terms of visual impact particularly in terms of the adjacent residents and the character and appearance of the area surrounding the core of the site and therefore adequate mitigation will not be provided.	Additional long range views have been added and agreed with consultees at DBC, NE and Kent Downs AONB.
DBC.1.91	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The KCC Ecology section provides advice to the Borough Council under a service agreement. They provide the following comments with regard to chapter 12 of the PEIR.	No response required
DBC.1.92	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	“The submitted ecological surveys in appendix 12.1 have not been reviewed in detail as at the time of writing the reports the majority of the surveys were still being undertaken.	All surveys (bar the winter hibernation surveys of the tunnels are now completed and reported in the Ecological Baseline Report (Document reference 6.2.12.1)
DBC.1.93	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	We highlight that no specific botanical survey has been carried out and we presume that the plant species were recorded during other surveys and therefore the number of rare plants within the site may be higher than recorded.	Detailed botanical surveys have been carried out on the Kent Project Site. This is discussed in the Ecological Baseline Report (Document reference 6.2.12.1)
DBC.1.94	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Records of Brown hare, hedgehog, pygmy shrew and weasel were identified during the data search but the ES states they will not be taken forward as an Important Ecological Feature. However we highlight that as no specific surveys have been carried out they may be present within the site and therefore impacted by proposed development and therefore should be considered within the submission. In addition we highlight that brown hare and hedgehog are priority species (under S41 NERC Act) and impacts to species of principal importance / BAP priority species are: “Capable of being a material consideration in the...making of planning decisions.” (paragraph 84, Government Circular (ODPM 06/2005)), Bat Surveys – it’s understood that internal examination of the buildings could not be carried out as a result of Covid 19 restrictions. But due to the size and	The potential presence of these species within the Project Site is considered within Appendix 12.1: Ecology Baseline Report (Document Reference 6.2.12.1). Their presence could not be ruled out but none were recorded during other survey work. None of these species was deemed to be an Important Ecological Feature for the purposes of identifying potentially significant effects, however the proposed mitigation and enhancement strategy (both on-site and off-site) would very likely benefit all of these mammal species. Upon completion of the external preliminary roost assessment, three buildings were considered to have

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			type of the proposed development we would have expected emergence surveys to have been scheduled to ensure it was understood if and to what extent bats were roosting within the buildings to ensure the impact on roosting bats was fully understood.	high potential for roosting bats, ten to have moderate potential and ten to have low potential within the DCO order limits. An additional 26 buildings are 'requiring further assessment' as access limitations prevented a full visual inspection. Any buildings requiring demolition will be fully assessed for its potential to support roosting bats in advance of works commencing.
DBC.1.95	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	We highlight that the species interest of the site is so high due to the range of habitats present within the site including scrub, woodland , semi improved grassland, Coastal Grazing Marsh, Open Mosaic Previously Developed Land, Reedbed and open water. We have concerns with the conclusions of the report about the classification of the importance of the species within the site and we are off the opinion that for many of the species groups the conclusions are underrated.	The valuation of the species populations has been undertaken using professional judgement, taking into account a variety of factors including local conservation status, abundance and distribution and usage of the habitats within the Project Site. A lower valuation does not alter the requirement to avoid harm and mitigate impacts on these species nor does it affect the requirement to protect biodiversity as whole.
DBC.1.96	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Duplicate - see above DBC 1.95	Duplicate - see above DBC 1.95
DBC.1.97	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	We highlight that as all the surveys have not been completed the importance classification can not be fully considered and we advise that those conclusions must only be made once the surveys have been completed.	All surveys (bar the winter hibernation surveys of the tunnels are now completed and reported in the Ecological Baseline Report (Document reference 6.2.12.1)
DBC.1.98	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Limited information has been provided on what ecological mitigation required to retain the ecological interest of the site and instead the report details that the following are the key mechanisms to implement the required mitigation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction and Environmental Management Plan • Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework Plan • Landscape and Ecological Management Plan • Green Infrastructure Strategy • Sustainable Drainage Scheme • Detailed Lighting Strategy. 	Proposed on-site mitigation measures are detailed within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3) and proposals for off-site mitigation are outlined in Appendix 12.10: General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation (Document Reference 6.2.12.10). Further details will be provided where necessary prior to commencement of development and can be secured by a DCO Requirement.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.99	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>We highlight that until all the ecological surveys have been completed and it is fully understood what is present on site it is impossible to fully understand what the impact will be, what mitigation is required and if it is achievable. We advise that this information is required prior to identifying what mechanisms could be used to implement it.</p> <p>We highlight that when we refer to impacts we refer to both direct and indirect impacts. This includes (but not limited to) habitat loss, changes to habitat management, increase in noise, increase in lighting and increase in disturbance.</p>	A full assessment supported by the completed surveys and detailed mitigation strategies is now contained within the ES Chapter 12 (document reference 6.1.12).
DBC.1.100	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>The proposed development will result in the direct loss of habitat for the implementation of the proposed development and the remaining areas will be required to be multi-functional and provide Open Space for recreation and SuDS in addition to the ecological mitigation. Due to the loss of habitat, impacts from the proposed development (including noise and lighting) and the other requirements on the retained habitat (in particular recreation) we are concerned that, due to the ecological interest of the site, there will be a limit to the amount of ecological mitigation which can be implemented successfully on site and there will be a significant loss of biodiversity within the site.</p>	<p>The ES acknowledges that off-site land/biodiversity offsetting will be required to fully address all negative impacts on ecological features. Whilst the final details of the off-site mitigation land and associated biodiversity offsetting schemes are not yet available, a number of guiding principles regarding the nature, scale and location of such offsets have now been clearly set out within Appendix 12.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.2) and within Appendix 12.10: General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation (Document Reference 6.2.12.10). These provide a greater level of certainty that relevant effects on important ecological features can be avoided or mitigated, and that a net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.</p>
DBC.1.101	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>We understand that due to the limited amount of space within development sites that open spaces do have to be multifunctional. However in these situations we would fully expect information to be submitted clearly demonstrating what the constraints on site would be and those requirements would not negatively impact the ecological mitigation.</p>	<p>The ecological mitigation strategies detailed within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3) have been prepared in parallel with the Landscape Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.7) and take account of the multifunctionality of the open spaces.</p>
DBC.1.102	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>The Swanscombe peninsula currently has limited recreational access so the site is largely undisturbed. The creation of walking trails within the site would encourage people to use the site and therefore result in an increase in disturbance within site and as such it may result in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in breeding bird species/numbers due to an increase in noise / light • Reduction in bat species/numbers due to increase in light (lighting may be required within the open space area due to H+S) • Loss of habitat due to increase in trampling 	<p>An access strategy is proposed as detailed in the Landscape Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.7) and EMMF (Document Reference 6.2.12.3) which proposes managed accessibility, improving access and facilities on some routes whilst limiting access to other parts of the Peninsula to limit disturbance. Bird hides are also proposed to minimise disturbance.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.103	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Therefore we would fully expect any submitted information to fully assess the impact the proposal would have from an increase in recreational pressure.	As above
DBC.1.104	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	We highlight that the pressure from recreation would result from the proposed development and existing and proposed housing within the surrounding area.	As above
DBC.1.105	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Surface Water Drainage Features are required to prevent surface water flooding and therefore any SuDS Features will have to be managed in a way that means that they will remain operational. We agree that SuDS features can benefit biodiversity but there will be restrictions on the types of habitats that can establish within these areas and the management priority will be for surface water drainage not biodiversity. Therefore there will be limits on the mitigation which can be incorporated in to the SuDS scheme.	The ecological and landscape strategies have been prepared in parallel with the surface water drainage strategy to ensure that the assumed biodiversity benefits of any SuDS are realistic and achievable. The final assessment of impacts upon Botany Marshes LWS has been informed by the baseline information and proposed mitigation set out in within Chapter 17 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.
DBC.1.106	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	We highlight that due to the proposed recreational usage of the site there may be requirements to avoid deep water bodies within the site for H+S reasons and therefore it may not be possible to retain existing habitat types or species present within the site.	The ecological and landscape strategies have been prepared in parallel with the surface water drainage strategy to ensure that the assumed biodiversity benefits of any SuDS are realistic and achievable. The final assessment of impacts upon Botany Marshes LWS has been informed by the baseline information and proposed mitigation set out in within Chapter 17 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.
DBC.1.107	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The report has detailed that there will be a direct impact on Botany Marshes LWS designated sites due to alteration of hydrological regime through destruction of adjoining wetland but advised that the proposed mitigation is certain subject to design and implementation of suitable drainage and hydrological strategy. We highlight that the implementation of appropriate mitigation is not certain until it has been clearly demonstrated that an appropriate drainage and hydrological strategy can be implemented – we would suggest that until that point the proposed mitigation is uncertain at best.	The ecological and landscape strategies have been prepared in parallel with the surface water drainage strategy to ensure that the assumed biodiversity benefits of any SuDS are realistic and achievable. The final assessment of impacts upon Botany Marshes LWS has been informed by the baseline information and proposed mitigation set out in within Chapter 17 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.
DBC.1.108	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	We highlight that there is a need for any future submissions to clearly demonstrate that they have worked collaboratively with other specialists to ensure it is fully understood what the direct and indirect impacts from the proposal is and if the mitigation is achievable.	The ecological consultants have liaised extensively with the transport, noise, air quality, lighting, water, landscape and ground conditions specialists to inform the assessments in Chapter 12 (document reference

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				6.1.12) and Chapter 13 (document reference 6.1.13) of the ES.
DBC.1.109	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The submitted information has highlighted that due to the use of the site by wintering birds the proposed development will have a negative impact on South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI, Inner Thames Marshes SSSI , Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar/ SSSI and Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar and the mitigation is uncertain due to the requirement of off site mitigation. We highlight to fully understand the if the impact can be mitigated details of an off site mitigation area must be provided and it must be demonstrate that the mitigation is achievable and it can provide suitable habitat in perpetuity. We highlight that as the proposal will result in likely significant effect on the designated sites there will be a need for any further information submitted to enable the determining authority undertake an Appropriate Assessment.	The need for a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) is acknowledged and information to assist the competent authority in making such an assessment is provided in Appendix 12.4: Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.4).
DBC.1.110	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The submitted information has highlighted that there will be a need for off site species mitigation and we would expect information to be submitted demonstrating that suitable mitigation areas can be created within Kent and ideally the immediate surrounding area. We highlight that due to the size of any off site mitigation areas and the habitat creation requirements it may not be possible for the proposed designated sites and the species mitigation to be located within the same area. It must be clearly demonstrated that the mitigation can be implemented and retained in perpetuity.	General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation are provided within Appendix 12.10 (Document Reference 6.2.12.10), which include providing off-site land within the Greater Thames Nature Improvement Area.
DBC.1.111	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	We highlight that we expect ecological surveys to have been carried out on the proposed off site mitigation areas. This will enable consideration of whether the proposed off site mitigation is appropriate and any requirements for habitat creation would not negatively impact any species currently present within the site.	A number of land holdings are being considered for delivery of off-site mitigation. Potentially suitable land will be subject to an initial Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey followed by an assessment of the potential impacts of any proposals for habitat creation/ enhancement on the existing habitats and species of conservation value. The impact assessment, and design of ecological mitigation measures will be informed by detailed 'Phase 2' ecological surveys as considered necessary following completion of the initial Phase 1 survey. Whilst the final details of the off-site mitigation land and associated biodiversity offsetting schemes are not yet available, a number of guiding principles regarding the nature, scale and location of such offsets

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				have now been clearly set out within Appendix 12.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.2) and within Appendix 12.10: General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation (Document Reference 6.2.12.10). These provide a greater level of certainty that relevant effects on important ecological features can be avoided or mitigated, and that a net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.
DBC.1.112	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The submitted information has detailed that the applicant is proposing to implement Net Gain and detailed that the proposed development will result in a loss of 355 units however the Net Gain information has been submitted as a PDF rather than a excel Metric and therefore there it is difficult to interrogate the data to consider if we agree with the conclusions. To enable full consideration of this matter we would expect a excel Net Gain Metric and corresponding maps showing the locations of the habitats detailed within the metric. We highlight that the loss of habitat (in Net Gain terms) may be higher than 15%. In situations where Net Gain is proposed we would expect information to be submitted demonstrating that it can be implemented and retained in perpetuity.”	This information is provided in Appendix 12.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.2).
DBC.1.113	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	RISK: There is a significant risk at present that the proposal will not be assessed fully with regard to ecology and biodiversity and will result in significant harm to the bio-diversity of the sites.	A full ecological impact assessment has been completed as described in Chapter 12 including a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.2).
DBC.1.114	Dartford Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The Council would also raise the issue that it will seek a s106 agreement with regard to the management of the Green Zones to ensure that they are retained as such in perpetuity to ensure there is no “permitted development associated with the “amusement park” as suggested in the DCO and that the sites aren’t subsequently used for expansion of the “theme park” through themed nature trails. These Green Zones should be managed such that they remain open and are not behind a payline	There is no intention to include the areas outside the Leisure Core for commercial purposes as detailed in the Landscape Strategy ((Document Reference 6.2.11.7) and EMMF (Document Reference 6.2.12.3).
DBC.1.115	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Kent County Council Heritage Conservation, who are the Council’s advisors with regard to archaeology, have provided the following to the Council. Listed Buildings are matters dealt with by the Council.	This is noted
DBC.1.116	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	“Chapter 14 of the PEIR covers Cultural heritage and archaeology and correctly notes that nationally and internationally important archaeological remains are known to be present within the Kent part of the site; these include the designated sites of Palaeolithic Bakers Hole SSSI and scheduled monument, Neolithic remains along the Ebbsfleet valley and Roman remains around Springhead Roman town and religious focus. In addition, nationally important undesignated archaeological assets are known or expected to be	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			present within the site and under the NPPF (para 194 footnote 63) should be treated as though they are designated.	
DBC.1.117	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Chapter 14 is supported by a draft Archaeological Desk based assessment 2015, a draft Archaeological deposit model and characterisation 2015, a Historic Landscape assessment 2015, a fluxgate gradiometer survey 2016, an Earth resistance and EI survey 2017 and a Palaeolithic Desk-based assessment 2017. As stated in the draft Desk based assessment and the draft deposit model and characterisation, both of these reports will need to be updated to take account of the later reports noted above and the updated Historic Environment Record search which was obtained in 2020. As up to date reports have not been shared as part of the statutory consultation, draft updated reports should be sent to statutory consultees and local authorities for comment prior to DCO submission.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.118	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The updated Archaeological desk-based assessment should also include a detailed historic map regression (see KCC standard specification current version), a specialist assessment of industrial archaeology (including the cement industry, Bell Wharf and the super pylon), which seems to have been underestimated in the reports so far, and a detailed archaeological impact assessment, which should include temporary construction impacts and landscape and biodiversity mitigation alongside the development proposals.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14). Biodiversity mitigation is addressed in Appendix 12 - Ecological Management and Mitigation Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3)
DBC.1.119	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	In addition, archaeological field evaluation will be required in several areas of the site prior to submission of the DCO. In particular, the areas which require evaluation to be undertaken and reported on before submission of the DCO include Bakers Hole SSSI, Scheduled Monument and adjacent non-designated archaeological remains (transit route, people mover, interchange area); non-designated archaeological remains in the area of Springhead Roman town and religious focus; designated and non-designated archaeological remains of earlier prehistoric date along the flood plain and adjacent areas of the river Ebbsfleet; and borehole assessment of alluvial areas relating to the river Thames. Natural England and Historic England are the main advisers in relation to the designated sites but important archaeological remains are known to be present outside the designated areas so KCC Heritage Conservation would wish to agree the Written Schemes of Investigation for the evaluation work prior to it being undertaken	This is noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			and the draft reports prior to DCO submission. The work should be carried out according to KCC standard specifications.	
DBC.1.120	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Information in the PEIR is unclear about the proposed location of the people mover – the illustrative masterplan seems to show Option 1 of the routes considered in the Palaeolithic DBA, whereas Masterplan fig 4.2e (described in 4.27 as the current proposal) seems to show option 3 of the routes assessed in the Palaeolithic DBA and paragraph 4.45 states: ‘The solution now proposed involves a people mover route comprising a lightweight road laid on the surface of Baker’s Hole, with minimal ground penetration to avoid disturbance to the geological and Palaeolithic features that justify the protection of the site. From the proposed travel interchange the route would cross the designated area and then follow a course along the eastern edge of Baker’s Hole. To facilitate its future removal or realignment, the people mover route would not be adopted as public highway.’	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)
DBC.1.121	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Option 2 of the people mover routes causes least harm to cultural heritage (see Palaeolithic DBA) – this route should therefore be chosen or a full explanation provided within chapter 4 of why it has not and clarity as to which of the other routes is proposed. As noted above archaeological field evaluation should be undertaken prior to submission of the DCO.	This is noted and further addressed in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)
DBC.1.122	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	In addition, all of the proposed routes for the people mover, transit route and interchange will have an impact on non-designated archaeological remains of expected national importance; field evaluation is required prior to submission of the DCO, as noted above.	This is noted
DBC.1.123	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	I welcome the intention noted in Chapter 14 to produce a Historic Environment Framework and strategy for submission with the DCO; a draft documents should be sent to local authorities and statutory consultees for comment prior to submission of the DCO. The document should include agreements for management and enhancement of heritage assets within LR land ownership which will include Bakers Hole SSSI, SM and adjacent archaeological remains.	This is noted
DBC.1.124	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	I also welcome the statement in 14.215 that ‘Opportunities will be sought to mitigate effects on the historic environment through improving public understanding and engagement with, and protection of, the historic environment. The nature of the use, display and interpretation of the archaeological and built heritage evidence is currently under discussion and will be more fully addressed in the ES and supporting appendices but options include: ...’. Again, draft proposals should sent to local authorities and statutory consultees for comment prior to submission of the DCO. There are opportunities to improve the condition, management, display, and	This is noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			interpretation of the important archaeological remains within and adjacent to the site – this should be explained in detail in the DCO following further discussion local authorities and statutory consultees, and developer contributions should be agreed to allow these ambitions to be achieved. Understanding of the historic environment of the area will help in understanding the context of the development and through careful design can help develop a sense of place and sense of identity of the development within the local area.	
DBC.1.125	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Detailed comments Temporary rights and access to land – mapping of designated and non-designated heritage assets needs to be undertaken and safeguards put in place to ensure damage is not inadvertently caused.	This is noted
DBC.1.126	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	4.46 – the Bakers Hole SSSI should also be considered in the Cultural Heritage section in terms of its Palaeolithic archaeology and the need to consider geological evidence to understand Palaeolithic archaeology	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.127	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The Kent project site 5.23 onwards should include description of cultural heritage	This is noted
DBC.1.128	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	5.32 Welcome recognition of 1965 ‘super pylon’ as a local landmark but it also needs to be considered as an industrial heritage asset, in terms of views and setting etc.	This is noted
DBC.1.129	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	5.45 Land remediation proposals and 5.57 landscaping should be assessed for archaeological impacts.	This is noted
DBC.1.130	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	5.63 people mover and transit interchange and 5.68 access route - impacts on archaeological remains should be noted.	This is noted
DBC.1.131	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	5.75 river transport – heritage assessment of proposals at Bell Wharf is needed and appropriate mitigation.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.132	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	5.76 flood defence and 5.77 habitat improvement – archaeological impact assessment and appropriate mitigation is needed.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.133	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	5.66 construction activities – need for archaeological investigations has been noted but there is also a need for archaeological evaluation, impact assessment and mitigation through design first.	This is noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.134	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Written schemes of investigation and Construction practice codes should also be agreed before consent is granted.	This is noted
DBC.1.135	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Transport Management Plan need to take full account of archaeological impact assessment and mitigation requirements.	This is noted
DBC.1.136	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Ch 6 Scope of EIA and methodology Table 6.1 should be amended to include non-World Heritage Site internationally important heritage assets – the latter is based on political decisions not significance thresholds. Expert professional judgement should be used. Table 6.1 should also be amended for all levels of sensitivity to include non-designated heritage assets as possible sensitive sites, see NPPF para 194 footnote 63. Again professional judgement should be used.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.137	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	9.390 Mitigation measures should be agree with LPAs and statutory consultees before submission of the DCO.	This is noted
DBC.1.138	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Ch 10 As noted above the impact on heritage assets at Bell Wharf needs to be assessed including from dredging.	This is noted
DBC.1.139	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Ch 11 Landscape and visual effects – Landscape Strategy document including planting proposals should take account of heritage assets.	This is noted and addressed in ES Appendix 11.7 Landscape Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.7)
DBC.1.140	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The landscape character assessment should take account of historic landscape character which at the moment it does not seem to include.	This is noted and addressed in ES Appendix 11.1 Landscape and Visual Baseline Report (Document Reference 6.2.11.2 and ES Appendix 11.7 Landscape Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.7)
DBC.1.141	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The site is referred to as brownfield or having previous industrial use but the industrial heritage character needs to be assessed further.	This is noted
DBC.1.142	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Table 11.4 should include Springhead Roman town, St Botolph's Church, All Saints Church, Northfleet historic town, and Swanscombe peninsula super pylon.	This is noted
DBC.1.143	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Chapter 14, the draft Archaeological desk-based assessment and the draft deposit model etc will need to be updated as noted above and stated in 14.3. The potential for survival of important industrial heritage remains should be considered in more detail rather than just assuming that recent industrial use will mean their wholesale removal. Further assessment by an appropriately qualified specialist will be required. Draft reports should be provided prior to submission of the DCO.	This is noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.144	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	It is disappointing that archaeological field evaluation has not yet been completed and reported on. Draft reports should be provided prior to submission of the DCO.	This is noted
DBC.1.145	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	14.57 – KCC standard specifications for archaeological work (copies attached to the email) should be added to the relevant guidance section.	This is noted
DBC.1.146	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Palaeolithic desk-based assessment - more detailed assessment of impacts including sections, at the southern end of the people mover, transport access and transit interchange is required.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.147	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	See also general comments re cultural heritage above.	This is noted
DBC.1.148	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	It is not possible to comment on most of Chapter 14 until the baseline assessment has been updated and the field evaluations carried out. In the absence of up to date information in the statutory consultation, a draft of Chapter 14 should be provided to the local authorities and statutory consultees for comment before it is finalised.	This is noted
DBC.1.149	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Ch 18 The impact of the proposals on the geological significance of Bakers Hole SSSI does not seem to have been assessed in this chapter or elsewhere in the PEIR. When it is assessed should be aware that geological character and value contributes to Palaeolithic significance also.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.150	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Fig 5.4 Land use plan - the whole of Bakers Hole SSSI/SM and adjacent nationally important non-designated Palaeolithic archaeology is shown as resort access – this introduces too much flexibility and uncertainty into the proposals and should be amended to show the agreed route.	This is noted
DBC.1.151	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Fig 9.5 – should include other important heritage assets.	This is noted
DBC.1.152	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Fig 11.2 should include nationally important non-designated archaeological assets.	This is noted
DBC.1.153	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Fig 14.1 and 14.3 Swanscombe skull SSSI and NNR should be included on plan of Kent heritage assets.	This is noted
DBC.1.154	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Figs 14.3 to .7 need to be updated.”	This is noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.155	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	KCC Heritage Conservation have also supplied to the Council standard specifications for evaluation and investigation stage documents which they require to be submitted as it is understood that it is useful to supply such documents at the DCO stage.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.156	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The Council notes that the Historic Environment Framework and Strategy for submission with the DCO referred to above does not appear to have been included in the Draft DCO.	The Heritage Strategy will be captured either within an updated draft DCO or as part of the S106.
DBC.1.157	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	It appears from these comments that a significant amount of work, assessment and detailed design needs to be completed in order for the impacts on cultural heritage and archaeology to be understood and mitigated.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.158	Dartford Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	RISK: The cultural heritage and archaeology in the area may be lost without adequate investigation and interpretation.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
DBC.1.159	Dartford Borough Council	Noise and vibration	The Council notes that there is a commitment to discuss the methodology of the assessment and the noise receptors with the Council's Environmental Health advisors and welcomes this. However, there has been no discussion yet with regard to this methodology and the Council is concerned about the limited time that now may be available to discuss and agree such detail.	The Noise and Vibration Assessment was discussed with DBC on the 23rd October 2020 and the receptors for the assessment were presented to DBC. Further information about noise and vibration is included in Chapter 15 of the ES. (document ref 6.1.15)
DBC.1.160	Dartford Borough Council	Noise and vibration	The assessment should include consideration of the impacts from the evening uses and venues proposed, as well as impacts away from the Resort at transport interchanges and other locations where visitors/ employees/construction workers may gather. There is little mention of the evaluation of associated development such as hotels/convention centre.	The Noise and Vibration Assessment (document ref 6.2.15.4) includes consideration of noise from outdoor events and gatherings of people such as those connected with the Conference Centre. Further information about noise and vibration is included in Chapter 15 of the ES. (document ref 6.1.15)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.161	Dartford Borough Council	Noise and vibration	The Council notes that a floating pontoon is proposed to serve Thames Clipper, which will extend from Bells Wharf towards Ingress Park (a waterfront residential development). As noise cannot be attenuated well over water this should be assessed in detail with regard to the impact on the adjacent existing dwellings as well as the new residential development (with a resolution to grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement) which will extend over the foreshore on a pier structure	The Noise and Vibration Assessment (document ref 6.2.15.4) includes modelling of the noise from vessels using the floating pontoon. This noise is assessed for both northern and southern banks of the river. Further information about noise and vibration is included in Chapter 15 of the ES. (document ref 6.1.15)
DBC.1.162	Dartford Borough Council	Noise and vibration	There is no assessment of residential receptors near infrastructure buildings, particularly those buildings proposed to the rear of Swanscombe High Street.	The London Resort infrastructure compounds are assessed in the ES and given plant noise breakout limits. In line with BS 4142:2014+A12019, the aim is to attain a noise level 10dB below the existing background noise environment at NSRs. Further information about noise and vibration is included in Chapter 15 of the ES. (document ref 6.1.15)
DBC.1.163	Dartford Borough Council	Noise and vibration	RISK: Inadequate assessment of noise potential could result in inadequate mitigation	The noise and vibration assessment is presented within Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15) and details the mitigation required for the proposed development.
DBC.1.164	Dartford Borough Council	Air quality	General comments on the proposed methodology The proposed assessment methodology is generally accepted. However the Council notes that the report states that the traffic modelling will be used to identify the full study area used for the air quality assessment. One of the Council's main concerns is the impact that the development will have on the local road network. Whilst the majority of vehicles accessing the site are likely to use the Strategic Road Network(SRN) there may be a large number of vehicles that are displaced from the SRN on to the local road network as a result of increased congestion. This scenario should be included within the modelling. The impacts of additional bus services, their direct contribution to air pollution, as well the air quality consequences of increased congestion on the local road network should also be considered.	The impact of additional road traffic generated by the proposed development has been considered in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).
DBC.1.165	Dartford Borough Council	Air quality	Given the potential for wider impacts arising from the development, the other Air Quality Management Areas in the Borough should also be considered, not only the AQMA immediately adjacent to the site along the A226 and that at Bean junction.	Nearby AQMA's are presented in the baseline section of Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).
DBC.1.166	Dartford Borough Council	Air quality	It is suggested that in order to ensure the final assessment meets the Council's normal requirements that the detail of the proposed assessment is discussed further with the Council's Environmental Health advisors and agreed before the modelling work is carried out.	The assessment methodology was consulted upon during the Section 42 statutory consultation period in 2020.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.167	Dartford Borough Council	Air quality	Potential mitigation put forward to reduce air quality should be included and assessed within the EIA.	The Air Quality assessment is presented within Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16) and details the mitigation required for the proposed development.
DBC.1.168	Dartford Borough Council	Air quality	Consideration should be given to new areas with regard to worsening air quality which may lead to a need for further AQMAs to be declared. The Council would expect the developer to pay for designating such AQMA and funding mitigation. Examples might be worsening air quality in Ingress Park, due to the increased number of buses, cars looking for park etc, or worsening air quality on the new development in Ebbsfleet Garden city adjacent to Ebbsfleet junction and the Resort access road.	The impact on worsening air quality has been considered in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).
DBC.1.169	Dartford Borough Council	Air quality	Details should be provided of the proposed energy centre, in terms of location and emissions.	The proposed energy centre has been assessed within the Air Quality assessment including its location and emissions, detailed in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16)
DBC.1.170	Dartford Borough Council	Air quality	The air quality of the proposed riverboat landing appears to have been assessed with regard to the construction impacts but there seems to be no assessment with regard to the operational impacts on air quality.	Assessment of vessel emissions has been considered in the Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16) for the construction and operational phases.
DBC.1.171	Dartford Borough Council	Air quality	RISK: Increased levels of pollutants within the Council's AQMAs which are all based around the local and strategic road network. Need for further AQMA's to be declared where new housing is coming forward in the Garden City.	N/A - no response needed.
DBC.1.172	Dartford Borough Council	Air quality	RISK: Increased emissions as a result of the development could delay the achievement of Air Quality objectives in the Borough.	N/A - no response needed.
DBC.1.173	Dartford Borough Council	Water resources and flood risk	The Council will defer to comments made by the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (KCC) and other statutory consultees with regard to this matter.	Discussions on procuring a water supply to the development is ongoing with Thames Water. Supply provided to the development must be considered within Thames Water strategic supply planning with any impacts to future supply for household and industrial users considered and mitigated. Reference is made to the Utilities Statement (Document Reference 7.6) for details.
DBC.1.174	Dartford Borough Council	Water resources and flood risk	However, the water management issues in this area are complex and must be considered with regard to other developments coming forward. The Council as local planning authority needs to ensure that the development does not prejudice the infrastructure available for other developments, particularly given the level of development coming forward within the Borough. The Council will expect the assessment to consider how the impact of the development on water resource availability will be mitigated.	As above

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DBC.1.175	Dartford Borough Council	Water resources and flood risk	The Council will also expect the water management mitigation proposals to set out how water will be conserved and water use minimised both during the construction phase and the operation phase.	As above
DBC.1.176	Dartford Borough Council	Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions	The Council would suggest the involvement of their contaminated land officer in the detailed site investigation methodology and assessment in order to ensure that the risk to human health is prevented.	Noted. The design and implementation of any ground investigations will be subject to agreement with local authority and EA regulators, as well as other stakeholders.
DBC.1.177	Dartford Borough Council	Materials, energy and waste	The Council defers to KCC as waste authority with regard to the detail of this assessment.	The potential for traffic generated air quality impacts on designated sites has been considered within Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).
DBC.1.178	Dartford Borough Council	Materials, energy and waste	However, the Council would expect the mitigation proposed to seek to minimise waste generated, maximise recycling and seek to minimise impacts with regards to the removal of waste from the site. The number of vehicle movements should also be minimised. If, as is likely, a commercial waste company undertakes the waste collection operations, there would need to be assessment provided of the origin/destination of the waste vehicles to feed into the traffic modelling. Waste disposal is a KCC matter but it may have land use effects on the area if there are additional requirements for waste sorting/recycling/ incineration or other disposal facilities such as anaerobic digestion.	The disposal of waste from the proposed development, recycling and mitigation proposed is assessed within the Waste and Materials Chapter of the ES - Chapter 19 (document reference 6.1.19).
DBC.1.179	Dartford Borough Council	Materials, energy and waste	The Works set out in the DCO include provision for waste transfer facilities. More details of the location of this should be provided, as the works plans provide a number of alternative location. Together with details as to whether such a facility would be dedicated to the Resort only or accessible to other waste companies.	The detail for the waste transfer facility can be found within the appendices to the Chapter 19 of the ES - Waste and Materials (document reference 6.1.19). These are the operational waste management strategy and the construction waste management plan.
DBC.1.180	Dartford Borough Council	DCO	Detailed comments on the draft Development Consent Order are attached to this response (appendix B).	The feedback on the draft DCO (document ref 3.1) has been reflected in a revised draft which is being discussed between the parties and legal advisers.
DBC.1.181	Dartford Borough Council	DCO	Some issues have been touched on above but as identified there appears to be inadequate detail on implementation and phasing and the requirement for approval of details of works parcels is limited.	As above
DBC.1.182	Dartford Borough Council	DCO	The provisions for deemed consent seem to give very little time for consideration of what could be complex detailed matters, given the lack of information submitted with the proposal. Although not matters for the	As above

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			Council, the risk to the Council is that important matters in the Borough managed by other statutory providers will not be considered fully.	
DBC.1.183	Dartford Borough Council	DCO	Article 51 advises that the development is an amusement park for permitted development purposes. But the Council would argue that a lot of the principal development and all the associated development is not actually the amusement park. The area to be considered for this benefit should be defined on a plan. The risk is that permitted development could take place on Green Zones or landscaped areas or could impact on neighbouring residents.	The draft DCO (document ref 3.1) provides the relevant controls on where development can take place, along with the requirements which are dealt with by the planning authority.
DBC.1.184	Dartford Borough Council	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	In order to start to identify some of the mitigations required as a result if the proposal the Council has also attached a table of the s106 requirements (Appendix C) which should be considered as a starting point for discussions on the matter. The Council reserves the right to add or amend this list of requirements as the impacts of the proposal become more fully understood.	The DBC S106 schedule is acknowledged. The proper time to begin meaningful S106 dialogue is when the various effects and mitigation are known. Workshops have commenced with the local planning authorities on the proposed structure of the S106, and headline topics for inclusion. There is a timeline under discussion with the local planning authorities to produce a draft 106.
DIO 1.1	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) MOD		Thank you for consulting Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) on the above proposed development. This application relates to a site outside of Ministry of Defence (MOD) statutory safeguarding areas (SOSA). We can therefore confirm that the MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.	LRCH notes this response.
DPLG.1.1	DPWorld London Gateway	Land use and socio-economic effects	1. Once fully developed, the Port will comprise six shipping berths providing additional deep sea shipping and container handling facilities with an annual throughput of 3.5 million TEU (twenty foot equivalent units), and approximately 1,900 directly employed staff. The adjacent Logistics Park will provide up to approximately 830,000sq.m of commercial floorspace, including storage and distribution, research and development, and general and light industrial facilities. In total, the Logistics Park is anticipated to generate approximately 13,400 direct employment opportunities, and a further 24,000 indirect employment opportunities are anticipated to arise as a result of the combined Port and Logistics Park development.	Noted
DPLG.1.2	DPWorld London Gateway	River Transport	2. The National Policy Statement (NPS) for Ports (January 2012) recognises "the essential contribution to the national economy that international and domestic trade makes' (Para. 3.3.6), and that 95% of all goods in and out of the UK move by sea via coastal ports. The NPS for Ports also forecasts an increase in container traffic by 2030 over a 2005 base of 182% from 7 million to 20 million TEU. Thus, once fully developed, the committed Port will facilitate approximately 18% of all UK container trade and approximately 27% of the predicted growth in such trade by 2030. Additionally, the Logistics Park will provide 'port centric' benefits which, along with rail and	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			transhipment opportunities, will result in significant transport efficiencies, removing 65 million HGV miles off of UK roads every year (equivalent to approximately 2,000 HGV movements per day).	
DPLG.1.3	DPWorld London Gateway	Land use and socio-economic effects	3. With first operational use taking place in November 2013, the Port currently comprises 3 operational berths, whilst the Logistics Park currently provides 154,674sq.m of operational floorspace in seven site buildings, with three further buildings consented and currently under construction.	Noted
DPLG.1.4	DPWorld London Gateway	River Transport	We are of the view that the proposed ferry terminal on the north banks of the River Thames in Tilbury: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not promote the use of sustainable transport by visitors to the London Resort or a material reduction in visitor related road vehicle mileage; and 	The River Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed to accommodate up to 15% of total people arriving and departing by River. The Travel Demand Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) set out how LRCH will seek to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes.
DPLG.1.5	DPWorld London Gateway	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has the potential to result in significant detrimental impacts to the local and strategic highway network in Thurrock and the South Essex area, and in particular access to nationally significant infrastructure including the DP World London Gateway port. 	The London Resort transport analysis has considered relevant cumulative development, as outlined in Chapter 9 of the ES (document reference 6.1.9) - Land Transport and Chapter 10 (document reference 6.1.10) - River Transport.
DPLG.1.6	DPWorld London Gateway	Land transport	<p>Sustainable Transport</p> <p>Whilst the proposed ferry terminal at Tilbury has the potential to relieve traffic impacts experienced by roads within Kent in the vicinity of the Resort site, it does not encourage or facilitate a shift away from reliance on the private motor car by visitors. Indeed reliance on the private car is facilitated by the associated proposals for 2,500 car parking spaces.</p>	LRCH acknowledge that car travel will be an important part of the travel choice for visitors. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), alongside Demand Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel. The number of parking spaces has been calculated using the likely mode shares to the Resort. The provision of 25% visitor car parking at Tilbury seeks to reduce impacts to Dartford Crossing by reducing the need to travel across it, with car parks provided on both sides of the river.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DPLG.1.7	DPWorld London Gateway	Land transport	We note that from a number of key highway nodes north of the river (for example M25 Junction 30) the ferry terminal and the Resort site in Kent are approximately equidistant by road transport. Indeed, even following implementation of the proposed Lower Thames Crossing (LTC), road journeys from the M25 to the ferry terminal will not be materially shorter than journeys to the Resort site (due to the need to depart the LTC onto the A13 eastbound and U-turn at the A13/ A101 4 junction before travelling on A13 westbound to access the A1089).	The advantage of having a car park at Tilbury is the ability to direct visitors from the north to that car park by allocating a car park space when a Resort ticket is booked. This negates the need for visitors to travel south of the river.
DPLG.1.8	DPWorld London Gateway	Land transport	<p>Whilst the Tilbury area is served by a rail station, a rail journey to Tilbury by visitors would, as a minimum, form one part of a tri-modal journey (rail/bus/ferry) to the Resort site (with possibly additional modes required to access between place of residence and the departing rail station). Such a travel option would be unlikely to be taken up by the majority of visitors, who will often be carrying provisions for a full-days activity and be in family units including younger family members. Even for the limited number of visitors who would be minded to utilise rail transport, the London-centric nature of the rail network results in such journeys being viable only for visitors originating from locations along the Essex Thameside (i.e. Southend to London Fenchurch Street) route. Due to the lack of north/south connectivity within and across Essex, journeys originating from further north would require visitors to first travel into London before travelling eastbound to Tilbury. For example a journey to Tilbury from Chelmsford would involve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Rail journey - Chelmsford to Stratford • London Underground - Stratford (Jubilee line) to West Ham • National Rail journey - West Ham to Tilbury 	LRCH has developed a comprehensive, multi-modal transport strategy, and undertaken a full highway impacts and public transport assessment, which is available in our Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Demand Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) outlines how LRCH will seek to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes.
DPLG.1.9	DPWorld London Gateway	Land transport	The above journey has a duration of approximately 90 minutes and (as priced on 30th July 2020) attracts a cost of £22.60 (1 adult) or £46.50 (2 adults plus 2 children) each way (Source: https://www.nationalrail.co.uk/). Conversely a journey from the centre of Chelmsford to Tilbury by car comprises a travel distance of approximately 29 miles with a duration of 35 minutes (source: https://www.theaa.com/route-planner/route).	No response required.
DPLG.1.10	DPWorld London Gateway	Land transport	It is therefore clear that, for the vast majority of visitors who reside north of the River Thames, use of rail or other forms of public transport to access the Tilbury ferry terminal is entirely unviable, with the result being reliance upon the private motor car. As such the proposed ferry terminal does not comprise a sustainable transport measure.	No response required.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

DPLG.1.11	DPWorld London Gateway	Land Transport	<p>Impacts on the Thurrock and South Essex Highway Network</p> <p>Given that a journey to the Resort site in Kent is not materially shorter than a journey to the Tilbury ferry terminal for the vast majority of potential visitors residing to the north (including in the circumstance where LTC is operational), it is not clear what incentive there will be for visitors to utilise the ferry terminal. Aside from any potential differential entry ticket/parking pricing, the only incentive we can identify is the opportunity to avoid areas of the road network which typically experience congestion, such as the Dartford Crossing. However, during incidents which cause congestion at the Dartford Crossing it is typical for the surrounding road network (including the M25/A13 Junction (M25 Junction 30)) to also experience significant congestion. Thus, there will be a desire to avoid the entire West Thurrock area (including M25 Junction 30/31) where possible.</p>	<p>The Tilbury visitor arrival opportunity will play a significant part in trip distribution and access by ferry. Further information is available in ES Chapter 9 - Land Transport. (document ref 6.1.9)</p>
DPLG.1.12	DPWorld London Gateway	Land transport	<p>The proposed LTC will provide an alternative route to Tilbury which avoids the West Thurrock area. However, the route southbound from LTC to Tilbury (via the A1089) requires visitors to leave the LTC at its junction with the A13 before travelling eastbound on the A13, u-turning at the A13/A1014 (Manorway Interchange) junction and returning westbound on the A13 to access the A1089 southbound. Alternatively visitors in light vehicles (private motor cars) may seek to utilise the A128 and local roads within the Tilbury/Chadwell-St-Mary area.</p>	<p>The highway impact assessment that has been undertaken includes the road network around Tilbury. This is available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic. Traffic modelling has been undertaken in forecast scenarios with and without the LTC and LTC is included in the model coverage</p>
DPLG.1.13	DPWorld London Gateway	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	<p>To take account of the above, it will be necessary for potential cumulative impacts upon local roads within Thurrock (including A13 links and the Manorway Interchange junction) arising from the proposed Tilbury ferry terminal operating in association with the LTC to be fully considered. For the purpose of such assessment, due to its critical role in providing the sole means of access to the Nationally Significant DP World London Gateway port and logistics park, Manorway Interchange should be considered highly sensitive to changes in traffic flows. Cumulative impact assessment of highway and other environmental impacts must also consider the consented but as yet unimplemented part of the DP World London Gateway port and logistics park, in addition to the Thames Enterprise Park project, for which an application for planning consent is currently being considered by Thurrock Council (Reference: 18/01404/OUT).</p>	<p>The transport analysis addresses relevant schemes within the assessment work ES Chapter 9 - Land Transport (document ref 6.1.9).</p>
DPLG.1.14	DPWorld London Gateway	Cumulative, in-combination and	<p>The impacts upon the strategic sections of the A13 and M25 Junction 30 will also need to be considered in the scenario whereby the LTC project does not proceed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		transboundary effects		
DPLG.1.15	DPWorld London Gateway	Project description	I trust the comments set out above are useful in informing the further evolution of the London Resort proposals and in particular discussions with the promoters of the LTC. DPWLG would welcome ongoing dialogue with the London Resort Company Holdings team leading up to the proposed DCO application.	On-going dialogue between major development in the area - directly, and through Thurrock Council is noted.
EDC.1.1	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 1 Introduction Para 1.14	Chapter 1 para 1.14 accurately sets out the 'key principles' in PINs Advice Note Nine: Using the Rochdale Envelope which PINs say should be taken into account in the DCO application and documents. However, Advice Note Nine also notes key propositions from the caselaw, including the ES should be 'based on cautious 'worst case' approach.' Whilst there is reference to this in places in the PEIR is not clear that the applicant has done this in every case the PEIR or proposes to do this in the ES.	The ES is based on clearly defined maximum parameters, sufficiently detailed to enable a proper assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the proposed development, whilst seeking flexibility about the detailed design of some elements of the project, including the content of Gates One and Two. The assessment approach is fully explained in the ES (document ref 6.1.6)
EDC.1.2	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 1 Introduction Para 1.17	Chapter 1 states in para 1.17: <i>“The Applicant will ensure that design details in which there might be continuing public interest will be the subject of safeguarding DCO ‘Requirements’ - similar to the planning conditions that attach to a conventional planning permission - so that such details can be submitted for approval to the relevant planning authority at a local level, once the DCO is made”</i> This statement is made with regards to the need for flexibility associated with the potential need to change rides etc. However, it is unclear where this is addressed within the DCO.	The assessment approach with respect to The Rochdale Envelope, and flexibility sought will be fully explained in the ES (document ref 6.1.6). The draft DCO (document ref 3.1) will ensure that design details in which there might be continuing public interest will be the subject of safeguarding requirements, so that such details can be submitted for approval to the relevant planning authority at a local level.
EDC.1.3	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 2 Law and Regs Para 2.11	Chapter 2 states in para 2.11 that the PEIR complies with Regulation 12(2) and forms the PEIR for the purposes of consultation. We do not agree that the information in the PEIR complies with the definition of preliminary environmental information in regulation 12 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, as it is not, at this stage, sufficient for the consultation bodies to develop an informed view of the likely significant effects of the development.	We maintain our view that the PEIR complied with the definition of preliminary environmental information as set out in regulation 12(2) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, and was sufficiently detailed for the consultation bodies to develop an informed view of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development - see Consultation Report (document ref 5.1). No specific examples have been provided to quantify this statement, and no other consultation bodies have expressed concerns in this regard. Indeed, the level of information provided for Consultation is greater than that issued in the 2015

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				Consultation which the EDC was satisfied complied with the Regulations.
EDC.1.4	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 2 Law and Regs Other Relevant Provisions	<p>Under the heading 'Other Relevant Provisions' a number of additional licensing regimes are referred to. It would be clearer if this section was split into two sections –</p> <p>(a) a section headed 'Other licensing requirements' with the applicant explaining that there are additional licences that the proposed development expects to seek; and</p> <p>(b) a second section headed 'other key relevant legislation', with the applicant explaining that this list not exhaustive, as each 'topic' chapter contains reference to relevant laws for that topic</p> <p>This section does not contain much detail on what works are proposed to be licensed nor any detail of discussions that have been held with the relevant regulators to date. To give two (non-exhaustive) examples:</p> <p>(a) in relation to the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, para 2.14 lists works relevant to the delivery of the proposed development that 'might' require a marine licence. No further detail is provided; and</p> <p>(b) in relation to the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, reference is made to the option of standard or tailored permits (para 2.17) and a list of works and activities 'potentially' required for the construction and operation of the proposed development that 'might' require an environmental permit are listed, but no further discussion of whether an environmental permit is anticipated or whether it will be standard or bespoke.</p> <p>No reference is made to documents such as the 'Thames Concordat' which sets out how the Marine Management Organisation and Port of London Authority may work together on proposed development projects that affect them both.</p>	<p>The Law and Policy chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.5) includes an explanation of additional licensing/permitting regimes. Appropriate detail of what works are proposed to be licensed/permited under these regimes is included in the ES, with signposting to other chapters accordingly.</p> <p>The ES documents consultation undertaken with consultation bodies including regulators.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.5	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 2 Law and Regs Para 2.23	Chapter 2, para 2.23 refers to the Water Resources Act 1991 and says that under this Act it is an offence to cause or knowingly permit any poisonous, noxious or polluting material, or any solid waste to enter any controlled water. This section of the Water Resources Act 1991 was repealed in 2010 and the offence is now contained in the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016	The ES is based upon up to date legislation (document ref 6.1.5)
EDC.1.6	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 2 Law and Regs Para 2.34	Chapter 2, para 2.34 refers to the possibility of an Appropriate Assessment being undertaken 'if it is considered that the London Resort is likely to have a significant effect on a protected site...' Our consultation response on ecology, prepared by Kent County Council's Ecological Advice Service, advises that 'as the proposal will result in likely significant effects on the designated sites there will be a need for any further information submitted to enable the determining authority undertake an Appropriate Assessment.'	This is addressed in ES Chapter 12 (document ref 6.1.12)
EDC.1.7	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	In para 3.5 there is no mention of EDC Implementation Framework or Vision.	The EDC Implementation Framework is referred to where appropriate and the relevant planning authority captured in the revised draft DCO (document ref 3.1).
EDC.1.8	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	Para 3.6 states that a substantial component of the proposal is the road.	In the description of development, a distinction is made between the Principal Development, which comprises all works proposed within what would be the Entertainment Resort, and Associated Development, comprising other development that has a direct relationship with the Principal Development and is required to support its construction or operation. Associated development is defined in Annex A of the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects (April 2013). The A2 Highways Works comprising a signalised at-grade gyratory junction to replace two existing roundabouts at the A2(T) / B259 junction are included in the works described as Principal Development. It is local transport links that are included as Associated Development. We believe this meets the description of associated development as defined in Annex A of the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects (April 2013) with reference to the Access arrangements section, and the following inclusions (not exhaustive): <i>'formation of new or</i>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				<i>improved vehicular or pedestrian access (to stations, work sites etc), whether temporary or permanent; Alteration of construction of roads, footpaths and bridleways; Construction of new rail, road or footbridges, viaducts or tunnels, and works to reconstruct, alter or replace existing ones'. (document ref 3.1)</i>
EDC.1.9	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	Para 3.11 states that the Resort and London International Cruise Terminal will work “harmoniously together”.	LRCH has a number of agreements in place with the Port of Tilbury (London) Ltd
EDC.1.10	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	Para 3.35 notes that EDC has development management responsibilities, but again there is no mention of the Implementation Framework or the Vision	The EDC Implementation Framework is referred to where appropriate, including the Planning Statement (document ref 7.4)
EDC.1.11	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	Para 3.47 contains the first mention of the Implementation Framework, but only in relation to the land identified for the Resort.	The EDC Implementation Framework is referred to where appropriate, including the Planning Statement (document ref 7.4)
EDC.1.12	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	Table 3.2 has no mention of EDC	The ES refers to, and is based upon, up to date local and national policy (document ref 6.1.5)
EDC.1.13	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	Paragraph 3.35 records that EDC was set up in 2014. As previously advised EDC was set up in 2015.	Noted - shadow organisation has been established in 2014
EDC.1.14	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	<p>Paras 3.46 and 3.47 are a statement regarding EDC. This records that Ebbsfleet Garden City Implementation Framework identifies a large central area of Swanscombe Peninsula as 'Land subject to London Resort NSIP process' and proposes that the marshes and other open land around it should be 'an open estuarine ecological park.'</p> <p>No detail is provided to explain how the proposed development will work alongside the development proposed at Ebbsfleet Central. We understand that EDC as landowner has major concerns that the current proposed development would significantly prejudice development of Ebbsfleet Central,</p>	The ES fully describes the local and wider context within which the London Resort is proposed to be built, including the relevant planning approvals (document ref 7.4)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			an extant consent and the centrepiece of Ebbsfleet Garden City, preventing EDC from carrying out its statutory purpose to regenerate the designated Urban Development Area.	
EDC.1.15	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	Para 3.49 states that KCC is working on preparing a Kent Mineral Sites Plan - this plan was adopted by KCC in September 2020.	Noted, the ES refers to, and is based upon, up to date local policy (document ref 7.4)
EDC.1.16	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	Para 3.52 – Reference is made to Thurrock's development plan. It should be made clear that the Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development also includes waste policies for this area.	Noted. The waste and materials chapter specifically refers to, and is based upon, local policies relevant to waste and materials considerations (document ref 6.1.19).
EDC.1.17	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 3 Local and National Policy	Table 3.2 does not include reference to Kent's transport plan (or Thurrock's.)	The Transport chapters of the ES specifically refers to, and is based upon, local and national policies relevant to Transport considerations. (document ref 6.1.9 and 6.1.10)
EDC.1.18	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 4 Alternative Sites	Para 2.3.6 of the July 2020 Scoping Opinion records that the Scoping Report does not provide much information concerning options of site layout, building location and design. The PEIR does not provide much information on this either. More detail needs to be given and consideration given to the impact of site layout, design etc on Ebbsfleet Garden City including Ebbsfleet Central (DA/15/00351/VCON and 20150155).	The alternatives sections of the ES includes details of design evolution as part of the iterative EIA process. Consequently, details of alternative layouts, building location and building design that were considered are described, along with the rationale behind the final design approach taken. (document ref 6.1.4)
EDC.1.19	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 4 Alternative Sites	Para 4.14 states that proposed developments should, as far as possible, avoid compromising other planning intentions.	The EDC Implementation Framework is referred to where relevant This is confirmed in the Planning Statement (document ref 7.4)
EDC.1.20	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 4 Alternative Sites	Para 4.25 lists a number of sensitivities that were taken into account in considering development options and land-take. The need to reconcile the proposed development with Ebbsfleet Garden City including Ebbsfleet Central (DA/15/00351/VCON and 20150155) is not referred to.	This is considered (document ref 7.4)
EDC.1.21	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 4 Alternative Sites	Para 4.27 concerns scheme evolution. it is unclear how the comments EDC have made of the previous stages of consultation have been addressed.	The Consultation Report documents all consultation undertaken with consultation bodies including regulators and interested parties and how any comments have been addressed. (document ref 5.1)
EDC.1.22	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description	Has Ebbsfleet Central (DA/15/00351/VCON and 20150155) been factored into the development of the scheme design? It appears from the various studies that the consented scheme at Ebbsfleet Central and the allocations in the local plans have not been taken into account when looking at baseline and resulting impacts.	The Description of Development refers to the proposed scheme (document ref 6.1.3). The implications on other approvals are referred to.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.23	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description	Generally this chapter does not include sufficient detail of the proposed development. More detailed plans are needed showing what is proposed, precisely what has been assessed and more detail generally.	The Proposed Development chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.3) includes a detailed description of the London Resort proposals, with reference to a full set of project plans. (document ref 2.5)
EDC.1.24	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5, Scheme Description	Within the works descriptions there is no information provided about the upper limits of the development. Whilst it is recognised that there are the parameter plans available it is unclear how they have informed PEIR and this needs to be addressed in the ES.	The ES is based on clearly defined maximum parameters, sufficiently detailed to enable a proper assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the proposed development, whilst seeking flexibility about the detailed design of some elements of the project, including the content of Gates One and Two. The assessment approach is fully explained in the ES (document ref 6.1.6), with reference to a full set of parameter plans. This is an approach discussed with PINS.
EDC.1.25	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.50	Para 5.50 makes reference to the fact that there will be remediation of the Kent and Essex project sites but there are no details provided of how this will be achieved, the duration of such works etc to inform the factors that need to be considered in the subsequent topic chapters. These works in themselves have the potential to generate significant effects.	The Ground Conditions chapter of the ES provides a detailed description of any remediation works that are proposed to be undertaken, informed by survey work and will be set out within a Construction Method Statement (CMS) (document ref 6.2.3.1), supported by a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
EDC.1.26	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.51 and Chapter 6 EIA General Scope and Methodology	Para 5.51 states: <i>“As noted, the content of the zones will be changed or updated from time to time in line with evolving market demand and the draft DCO will incorporate the flexibility to do this”</i> . It is unclear how this approach has been reflected in the PEIR outputs as this is not addressed at all in the EIA Scope chapter.	The assessment approach with respect to The Rochdale Envelope, and flexibility sought, is fully explained in the ES (document ref 6.1.6). The draft DCO (document ref 3.1) ensures that design details in which there might be continuing public interest will be the subject of safeguarding requirements, so that such details can be submitted for approval to the relevant planning authority at a local level.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

<p>EDC.1.27</p>	<p>Ebbsfleet Development Corporation</p>	<p>5.45 of Scheme Description Para 5.59</p>	<p>Inconsistency with regards to car parking provision in the various consultation documents.</p> <p>Paras 2.3.2 and 2.3.3 of the Explanatory memorandum state:</p> <p><i>“the construction of up to three multi storey parking buildings within the Dartford / Gravesham portion of the site as part of a maximum provision of 7,500 car spaces, 150 coach parking spaces, 350 motorcycle spaces and 250 secure cycle spaces for visitors..</i> <i>the construction of up to three multi storey parking buildings within the Thurrock portion of the site as part of a maximum provision of 2,500 car spaces and 55 coach parking spaces for visitors”.</i></p> <p>Para 5.59 of the scheme description then states:</p> <p><i>“A maximum provision of 10,000 car parking spaces for visitors and hotel guests are proposed, in up to four multi-storey car parks with up to ten decks and floorplates of 9,000 m2, along with up to 250 VIP parking spaces under the main visitor plaza and 500 staff parking spaces in the Back-of-House area, giving a total of 10,750 car parking spaces. Also proposed are 150 coach parking spaces, 350 motor cycle parking spaces and 250 secure cycle spaces for visitors. Collectively these parking areas would occupy a gross land area of 12.6 ha. Parking for visitors and hotel guests will be split between the Kent and Essex Project Sites in a ratio of approximately 3:1, with c.7,500 spaces at the Resort and c.2,500 spaces at Tilbury”.</i></p> <p>The proposed works within Work Numbers 3a and 3b of Schedule 1 of the DCO are consistent with the wording of the explanatory memorandum with regards to numbers of car parks and provision of spaces. However, work number 24 also allows for the construction of a further multi-storey car park. How many parking spaces would be provided in this location and are these spaces in relation to the Back of House area or are they separate (it is assumed that work number 9a relates to the Back of House area) and so these are additional spaces for Work Number 24?</p> <p>Whilst it is understood that the wording of the DCO is ‘up to three’ for both work Numbers 3a and 3b, the Scheme description suggests four plus parking at the Back of House area but the DCO would seem to allow for up to seven (work numbers 3a, 3b and 24) plus further staff car parking spaces (see comment below).</p>	<p>The Transport Chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.10) provides clarity with regards to the total number of multi-storey car parks and the total number of car parking spaces. This is reflected in the assumptions underpinning the assessment in the ES and associated transport modelling and also reflected on the parameter plans and the works plans.</p>
-----------------	--	---	--	---

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.28	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.66	Para 5.66 states that existing facilities at Ebbsfleet Station will be relocated to a convenient location nearby.	This is under discussion on Central dialogue, with HS1
EDC.1.29	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.68	Para 5.68 refers to the construction of an unadopted road up to four lanes in width	The Access Road is described in the Project Description (document ref 6.1.3).
EDC.1.30	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.76	Para 5.76 makes reference to proposed flood defence works consisting of building, improving and extending the existing earth berm around the Entertainment Resort and states that these works will accord with the EA's Thames Estuary 2100 strategy. Our reading of this strategy is that it says further work will be required at local scheme level but flood mitigation measures might include improved outflows, conserving the floodplain and maximising flood storage.	The Water Resources and Flood Risk chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.17) provides a full explanation of any flood mitigation measures proposed.
EDC.1.31	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.8	Para 5.8 states that the proposals are in keeping with the EDC Vision regarding integrating local Rights of Way, but this approach is not taken in regard to compliance with EDCs Vision for Ebbsfleet Central	The Resort masterplan accommodates the EDC vision and permissions in the Peninsula. The DCO information explains the relationship to Central based on extant permission and land agreements (document ref 7.4)
EDC.1.32	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.83	Para 5.83 states that LRCH has decided to 'take advantage' of the rules which allow up to 500 dwellings to be included in a DCO application. The housing is to be for staff working in the Entertainment Resort 'including full-time and seasonal employees. This is intended to allow for smooth operation of the Resort, assist recruitment, reduce the need to commute and reduce pressure on local housing rental markets and local transport networks,' We note from para 5.47 that the type of housing proposed is dwellings with typically 4-6 bedrooms and shared kitchen and lounge facilities.	The parameters approach alongside information in the Design and Access Statement (document ref 7.1) highlights the approach. The details will be captured via requirements.
EDC.1.33	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.86	<p>Para 5.86 seeks to include temporary residential accommodation for Construction Workers. There is no indication provide of the likely number of construction workers that will be needed and therefore how this might affect travel, traffic flows etc.</p> <p>There is also no detail provided of construction traffic routes etc. and construction traffic flows and how they have been considered in the assessment or will be.</p>	<p>Further information about the construction phase, to include the numbers of construction workers and the need for temporary residential accommodation for construction workers, is included in the ES, with reference to a drafted Construction Method Statement (CMS) (document ref 6.2.3.1) and Construction Workforce Accommodation Strategy (CWAS) (document ref 6.2.7.8)</p> <p>Further information is also included regarding construction traffic routes and construction traffic flows with reference to a Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP), and how this has facilitated</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				robust technical assessments in order to understand the potential effects of the Resort during the construction phase.
EDC.1.34	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.86	<p>Whilst there are a series of works listed that will form part of the construction works (in para 5.86) there is no detail provided of the likely construction programme or phasing and therefore how this has been addressed in the assessment. Given the long term nature of the construction of this scheme this is fundamental to the assessment of its effects.</p> <p>There are some details provided in Chapter 7 regarding construction assumptions but these also need to be included in the Scheme Description as they are relevant to all topic assessments.</p>	Further information about construction phasing has facilitated robust technical assessments in order to understand the potential effects of the Resort. The approach taken will be fully explained in the ES, with reference to a drafted Construction Method Statement (CMS) (document ref 6.2.3.1) and Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). (document ref 6.2.3.2)
EDC.1.35	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Scheme Description Para 5.94/95	<p>Paras 5.94 and 5.95 discuss decommissioning and state that a decommissioning statement will be submitted subject to DCO requirements.</p> <p>However, there is no reference in the DCO at all to decommissioning other than with regards to the deemed marine licence.</p>	This will form part of the next review of the Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.36	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5, Scheme Description and Draft DCO/Explanatory Memorandum	<p>There is limited detail in the Scheme description with regards to staff car parking provision. There is a general lack of clarity with regards to the quantum of staff car parking spaces across the documents – for example, para 2.7.5 of the explanatory memorandum indicates that there will be up to 500 for the ‘Back of House’ buildings but this is not reflected in the detail in the scheme description or the DCO.</p> <p>Various work numbers also make reference to provision of ‘associated staff car parking’ but there is no indication of the quantum (work numbers, 9a, 9b, 10a, 10b).</p>	The Land Transport chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.10) provides clarity with regards to the total number of staff car parking provision as well as the total number of car parking spaces. This is reflected in the assumptions underpinning the assessment in the ES and associated transport modelling and on the parameter plans and the works plans.
EDC.1.37	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5, Scheme Description and the draft DCO Para 5.71	<p>Para 5.71 of Chapter 5 states:</p> <p><i>“A staff travel plan will be implemented to promote car sharing and non-car-based transport modes for staff. An event management plan will explain how the car parking spaces will be used throughout the year and in response to specific events at the Proposed Development. Both plans are likely to be secured pursuant to DCO Requirements”.</i></p> <p>Neither of these are presently made reference to in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO. Whilst it is recognised that the wording ‘are likely’ is used in the Scheme description, in view of the scale of the development and the comments raised with regards to staff car parking provision that this is required.</p>	<p>The Transport chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.10) provides clarity with regards to the total number of staff car parking provision as well as the total number of car parking spaces. This is reflected in the assumptions underpinning the assessment in the ES and associated transport modelling and reflected on the parameter plans and the works plans.</p> <p>It is re-stated that a staff travel plan will be implemented to promote car sharing and non-car-based transport modes for staff. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) alongside the Travel Demand</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				Management Plan (Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel.
EDC.1.38	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapters 6 – EIA Scope and General Methodology	<p>Lack of Clarity regarding Underpinning Assumptions and the Environmental Assessment presented in the PEIR</p> <p>There is no detail provided in this section of how the parameter plans have informed the assessment presented within the PEIR.</p> <p>There is also a lack of clarity with regards to assessment scenarios including the phased opening of the park and the traffic scenarios considered in the subsequent assessments.</p> <p>There is also no detail provided regarding construction assumptions, timescales and scenarios that will be used to inform the assessment of construction effects.</p> <p>There will be periods when construction and operation of the development are occurring at the same time – Gate 1 will be open and Gate 2 will continue to be developed. This is not addressed in this chapter and it is unclear how a reasonable worst case will be assessed for each topic assessment.</p>	<p>The ES is based on clearly defined maximum parameters (document ref 6.1.6), sufficiently detailed to enable a proper assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the proposed development, whilst seeking flexibility about the detailed design of some elements of the project, including the content of Gates One and Two. The assessment approach, together with any assumptions or scenarios used are fully explained in the ES.</p> <p>Greater clarity about construction phasing has facilitated robust technical assessments in order to understand the potential effects of the Resort. The approach taken is fully explained in the ES, with reference to a drafted Construction Method Statement (CMS) (document ref 6.2.3.1) and Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (document ref 6.2.3.2).</p>
EDC.1.39	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 6 EIA Scope and General Methodology Para 6.10	Para 6.10 states that mitigation measures will include embedded mitigation through design as well as any further specific mitigation.	A clear distinction is made between inherent mitigation through design, and additional mitigation. The ES also details the method intended to secure any additional mitigation proposed (document ref 6.1.22)
EDC.1.40	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 6 EIA Scope and General Methodology Para 6.25	Para 6.25 on transboundary effects states that the matrix concluded that the increase in trips that could be attributed to the London Resort would be negligible and many of the overseas people visiting the London Resort would be already staying in the region anyway. This does not seem consistent with what has been said elsewhere about the attraction of the proposed development.	The assessment of transboundary effects is fully considered and explained in ES Chapter 21 (document ref 6.1.21)
EDC.1.41	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 6 EIA Scope and General Methodology Table 6.4	Note that the PEIR introduces a River Transport chapter, which wasn't covered in the EIA Scoping Report.	For presentation purposes, and ease of reading, the Transport chapter in the PEIR was split out to comprise a separate Land Transport chapter and River Transport chapter. This presentational approach has carried through to the ES (document ref 6.1.9 and 6.1.10). The Scoping Report chapter titled Transport, accessibility

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				and movement covered both modes of Transport with the scope of the River Transport assessment being explained at Para's 9.81 to 9.90 of the chapter. (see documnt refs 6.1.9 and 6.1.100).
EDC.1.42	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 6 EIA Scope and General Methodology	There is no mention in this chapter of how Major Accidents and Disasters are considered.	The ES addresses the potential for major accidents and disasters as a result of the Proposed Development. (document ref 6.1.21)
EDC.1.43	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 21 - Cumulative Effects	<p>Para 21.2 states that the cumulative assessment is preliminary. Whilst details are provided about some of the developments that should be included within the assessment, no further detail is provided and so limited comment can be provide on this chapter. It would have been helpful if stages 1 and 2 had been completed to facilitate more informed comment.</p> <p>Para 21.7 states that <i>“Developments were identified within an initial 5km radius of the London Resort, subject to confirming the NSIP's ZOI incorporating both the Essex Site and the Kent Project Site. The initial ‘long list’ of developments is included in Appendix 21.1, this list will now proceed to Stage 2...”</i>.</p> <p>However, the table in Appendix 21.1 does not include details about the ZOIs of the other developments. The Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 17 also states that the ZOIs for each aspect should inform this process (this is part of Stage 1 of the process) but this detail is also lacking. Therefore, it is not possible to accurately comment on the relevance of the list of schemes proposed to be included in the cumulative assessment.</p>	The cumulative assesment outlined in the PEIR was preliminary subject to further work being undertaken. The ES includes full details of the cumulative process, to include details of the ZOI for each aspect and the justification for inclusion or exclusion of schemes accordingly. This will be in line with PINS Advice Note 17. The committed schemes in the EDC area are noted and will be checked against the CEA short list to ensure a robust assessment, and cross-checked with feedback previously provided by the EDC, DBC and GBC. (document ref 6.1.21)
EDC.1.44	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 22 – Conclusions	<p>This chapter does not form a conclusion as the likely significant environmental effects of the proposed development – it only states that the ES will identify the same.</p> <p>It states that LRCH will refine its proposals with the benefit of the July 2020 Scoping Opinion and detailed technical studies will continue to feed into the design and assessment process.</p>	Consultation is ongoing with interested parties and engagement with the EDC has been requested. The ES presents a conclusion of the likely significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development. (document ref 6.1.22)
EDC.1.45	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.10	Consultation with Local Authority/local infrastructure providers (e.g. police, fire and health) should also be undertaken to ensure that the EIA considers the impact of the proposed development on local service and infrastructure provision	This consultation has been undertaken and is reported in the Chapter 7 of the ES. (document ref 6.1.7)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.46	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.15	As described at 7.10 above there is no mention of wider relevant local infrastructure/services such as emergency services. It would also be useful to confirm education will deal with early years and further and higher education.	There has been ongoing consultation with the emergency services to produce an emergency services strategy. Education services have been consulted and are assessed as part of the ES Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.7)
EDC.1.47	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Table 7.2	<p>Could assessment of where existing 'bad neighbour' employment uses will relocate to be added to the effect 'Potential temporary or permanent displacement/loss of businesses and other services'?</p> <p>Also, in general there is little description or acknowledgement that there are significant numbers of existing industrial businesses that will presumably have to be moved/ or jobs and businesses lost i.e. displaced. The land use and socioeconomics chapter will need to assess the impact on these businesses and their employees and whether it has a significant impact on industrial capacity in the functional economic market area (FEMA)</p>	This is assessed and reported on in the ES Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.7)
EDC.1.48	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.39	Consultation with local infrastructure providers e.g. Health education could form part of approach to assess impact on local services	Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the detail set out in the and is reported in Chapter 7 of the ES. (document ref 6.1.7)
EDC.1.49	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.48	Has the scoping out of the cumulative assessment been agreed with relevant consultees? The specific cumulative impact of a range of developments on specific social infrastructure resources i.e. local hospital, could be lost in this approach, and it is not clear that the full range of potential receptors has been considered. Perhaps acknowledgement of this issue and justification of why it is not an issue should be made here.	The long list of developments to be considered was presented as part of the PEIR. Through ongoing work as part of the EIA the Zones of Influence for each specialism have been defined and these have been applied to the CEA process as defined (document ref 6.1.7)
EDC.1.50	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.60 and 7.426 - 7.429	<p>Chapter asserts that the assessment of socioeconomic effects is "inherently cumulative" as it incorporates the likely effect of future developments through presenting a combination of both projections and plans for key socio-economic variables and how they will change over time. On this basis, a separate assessment of the cumulative impact of future schemes would risk double counting.</p> <p>However, chapter also acknowledges that projections are not available for all socio-economic elements such as construction workers or changes in public services.</p>	The cumulative approach in relation to socio-economic effects is described in the PEIR and is a combination of the inherently cumulative baseline, given the fact that the assessment presents future projections of baseline conditions taking account of trends over time. The PEIR identifies that for those receptors and effects not covered in this manner, the CEA approach will apply. The cumulative assessment has been undertaken in line with the PINS guidance note on CEA and presented in the ES (document ref 6.1.7)
EDC.1.51	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para	Very sparse detail on how the Proposed Development could benefit local employment and skills. This detail is deferred to the Skills and Employment Strategy but this is unavailable at this stage and no real substance on what it might include is provided. It is accepted that not all the detail will be	The PEIR presented the preliminary information on the assessment. The Applicant's employment and skills initiatives are presented in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy which forms part of the DCO application.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		7.269 - 7.270 & 7.415	provided in the PEIR but what is provided does not provide any confidence that this opportunity will be maximised.	The measures set out in this Strategy form the basis for the mitigation considerations in the ES Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.7)
EDC.1.52	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.275	Construction phase perception of increasing crime. Although the PEIR states it is not possible to quantify the magnitude of the effect, is it possible to state that it is likely to be adverse (as has been done for other un-quantified effects)? Also, state the sensitivity of the receptor here – potentially different sensitivities for different age groups i.e older people and young families more sensitive than younger people without children.	As explained it is not possible to define the impact of the development upon fear of crime. The approach is explained in the ES Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.7); The Construction Method Statement (CMS) (document ref 6.2.3.1) sets out the controls and measures to ensure that the construction period will be managed in accordance with the highest standards to minimise any adverse impacts including crime. This is covered in the Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7).
EDC.1.53	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.280	Not clear how conclusion that effect of construction workers on local health services is negligible. Given the widely accepted view that UK health services are stretched (even more so in current Covid pandemic) (and the facts that the construction workforce supported by the Proposed Development is acknowledged to be large in 7.89 and that current healthcare provision is judged to have high sensitivity in 7.97), making the impact 'low' would result in a significant effect. Common sense would suggest that a large influx of construction workers could put pressure on local healthcare services.	All effects have been reviewed and fully assessed in accordance with the defined methodology as part of the ES Chapter 7. (document ref 6.1.7) and Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8).
EDC.1.54	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.293	Construction employment impact on local accommodation: Not clear how medium impact justified. For example, it seems like number of beds required by construction workers (2,460) is 50% of the total available tourist accommodation. This could be seen as high magnitude.	Effects have been reviewed and fully assessed in accordance with the defined methodology as part of the ES chapter. (document ref 6.1.7)
EDC.1.55	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.301	No conclusion in relation to impact on displaced businesses made in the PEIR	Noted, this forms part of the wider land referencing work which has been undertaken and the outcomes of this work are reported on in the ES Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.7).
EDC.1.56	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.415 - 7.424	Various potential mitigation measures addressing employment and skills effects, construction effects, operational effects are put forward; the PEIR states that these will be refined in connection with the Employment and Skills Strategy and ongoing engagement	Noted, the ES Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.7) clearly defines those measures that are inherent to the design, those measures that have been identified to mitigate identified adverse effects and those measures that offer enhancement.
EDC.1.57	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-economics Para 7.4307.432	Chapter assumes climate factors have little influence on socioeconomic baseline conditions with the exception of local healthcare facilities but climate change could well affect the nature of local jobs, the attractiveness of the Proposed Development as a holiday destination etc.	Noted, the consideration of climate is detailed in the relevant sections of the ES and is also addressed through the Greenhouse gas and climate change chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.20)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.58	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.8	States that ‘the assessment presents appropriate mitigation to minimise any adverse effects.’ This is an overstatement at this stage of the assessment, given that not all adverse effects have been identified and that for some adverse effects defined later in the chapter (notably in relation to access to healthcare / public and community services) no additional mitigation has been identified	Noted, requirements for mitigation of identified adverse effects are addressed in the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.59	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.13	Confirms HSE requires the Applicant to consider issues relating to waste and electrical safety States waste issues will be addressed in chapter 19 and states that electrical safety requirements are the responsibility of the construction site team and will be referenced in management plans Further confirms that HSE consider that there are unlikely to be issues relating to hazardous installations, substances or explosive sites	Link to human health is addressed in Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8) and Chapter 19 (document ref 6.1.19) of the ES.
EDC.1.60	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.18	Refers to external engagement undertaken to date in relation to the project and the approach to assessing health impacts. Feedback that health providers would like to be pro-actively involved and for a more innovative approach to be taken to how health can be incorporated into the proposals is encouraged.	Consultation has been ongoing through the EIA process and outcomes are reported on in the ES. (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.61	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.21	Assessment only considers health effects post mitigation (but at 8.371 acknowledges that there is currently no health-specific mitigation proposed)	The nature of the assessment means that it draws upon the residual effects of other technical areas where required for a holistic assessment and these are the effects that remain once mitigation has been specified. (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.62	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.23	Definitions of health receptors and receptor population – these are not defined very clearly and perhaps this is something that could be expanded upon / clarified further in the ES in order to improve readability for a wider audience.	More detail is provided in Chapter 8 of the ES document ref 6.1.8).
EDC.1.63	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Table 8.1	The table lists the receptor populations. The majority of these make sense and are understandable, however queries in relation to: General population category includes a group titled ‘road and public transport users, rail drivers, pedestrians and cyclists’. Not clear why rail drivers specifically are identified as a category, nor how this group are dealt with through the assessment (they are not referred to again) – perhaps a better group would be public transport staff in order to be more inclusive. Pregnant women should not be included as part of the children and young people group but warrant a line on their own – relates to pregnancy and maternity (so covers not only aspects of travel difficulties relating to women	ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8) clearly identifies the receptor groups that have been identified for the purposes of the human health assessment and the justification for the selection.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			who are pregnant or parents with young children, but also covers impacts of noise emissions on parents of new-born babies).	
EDC.1.64	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Table 8.2	Query why the potential health effects of increased flooding is only included in the construction section and the operational effects on site users are not considered too.	Likely effects are considered as part of the ES ; the effects of increased flood risk are also covered as part of the Water and Flooding chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.17) and the Health chapter (document ref 6.1.8).
EDC.1.65	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Table 8.2	Although mental health and wellbeing is referred to periodically in relation to specific potential impacts, there is no consideration of the resilience of the existing community to deal with potential change (which forms the cornerstone of mental health assessment).	Mental health and wellbeing has been considered as part of the specific potential impacts identified in table 8.2 and as explained in the baseline section of the PEIR. This has been further expanded upon within the ES, with greater consideration of the associated mental health impacts of the proposed development both during construction and once operational. (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.66	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Table 8.4	The table outlines various study areas for consideration of health effects. Consider that for certain construction and operation effects (e.g. changes in demand for health services, changes in demand for public services / community facilities), the study should be broader than simply the Community Impact Area, but encompass the Core Study area instead. Similarly, the displacement of commercial uses is restricted to the Project Site Boundary, when effects may be more widespread than this.	The study areas have been reviewed as part of the ongoing EIA process and the justification for each of the study areas is provided in the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8). Catchment areas for community and healthcare facilities form part of the baseline consideration in relation to health effects and is used to inform the health assessment in the ES.
EDC.1.67	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.114	Potential effect of displacement or change in access to open space – the role of access to open space for elderly people from a mental health perspective (e.g. dementia sufferers) needs to be spelled out more clearly.	Mental health and wellbeing for the elderly population has been part of the consideration of health impacts and has been expanded upon within the ES Chapter 8 and assessment (document ref 6.1.8).
EDC.1.68	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.128	Potential changes to local traffic and transport and changes in use of active travel modes. More baseline data should be included in relation to mode of travel (active travel modes) for local populations at present	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) provides details on the walking and cycling connections proposed as part of The London Resort. The Active Travel strategy identifies any additional improvements required to provide a cohesive network.
EDC.1.69	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.137	Potential effect of increased flooding – refers to ‘site users’ having a high sensitivity to flood risk. Given that this is in relation to construction here, does this refer to construction workers? See earlier ref to including flooding	Likely effects are considered as part of the ES, the effects of increased flood risk are also covered as part of the Chapter 17 of the ES, Water and Flooding (document ref 6.1.17).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			in the operational assessment, and the reference to site users then makes more sense.	
EDC.1.70	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.138	Last sentence of this paragraph is somewhat tenuous.	Mental health and wellbeing were considered as part of the specific potential impacts identified in table 8.2 and as explained in the baseline section of the PEIR. This has been further expanded upon within the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8) which gives greater consideration of the associated mental health impacts of the proposed development both during construction and once operational in relation to all likely effects, not just in relation to flooding.
EDC.1.71	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.154	Potential effects of the presence of the construction workforce – should the health of the construction workforce be considered in its own right (at the moment the section reads as though it is more concerned about the impacts of the construction workforce on the local population in terms of poor lifestyle habits). What access to dedicated welfare / health facilities will the construction workforce have, or conversely what will the impacts be on community healthcare facilities.	The impacts of the construction workforce on the local facilities are considered as part of the construction related assessment presented in the ES. Welfare facilities and management of the construction workers are set out within the Construction Method Statement (CMS) (document ref 6.2.3.1).
EDC.1.72	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.154	Further potential effects of the presence of the construction workforce may relate to community safety – section should include crime levels / data in relation to anti-social behaviour potential.	This is considered in the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8) and based on evidence where data exists.
EDC.1.73	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.172	Potential effect of work and training opportunities. Query as to what plans London Resort might have for schools interventions as well as for older people looking to retrain.	Further detail is provided in ES Chapters 7 and 8 (document refs 6.1.7 and 6.1.8)
EDC.1.74	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.187	Potential health effects from a change in local traffic and active travel during the operational phase – need to ensure that children and pregnant women / parents with young children are included as more vulnerable groups due to their greater reliance on public transport.	There is crossover between the land transport and human health chapters in relation to active travel and modes of transport. Full detail and assessment is provided in the ES including identification of sensitive receptors (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.75	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.234	Potential effects from changes in community cohesion – query the relevance of overcrowding to the assessment of health effects in relation to community cohesion.	Noted, this is expanded on in the ES (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.76	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.247	States that ‘the effect of any such change in access would be adverse in the absence of mitigation.’ Not strictly true.	The worst case scenario that has been considered for the identified effect is explained and justified in the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.77	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.258	Refers to key health policy themes of adequate heating and insulation as well as under-occupation and overcrowding – not sure of the relevance of this to the assessment of displacement of residential dwellings.	Noted, additional context is provided within the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.78	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.261	Health impacts in relation to displacement of residential dwellings are identified as being temporary – but more likely to be permanent if we are talking about the loss of houses.	Noted, this is considered in the assessment contained in the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.79	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.319	In relation to inclusive design and access, the paragraph states that ‘the Applicant is (doing) all they can to ensure these policies will be in place from opening day onwards’. How can this be better secured?	Noted. Additional detail and requirements is provided in the Design and Access Statement (document ref 7.1)
EDC.1.80	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.328	States that ‘there will be also expected to be health benefits to dependents of staff working onsite’ Further clarification required.	Benefits to dependents include an increase in skills and incomes and the positive health benefits associated with work and training opportunities. These effects will in turn lead to beneficial effects in terms of improved health and wellbeing and incomes for housing and services. This is further expanded upon within the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.81	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.329 and 8.330	Why not permanent health effects?	Noted, these are considered as part of the assessment work provided in ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.82	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.335	Potential effects from a change in the demand for health services – noted that mitigation measures will be further considered as part of the work undertaken for the DCO application and reported in the ES. This is an area of particular interest.	This issue is considered and assessed fully within the ES and appropriate mitigation measures, where required, are set out to ensure adverse effects are minimised as far as possible (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.83	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.337	Potential effects from a change in the demand for public services and community facilities – this section only really makes reference to health services, which are already considered as part of the previous health determinant (access to health services). What impacts might there be on other public services and facilities?	This is covered in further detail as part of the relevant assessments in the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.84	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.348	Potential effects associated with open space provision and amenity space – paragraph includes the statement that ‘overall, the impact on the marshes is expected to be beneficial’. This may only be true from a recreational perspective.	Access to open space will have potential beneficial effects in relation to issues wider than recreation, namely health and activity and mental health and well-being. Further detail is provided within the ES, Chapter 8. (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.85	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.351	Potential effects from changes in community cohesion – further explanation required as to how community cohesion will be assessed and how an baseline can be established, particularly in an area where there is already a great deal of change from a planned housing growth perspective. The paragraph refers to ‘current quiet cohesiveness’.	Further detail is provided in ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.86	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.368	States that ‘the health assessment considers the residual effects of other EIA technical assessments, which limits the opportunities for further mitigation’. Not sure what this means?	The health effects have been based on consideration of the residual effects of the other assessments that form part of the ES Chapter 8, Human Health (document ref 6.1.8). The residual effects are those that remain once mitigation specific to that effect has been taken into account. These measures have been identified in the respective ES chapters and appropriately address the identified effects, minimising adverse effects as far as possible. The health assessment explains in greater detail the mitigation measures that have been identified and where, if any, there is a requirement for additional mitigation in respect to health issues.
EDC.1.87	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.370	Sets out a number of preliminary recommendations for the HIA which relate to areas of adverse impact identified. No recommendations or specific next steps identified in relation to impacts on healthcare and public / community services, which is an area likely to have a significant adverse effect in the absence of mitigation.	The ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8) clearly defines mitigation measures required as a result of the HIA.
EDC.1.88	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 8 Human Health Para 8.371	Query the meaning of the sentence ‘In the absence of mitigation, the significance of the effects remains unchanged from 0’? This appears to link to the methodological assumption in 8.21 i.e. this assessment only considers the residual effects post mitigation considered in other PEIR chapters – but the methodology and conclusions are unclear	The health effects have been based on consideration of the residual effects of the other assessments that form part of the ES. The residual effects are those that remain once mitigation specific to that effect has been taken into account. These measures have been identified in the respective ES chapters and appropriately address the identified effects, minimising adverse effects as far as possible. The health assessment in the ES explains in greater detail the mitigation measures that have been identified and where, if any, there is a requirement for additional mitigation in respect to health issues.
EDC.1.89	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Cumulative and In-combination effects	<p>Noted that assessing the cumulative impact of committed schemes is not required at this stage, but would be reviewed at the ES stage as per 8.373;</p> <p>However, query assertion that a separate assessment of the cumulative impacts to health committed schemes would risk double counting as the assessment of effects is inherently cumulative. It is understood that the evidence on which this chapter depends (derived from other chapters such as land use and socio economics) is based on future projections.</p> <p>In addition, there is scope for in-combination health effects to be experienced. No consideration given to residential amenity as a potential effect – this is as a result of impacts arising from noise, air quality and visual</p>	Cumulative effects are fully assessed as part of the ES and reported on within the cumulative effects chapter (document ref 6.1.21)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			amenity on the existing population. As an ‘in-combination’ effect, this could be referenced within the cumulative assessment, although it is interesting to note that no in-combination effects have been identified.	
EDC.1.90	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Next Steps	A further next step should relate to the incorporation of further information relating to the implications of Covid-19 – noted that currently this is thought likely to be a temporary concern, but obviously this could change / there may be longer-term implications which need consideration in the ES that are of relevance to design or operation.	Noted, Covid-19 has been appropriately considered within the ES Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8)
EDC.1.91	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Areas of further inclusion	Human health effects from water quality	There is cross-over between the water and flooding chapter (document ref 6.1.17) and the human health chapter (document ref 6.1.8) of the ES in relation to this issue. The request to consider the effect is noted and is reported on within the ES.
EDC.1.92	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Areas of further inclusion	Effects on human health from climate change	Noted, the consideration of climate is detailed in the ES chapter and is also addressed through the Greenhouse gas and climate change chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.93	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.3	Final part of para makes reference to ‘other chapters discussing other matters’. This is too general and doesn’t help the reader to be able to refer to specific areas that relate to this chapter.	Noted, the ES provides clear cross referencing between chapters.
EDC.1.94	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.7	It is understood that the information contained within Chapter 9 is preliminary and will be subject to change.	Noted.
EDC.1.95	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.12 & 9.15 etc.	Has the TA been published as part of the consultation documents? We presume not as 9.16 and 9.105 states that the TA will be submitted as part of the ES.	Noted, the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed in consultation with the relevant highways authorities. As noted, this has data and assumptions which are linked to the noise and air assessments (document ref 6.1.15 and 6.1.16) in addition to the transport chapters (document ref 6.1.9 and 6.1.10). Detailed Transport Technical Notes were issued to the EDC in June 2020 for feedback (none was received).
EDC.1.96	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.13 and 9.107 - 9.110	Given the seasonal variability of visitors at the Proposed Development, it is proposed that an 85th percentile assessment day is to form the basis of the land-based transport assessment. This approach is supported by KCC but the position of other relevant statutory consultees is unclear.	Noted, it is agreed that the EIA should assume the worst case scenario and the justification for the approach used in the assessment is clearly defined in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.97	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.28 - 9.32	<p>The proximity of the public transport network (PT) is promoted as a key criteria for choosing the site and there is an aim to capitalise on the proximity of PT services.</p> <p>What does this equate to in terms of PT mode share?</p>	<p>Noted, all mode share assumptions are clearly detailed and justified in the ES. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel.</p>
EDC.1.98	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.36	<p>Promotes water taxis as an advantage. What mode share is achieved by this mode of transport?</p>	<p>Noted, all mode share assumptions are clearly detailed and justified in the ES. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel.</p>
EDC.1.99	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.60, 9.64-9.67	<p>The methodology proposed for the ES follows a combination of IEMA guidance and DMRB.</p>	<p>The scoping comments have been reviewed and the methodology used in the assessment clearly defined and consistent with standard and best practice approaches.</p>
EDC.1.100	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.62	<p>Final sentence. <i>'As the Lower Thames Crossing.....cumulative effects... will be reviewed again in coming years.'</i> Does this imply that cumulative effects will not be studied or evaluated within the TA for this scheme?</p>	<p>Cumulative effects are assessed in accordance with the PINS guidance note on CEA and reported on within the cumulative effects chapter (document ref 6.1.21).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.101	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.63 & 9.126 - 9.127	<p>At 9.63 the PEIR states that it has been agreed with the Highway Authorities that traffic modelling "to support" the Proposed Development can use traffic flow information from the Lower Thames Crossing</p> <p>(LTC) traffic model "combined with" other sources as appropriate, including the A2 (T) Bean and Ebbsfleet cordon model (A2BE).</p> <p>It is unclear from the PEIR how traffic flow information from the LTC model is compatible with and will be combined with the traffic flow information from other models. (Refer also to our comments in response to 9.134 below.)</p> <p>At 9.126 to 9.127, the PEIR states that the traffic flow data from the A2BE and Lower Thames Area Model (LTAM) models¹ will be used "as a basis" to create a spreadsheet-based traffic model "to assess" the implications of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>It is unclear whether or not the proposed spreadsheet model will be limited to traffic flow data from the A2BE and LTAM models or whether it will also utilise traffic flow data from other sources.</p> <p>It is also unclear whether or not the proposed spreadsheet model will be used to undertake the assessment itself, or just as a source of input information.</p> <p>It follows that it is not possible to form an informed view on the role of the spreadsheet model in assessing the impact of the traffic associated with the Proposed Development across the wider highway network.</p>	Further detail is provided in ES Chapter 9 and supporting transport assessments (document ref 6.1.9)
EDC.1.102	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.63 & 9.112	<p>At 9.63, the PEIR asserts that the potential transport influence of the LTC "will be captured" within the model used to assess the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Para 9.112 explains that both the A2BE and the LTAM include most up to date development projections as well as other committed development forming part of the Local Plan(s) in the area.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered that "any effects resulting from the assessments based on the modelled value are cumulative."</p> <p>The approach to inherent cumulative impacts needs to be clarified and (if appropriate) justified.</p>	Detailed merge and diverge assessments for the A2 are included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). It should be noted that the vast majority of Resort traffic is outside of the peak hours. The Assessments undertaken take account of both with and without LTC.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.103	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.111-9.113 & Figs 9.2 and 9.3 – STUDY AREAS	<p>The PEIR provides that:</p> <p>The extent of the 'local' study area is shown on Figure 9.2 and is based on strategic traffic models used to assess the impacts of significant infrastructure projects in the locality of the Proposed Development i.e. A2BE and LTAM models.</p> <p>The extent of the 'strategic' study area is shown on Figure 9.3 and includes traffic links in the wider area considered essential for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The approach to study areas requires further clarification and justification.</p>	Noted, the ES clearly defines and justifies the study areas used within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.104	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.112 & Fig 9.2	<p>Figure 9.2 shows a series of highlighted road segments, in some cases unconnected. Even though this is being put forward as the local study area, the more local road network is omitted from Figure 9.2.</p> <p>While it is reasonable to expect that most visitors to the site are likely to come from some distance and arrive via the strategic road network employee trips are likely to be more local in nature and therefore the local roads in the vicinity of the development should be considered in more detail.</p>	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.105	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.113 & Fig 9.3	How are the strategic links outlined in Figure 9.3 being assessed, as a significant proportion of these fall outside of the model extent identified in Figure 9.2?	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.106	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.115 & 9.118	The PEIR is based on traffic count surveys carried out in 2014 and 2017 as survey work is currently hindered by Covid 19.	Comment noted, these matters discussed with key transport consultees - refer to Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.107	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.129	Given the likely impact on the strategic road network and proposed highway schemes, consideration should also be given to DMRB's LA105 and LA111 to identify and justify the relevant links to be assessed.	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.108	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.133	It might be reasonable to consider assessing another year as a combination of peak construction traffic combined with Gate 1 operational traffic, as this may form a worse-case scenario.	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.109	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.134	<p>Para 9.134 states that the 3 assessment scenarios (or years) in Para 9.133 will be "aligned with" the model years included in LTC model to provide peak time data.</p> <p>It is uncertain whether you plan to use the LTC model years as proxies for the assessment years proposed in Para 9.133, or whether you intend to adjust the LTC model years to reflect the proposed years, please clarify?</p>	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.110	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.134 & 9.135	<p>The PEIR states that the weekend time period to be assessed will need to be discussed further with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Given the leisure focus in combination with the size of the development, it is reasonable to expect that a Development Peak, or weekend period would also be assessed, as parts of the transport infrastructure will be impacted differently.</p> <p>The expected wide-scale influence on the strategic road network indicates that this additional period should not be treated as just a sensitivity test within the local area micro-simulation model.</p>	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.111	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.146	<p>Given the size of the proposed development, we would consider a quantitative assessment of WCH should be undertaken, especially with respect to the key corridors between nearby rail stations, bus stops and the development site entrances. It is important to understand how many people will be impacted by any proposed changes to WCH routes across the project boundary.</p> <p>WCH should also be considered during the construction phase as part of the construction management plan.</p>	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.112	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.150	All Personal Injury Accidents (PIA) should be considered in detail as part of the Transport Assessment, not just those involving NMUs. Please confirm?	Noted. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) includes a full personal injury accident analysis.
EDC.1.113	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.154 - 9.156	<p>It is reasonable to consider vehicle delay on the highway network as part of the TA.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation measures may also result in changes to traffic conditions that require environmental assessment</p>	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.114	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.157 - 9.158	Construction traffic, while typically lower than development operating traffic, will generally comprise of a higher proportion of goods vehicles with a resulting disproportionate impact on the surrounding area in terms of pavement wear, noise, etc. A construction peak scenario should be considered to account for the largest flow of construction related traffic that	Noted. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) define the construction traffic scenarios that have been assessed and these represent the worst case scenario.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>could also be coincident with Phase 1 operations, i.e. Post 2025. Refer also to comment at 9.133 above.</p> <p>Justification of the expected high proportion of materials delivery by river should also be provided.</p>	
EDC.1.115	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.165	This paragraph implies that only Highways England will be consulted regarding the approach to the proposed "spreadsheet model". We would expect other highway authorities and key stakeholders are also consulted. Refer also to our comments at 9.63 & 9.126-9.127 above.	Noted, consultation has been undertaken with a range of stakeholders in regard to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.116	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.197 & Fig 9.10	The extent of the proposed additional area to the north of the River Thames, is disproportionately small, compared to the area south of the river. It would be expected that an area up to and including at least the A13 would be required to understand the PIA history and trends.	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.117	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.330 - 9.332	Rail access is being promoted as a primary access mode to the development. We note discussions are ongoing, but will any capacity assessments be undertaken to confirm that the existing (and proposed) rail infrastructure can accommodate the additional patronage resulting from staff and visitors to the site?	The Public Transport Strategy details the existing provision and proposes mitigation where demand is likely to impact the networks. LRCH is in discussion with local rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy and determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort; details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information. Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe Station.
EDC.1.118	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.368	The meaning of the last sentence is not clear, please elaborate?	The approach taken to the assessment of effects and the consideration of mitigation is clearly defined in 9.368-9.370. This have subsequently been further defined in the ES and is in line with the guidance approach that has been followed for the assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
EDC.1.119	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.379	While this is likely to be the case, the statement will need to be backed up by the appropriate analysis and justification.	Noted, this has been clearly defined where relevant in the ES. (document ref 6.1.9)
EDC.1.120	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.389	<p>It is not expected that the Proposed Development would have a significant effect on air travel patterns.</p> <p>However, as per the 2020 Scoping Opinion, consideration should be given to potential air travel safety considerations resulting from the construction or operation of the Proposed Development.</p>	Comment noted, this has been addressed in the ES (document ref 6.1.9)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.121	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Transport Para 9.398	Are the rights of way currently running through the site maintained once the site is developed? Will access to the northern portion of the peninsula still be available from the west (e.g. Route DS1)?	Further information is available in the ES Appendix 11.9 Public Rights of Way Assessment and Strategy.
EDC.1.122	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	RIVER TRANSPORT	The PEIR does not contain cross references to the river transport chapter (10).	Noted, the ES chapters clearly cross reference where appropriate to document ref 6.1.10.
EDC.1.123	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Visitor Data – Access to Raw Data	<p>Overall, it is clear that the majority of the evidence base and information provided within the Technical Notes prepared by WSP has been derived from research and analysis carried out by other consultancies (ProFun, LDP and Volterra) who are stated as being theme park and attraction sector experts and are therefore likely to have greater levels of experience of this type of development than WSP.</p> <p>As a result of the above, it is evident that a significant amount of information has been analysed and provided within the WSP Technical Notes, which is based on the data provided by the other consultancies. It is stated that this involved the use of commercially sensitive data and standard practices to enable a robust estimate of the likely number of visitors expected at the Resort. Without access to this base data it is not possible to determine if the assessment and predictions for visitor numbers are considered sound.</p>	LRCH will review the disclosure of additional information, as part of the emerging DCO.
EDC.1.124	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Visitor Data - Discrepancies	Forecast visitor numbers shown in Tables 2-4 and 2-5 within TN1 are lower than those shown in Tables 10 and 11 contained in the SATD, which should represent the same information. It appears that the discrepancies relate to the forecast number of visitors to the hotels at the Resort. There is also a discrepancy with the date used for the 85th percentile day in 2038 between the two documents, although the visitor numbers are consistent for this forecast year. It is not clear why the visitor numbers for the hotels would vary between the two documents, so clarification should be obtained from WSP.	Comment noted, these matters are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.125	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Infrastructure – Requirements	The documents state that proposed transport infrastructure will be operational by 2024, including “the improved junction on the A2, new car park provision, the people mover between the Thames, Ebbsfleet International and the London Resort, and the enhanced bus services”. No further details are provided on this list of infrastructure improvements and the list does not include any mention of the Access Road. It is therefore unclear what transport infrastructure is currently being proposed by LRCH and how the access and management strategies will relate to anticipated visitor numbers.	Comment noted, this is addressed in ES Chapter 3 (document ref 6.1.3)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.126	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Infrastructure - Design	The proposed alterations to the A2 junctions include introducing a 5 arm roundabout. There is no evidence in the appraisal documents on how this meets with the design requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges or indeed Highways England. During the meeting of 9th September 2020 between EDC, LRDH and associated consultants, WSP indicated discussions were ongoing with Highways England and that the design arrangements proposed are likely to change. Nevertheless, clarity is required on the scale, and suitability of the proposals, both in terms of design and junction operation.	Comment noted, the design of the road layouts is subject to discussion with the relevant highways authorities.
EDC.1.127	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Assessment Years	Three assessment years are considered in the analysis (2025, 2029 and 2038), with various day types being considered (peak day, a peak weekday, the 85th percentile day and an average day). The identified assessment years are considered appropriate given that they are referenced as coinciding with park opening, full operation and reaching peak operation.	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.128	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Forecast Demand	<p>WSP are proposing, due to the seasonal variability of visitors at the Resort, that the 85th percentile day assessment scenario will be used for the traffic modelling. This means that peak days, which amount to 54 days of the year will not be assessed in the modelling. This raises the following concerns:</p> <p>Figures 2 and 3 within the SATD identify that the daily and weekly attendance trends predicted for the LR are expected to peak during the Easter school holidays and the summer school holidays. However, these figures suggest that the peak attendance during these periods is likely to include some weeks outside of school holiday periods. This therefore contradicts the WSP conclusions that peak days would occur at times that traffic levels on the highway network are typically lower.</p> <p>The date of the peak visitor day varies depending on which assessment year is reviewed however these all occur in July with most in early July. During this period school holidays have not commenced and as such the evidence in the appraisal documents suggests that the peak visitor days, and by connection peak car demand, will occur during a period outside of school holiday periods. This therefore again contradicting the conclusion that peak days would occur at times that traffic levels on the highway network are typically lower.</p>	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.129	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Sensitivity Testing	Given these findings, the scale and unique nature of the development for the UK, we would expect sensitivity tests to be included so as provide a comprehensive appraisal of the developments impact upon the highway network and that the conclusions in the technical notes are sound.	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.130	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Mode Share – Parking Demands	<p>As the predicted mode share for visitors and staff has largely been based on car parking capacities, the mode share for private vehicle trips reduces for peak days compared to the 85th percentile day to account for the maximum number of parking spaces available. However, it is not clear how the LR will manage the number of vehicle trips made to the site. This raises the following concerns:</p> <p>1.) How will access to the car park be controlled? Indication in the WSP documentation is that this can be controlled at the point of booking. Whilst this may be possible, clarity on the approach is required to ensure predictions are based on outcomes which can realistically be secured. For example, . when booking a ticket, does a parking space also have to be booked at the same time? WSP will need to provide further details on the Travel Plan measures and parking management proposals in order to confirm how parking and travel choices will be managed/controlled so as to back up their assumptions and forecasts.</p> <p>2.) How will LR avoid visitors parking outside of the resort? Whilst there can be a link between parking restrictions and use of travel modes other than the car, it is not automatically true that parking controls reduce the volume of car trips. For example, with such a significant trip attractor it may be that other parties see opportunity to develop a car park that could be used by LR visitors i.e. much as occurs around airports where offsite parking can often be priced more attractively than on site car parks.</p> <p>3.) It would appear difficult to control car travel and associated parking demand for the retail, dining and entertainment element when the visit is as a sole-purpose trip. It therefore needs to be clarified how will LR be able to manage the parking demand associated with these uses.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel. An off-site parking strategy has been written to outline the management of visitors parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)</p>
EDC.1.131	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Trip Travel Patterns - General	<p>There is no evidence that the mode share assessments completed give adequate consideration to when visitors will travel. The evidence in the documentation indicates the peak hour of departure from the site will be 22:00-23:00, whereas the departure peak used for the trip generation in Technical Note 1 is 21:00-22:00.</p> <p>The availability of public transport in the evening will influence how people travel to and from the site - not simply at the point of departure, but also any onward connections.</p> <p>The nature of the scheme will attract families. Transporting children on public transport so late at night is unlikely to prove attractive to many</p>	<p>These points are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>parents, which means that significantly more visitors may choose to travel by car than assumed under the current assessments.</p> <p>The availability of evening public transport and end user requirements is likely to alter the car mode share allowance accounted for within the current appraisal. These impacts need to be considered further.</p>	
EDC.1.132	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Trip Travel Patterns - Use of Incentives	<p>During the meeting of 9th September 2020 between EDC, LRDH and associated consultants, there was an indication that incentives such as food discounts will be provided to visitors in order to encourage them to stay at the Resort later so as to avoid them leaving during network peak periods. However, no details regarding these types of incentives are provided in any of the documents and no evidence or examples of this working have been provided. It is also unclear how this would alter the travel patterns that have been predicted for the assessment, as the departure peak period assessed is 21:00-22:00.</p>	The Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel.
EDC.1.133	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Mode Share - Use of Comparables	<p>In determining predicted staff and visitor mode share data for the Resort, it is evident that a number of existing resorts and other major trip attractors, such as shopping destinations and stadia were reviewed in order to provide a comparison with that predicted for the LR. Although it may be a fair conclusion that some of the sites selected have similar characteristics to the LR in terms of transport availability and their geographical location, we question how it was determined that sites such as Lakeside and Bluewater and the Birmingham NEC are deemed comparable to the LR in terms of their actual uses.</p>	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.134	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Discrepancies in Assumptions	<p>The resultant mode share used for all visitors to the LR has been split into three categories (private vehicle, coach and other/public transport). It should be noted that some discrepancies have been identified in the mode share and trip generation tables provided in TN1 (see above). Clarification should be sought on these discrepancies.</p>	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.135	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Vehicle Occupancy	<p>In relation to vehicle occupancy, WSP have forecast an occupancy of 3 people per private vehicle and 30 people per coach (60% of a standard coach being occupied). These occupancies are the same level as Thorpe Park, taken from Travel Surveys carried out in April 2017. It is unclear why data from only Thorpe Park has been used to determine the potential vehicle occupancies, when a series of sites have been utilised to determine mode share, including Thorpe Park.</p>	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.136	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Staff Vehicle Occupancy/ Travel Plan	In relation to staff travel vehicle occupancy levels, TN1 states that due to the limited number of parking spaces on site (500 spaces), the occupancy for staff has been assessed as two per vehicle. It also states that a parking space will only be available to staff members who car share and that this will be enforced through the Travel Plan. However, it is not clear how the implementation of a Travel Plan, and particular measures within it, would impact on the mode share of staff travelling to and from the Resort.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) has taken into consideration staff travel.
EDC.1.137	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Travel Plan and / or Management Strategy	No Travel Plan or Management Strategy documents have yet been produced for the LR therefore it is not possible to confirm that the aspirations of the technical notes produced can be achieved.	These points are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC), which sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel.
EDC.1.138	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Traffic Modelling	In terms of the proposed modelling methodology which will be undertaken as part of the Transport Assessment for the LR, TN1 states that data from the A2 Bean to Ebbsfleet (A2BE) traffic model and the Lower Thames Crossing Area Model (LTAM) will be used as a basis. It also states that observed count information from Highways England, local authorities or other sources will be used as a check on the information received from Highways England, as the model used a base year of 2016. It would be useful to understand what data will be used for the validation, taking into account the circumstances in relation to COVID-19 and the reliability of new survey data.	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.139	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Car Parking	The appraisal approach by WSP is such that car parking demand is intrinsically linked with mode share. Observations above under the mode share heading therefore apply here as well however additionally we are unclear of any appraisal that considers dwell time. This is an essential component of determining adequacy of car parking provision and that proposed by LR. Clarification on how dwell time influences occupancy and therefore adequacy of the 10,000 spaces is required.	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.140	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Other Trips	Reference is made to deliveries within the PEIR document, stating that the traffic generated through maintenance and deliveries for all on-site facilities will be considered when assessing the impacts of the LR. It is also mentioned that an Outline Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) will accompany the application, noting that most deliveries and (primarily waste) collections are anticipated to be made overnight. However, no mention of trips associated with deliveries has been made in any of the WSP Technical Notes and as such the scale of vehicle deliveries has not been identified.	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.141	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	London Resort Road	It should be noted that no detailed information regarding the access strategy for the LR is provided within any of the Technical Notes. This is necessary to determine the suitability of the arrangement proposed.	Comment noted. This is addressed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
EDC.1.142	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Para 11.19	The 6km search area is unlikely to be sufficiently broad given the scale of the Proposed Development. For some receptors, including the Kent Downs AONB, the range should be increased to up to 10km, as per the 2020 Scoping Opinion.	The search area has been reviewed. Full details in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11)
EDC.1.143	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Para 11.47	Given that part of the Proposed Development is situated within the Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone, consideration of seascapes should also be included.	The implications of the MCZ has been accommodated. Full details in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11)
EDC.1.144	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Para 11.59	The description of the skyline of Swanscombe Peninsula should be redefined to include chalk ridgelines with trees visible to the south, not just overhead power lines and pylons. The ES should reflect the importance of these features within the assessment of landscape and visual impacts.	Noted - please see wording in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11)
EDC.1.145	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Paras 11.66 - 11.69	The description of Essex project site needs to include reference to salt marsh and mud flats (these areas of ecological value are not unique to the Kent project site).	Noted - please see wording in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11)
EDC.1.146	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Paras 11.79 onwards	A clear description of the likely effects of the Proposed Development on the metropolitan Green Belt (which affects the southern area of the Kent project site) and areas of Ancient Woodland should be provided and how they will be assessed in the ES.	Noted - this is captured in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.147	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Paras 11.79 onwards	insufficient information to form a view on the visual impacts of lighting in connection with the Proposed Development. Light impacts will arise during both operational and construction stages of the Proposed Development and this is a significant omission. The assessment should have regard, in particular, to the light effects of the rides within the Proposed Development and the likely use of special effects at the Proposed Development. The ES should adopt the Rochdale Envelope approach to possible impacts of lighting and special effects, which are likely to include fluorescent lighting, flashing lights and pyrotechnics.	Please see ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11) and the Outline Lighting Strategy (document ref 7.9)
EDC.1.148	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Tables 11.6, 11.8 & 11.10	The landscape effect on the Kent level 'Western Thames Marshes LCA' is stated to be minor adverse at both years 1 and 15. Given that the site occupies the vast majority of the eastern section of the Western Thames Marshes LCA, it is considered that there would be a substantial adverse effect on this LCA, which is characterised by open, flat, undeveloped marshland. The magnitude of change on the Marshland LLCA is stated to be 'high' for both construction and year 1, but should be 'very high'. A clear breakdown of the sensitivity, magnitude of change and effect should also be set out for the LLCAs. Does not tabulate the magnitude of change or describe the nature of the proposed change on each receptor. No assessment of sensitivity, magnitude of change and effect on landscape components of the site, which should inform the type and extent of mitigation required.	Landscape effects set out in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11)
EDC.1.149	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Tables 11.7, 11.9 & 11.11	The assessment categorises the vast majority of public rights of way as medium visual sensitivity, rather than high sensitivity, contrary to the EDP methodology at Appendix 11.1. Tilbury Fort and Grays Riverside Park should also both be assessed as high visual sensitivity, rather than medium. Public highways which pass through rural countryside, including New Barn Road and Park Corner Road, should be assessed as medium visual sensitivity, rather than low. Does not tabulate the magnitude of change or describe the nature of the proposed change, i.e. loss of vegetation, introduction of new built form, resort rides and security fencing. This is a fundamental part of the assessment process and is key in understanding how the predicted effects were reached, particularly given the heights of the proposals. No clear indication of mitigation planting or where existing vegetation requires removal, therefore unclear how the severity of many visual effects will decrease between years 1 & 15.	Landscape assessment set out in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11)
EDC.1.150	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Figures 11.5 & 11.6	A ZTV with obstructions or visual barriers would provide a more accurate representation of theoretical visibility, than the current 'bare earth' model used. The range should also be increased from 6km to 10km, allowing further consideration or potential views from the Kent Downs AONB.	See the ZTV information in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11) and the model verification (document ref 6.3.16.6)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.151	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Figure 11.7	Photographs should identify the approximate extent of the site on each photograph to aid the viewer, particularly in long distance views where the location of the site is not apparent. As set out in our 2020 Scoping response, we would recommend additional viewpoints from a number of locations (including the approaches to the site via rail, road and river). A series of Night Photo Viewpoint Locations identified within Appendix 11.1, however these photographs did not appear to be submitted.	Photograph information is contained in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11) and the photo viewpoints (document ref 6.3.11.10)
EDC.1.152	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Figures 11.9 & 11.10	The Landscape and Ecology Initiatives Plan and Green Infrastructure Strategy are both focused on the main resort area, and do not show any mitigation proposals to the southern parts of the Kent project site, surrounding the road infrastructure works. Concern over the impact on the Ebbsfleet Gateway landscaping resulting from the A2 junction works. The overall areas of tree loss are not clearly shown and therefore it is not possible to understand where new tree planting is proposed to mitigate for existing losses. Furthermore there is no detail of mitigation planting required to screen the Resort and its boundary fence from surrounding public footpaths and marshland. No details of locations and extents of surface water attenuation and detention features, set out in para 11.152. Concern over potential impact on Ebbsfleet Central area.	Landscape proposals for Order Limits are in Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (document ref 6.3.11.15)
EDC.1.153	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Appendix 11.1	The assessment methodology should be based on the Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) methodology for highways projects (as well as GLVIA3), given the substantial sections of new road proposed.	Methodology and assessment is set out in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.11)
EDC.1.154	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Landscape Appendix 11.2	The Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment does not identify the trees in the vicinity of Springhead Bridge that are covered by a Tree Preservation Order (Tree Constraints Plan - sheet 5 of 11). Furthermore, the extent of tree losses are listed (including 13.08 hectares of Category B trees) but not identified on a plan, meaning that an informed view about the type and extent of mitigation tree planting required cannot be made.	The extent of trees is covered in the tree retention and removal plan (6.3.12.57)
EDC.1.155	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Illustrative Parameters Plans	One of the new hotel buildings is shown to be 128m high, which equates to approximately 40 storeys. will clearly be a prominent building, sitting substantially taller than any other buildings within the wider surrounding area. There doesn't appear to be any justification or design narrative for a hotel building of this height within Chapter 5 of the PEIR, particularly when the other hotels are much lower in height. Gate 1 resort area shown as up to 100m in places, which seems excessively high within such a flat & visually prominent area.	The parameters are explained in the Design & Access Statement (document ref 7.1)
EDC.1.156	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Surveys	We highlight that full botanical survey was not carried out over the whole site and instead detailed botanical surveys were carried out within areas identified during the Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey and an additional 8 rare plants were recorded during the updated surveys.	Details of surveys are contained in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.157	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Surveys	Records of Brown hare, hedgehog, pygmy shrew and weasel were identified during the data search but the ES states they will not be taken forward as an Important Ecological Feature. However we highlight that as no specific surveys have been carried out they may be present within the site and therefore impacted by proposed development and therefore should be considered within the submission. In addition we highlight that brown hare and hedgehog are priority species (under S41 NERC Act) and impacts to species of principal importance / BAP priority species are: <i>“Capable of being a material consideration in the...making of planning decisions.”</i> (paragraph 84, Government Circular (ODPM 06/2005))	Details of surveys are contained in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12)
EDC.1.158	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Surveys Bat Survey	Bat Surveys – it’s understood that internal examination of the buildings could not be carried out as a result of Covid 19 restrictions. But due to the size and type of the proposed development we would have expected emergence surveys to have been scheduled to ensure it was understood if and to what extent bats were roosting within the buildings to ensure the impact on roosting bats was fully understood. We highlight that the species interest of the site is so high due to the range of habitats present within the site including scrub, woodland , semi improved grassland, Coastal Grazing Marsh, Open Mosaic Previously Developed Land, Reedbed and open water.	Details of surveys are contained in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12)
EDC.1.159	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Classification of species/habitats	We have concerns with the conclusions of the report about the classification of the importance of the species/habitats within the site and we are off the opinion that for many of the species/habitats groups the conclusions are underrated.To demonstrate our point we have the following examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reptiles have been assessed as district level importance even through the presence of 3 species of reptile make the site suitable to be considered as a Local Wildlife Site. Therefore we would expect the reptile population to have been assessed as county importance. • Otters have been assessed as local importance but otters are not common within Kent and therefore the presence of otter is of note – therefore we would expect otter to have been assessed as at least county importance. • Waterbodies have it has been assessed as district importance and as it can be a priority habitat and within the LWS we query why it is not of county importance 	Classification of the species and habitats is contained in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.160	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Ecological Mitigation	<p>Limited information has been provided on what ecological mitigation is required to retain the ecological interest of the site and instead the report details that the following are the key mechanisms to implement the required mitigation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction and Environmental Management Plan • Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework Plan • Landscape and Ecological Management Plan • Green Infrastructure Strategy • Sustainable Drainage Scheme • Detailed Lighting Strategy. <p>We highlight that until all the ecological surveys have been completed and it is fully understood what is present on site it is impossible to fully understand what the impacts will be, what mitigation is required and if it is achievable. We advise that this information is required prior to identifying what mechanisms could be used to implement it.</p> <p>We highlight that when we refer to impacts we refer to both direct and indirect impacts. This includes (but not limited to) habitat loss, changes to habitat management, increase in noise, increase in lighting and increase in disturbance.</p>	Ecological mitigation is captured within the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12), and the Ecological Mitigation Framework (6.2.12.3). In addition, there is on-going dialogue with key stakeholders.
EDC.1.161	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Onsite Mitigation	The proposed development will result in the direct loss of habitat for the implementation of the proposed development and the remaining areas will be required to be multi-functional and provide Open Space for recreation and SuDS in addition to the ecological mitigation. Due to the loss of habitat, impacts from the proposed development (including noise and lighting) and the other requirements on the retained habitat (in particular recreation) we are concerned that, due to the ecological interest of the site, there will be a limit to the amount of ecological mitigation which can be implemented successfully on site and there will be a significant loss of biodiversity within the site.	Ecological mitigation is captured within the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12), and the Ecological Mitigation Framework (6.2.12.3)
EDC.1.162	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Multifunctionality of open spaces	We understand that due to the limited amount of space within development sites that open spaces do have to be multifunctional. However in these situations we would fully expect information to be submitted clearly demonstrating what the constraints on site would be and those requirements would not negatively impact the ecological mitigation.	Ecological mitigation is captured within the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12), and the Ecological Mitigation Framework (6.2.12.3)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.163	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Multifunctionality of open spaces	<p>The Swanscombe peninsula currently has limited recreational access so the site is largely undisturbed. The creation of walking trails within the site would encourage people to use the site and therefore result in an increase in disturbance within site and as such it may result in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in breeding bird species/numbers due to an increase in noise / light • Reduction in bat species/numbers due to increase in light (lighting may be required within the opens space area due to H+S) • Loss of habitat due to increase in trampling <p>Therefore we would fully expect any submitted information to fully assess the impact the proposal would have from an increase in recreational pressure.</p> <p>We highlight that the pressure from recreation would result from the proposed development and existing and proposed housing within the surrounding area.</p>	The marshes will have a management plan to ensure the additional activity is carefully controlled (document ref 6.1.12)
EDC.1.164	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Multifunctionality of open spaces	<p>Surface Water Drainage Features are required to prevent surface water flooding and therefore any SuDS Features will have to be managed in a way that means that they will remain operational. We agree that SuDS features can benefit biodiversity but there will be restrictions on the types of habitats that can establish within these areas and the management priority will be for surface water drainage not biodiversity. Therefore there will be limits on the mitigation which can be incorporated in to the SuDS scheme.</p> <p>We highlight that due to the proposed recreational usage of the site there may be requirements to avoid deep water bodies within the site for H+S reasons and therefore it may not be possible to retain existing habitat types or species present within the site.</p>	SuDS information is found in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12)
EDC.1.165	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Multifunctionality of open spaces	<p>The report has detailed that there will be a direct impact on Botany Marshes LWS designated sites due to alteration of hydrological regime through destruction of adjoining wetland but advised that the proposed mitigation is certain subject to design and implementation of suitable drainage and hydrological strategy. We highlight that the implementation of appropriate mitigation is not certain until it has been clearly demonstrated that an appropriate drainage and hydrological strategy can be implemented – we would suggest that until that point the proposed mitigation is uncertain at best.</p>	The approach to Botany Marsh has involved a range of specialists to ensure the ecological and hydrology issues are addressed (document ref 6.1.12)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.166	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Off Site Mitigation	<p>The submitted information has highlighted that due to the use of the site by wintering birds the proposed development will have a negative impact on South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI, Inner Thames Marshes SSSI , Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar/ SSSI and Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar and the mitigation is uncertain due to the requirement of off site mitigation.</p> <p>We highlight that as the proposal will result in likely significant effect on the designated sites there will be a need for any further information submitted to enable the determining authority undertake an Appropriate Assessment.</p>	The implications of the scheme on designated areas are contained in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12)
EDC.1.167	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Off Site Mitigation	<p>The submitted information has highlighted that there will be a need for off site species mitigation and we would expect information to be submitted demonstrating that suitable mitigation areas can be created within Kent and ideally the immediate surrounding area. We highlight that due to the size of any off site mitigation areas and the habitat creation requirements it may not be possible for the proposed designated sites and the species mitigation to be located within the same area. It must be clearly demonstrated that the mitigation can be implemented and retained in perpetuity.</p> <p>We highlight that we expect ecological surveys to have been carried out on the proposed off site mitigation areas. This will enable consideration of whether the proposed off site mitigation is appropriate and any requirements for habitat creation would not negatively impact any species currently present within the site.</p>	The strategy for dealing with off-site mitigation is set out in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12)
EDC.1.168	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Net Gain	<p>The submitted information has detailed that the applicant is proposing to implement Net Gain and detailed that the proposed development will result in a loss of 355 units however the Net Gain information has been submitted as a PDF rather than a excel Metric and therefore there it is difficult to interrogate the data to consider if we agree with the conclusions. To enable full consideration of this matter we would expect a excel Net Gain Metric and corresponding maps showing the locations of the habitats detailed within the metric. We highlight that the loss of habitat (in Net Gain terms) may be higher than 15%. In situations where Net Gain is proposed we would expect information to be submitted demonstrating that it can be implemented and retained in perpetuity</p>	The project's approach to net gain is set out in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12) and net gain plans (document refs 6.3.12.42 and 6.3.12.43)
EDC.1.169	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Cumulative Effects	Chapter 12 indicates that cumulative effects have not yet been assessed but will be reported in the full ES. These will need to be considered when the information is available.	Cumulative effects in ES Chapter 12 (6.1.12) and ES Chapter 21 (document ref 6.1.21)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.170	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 12 Other Comments	The applicant should ensure that the legislation and policy which is considered and referred to is the latest version. For example, paragraph 12.62 refers to NPPG, updated 2019 - the relevant PPG on the Natural Environment was updated in July 2020 and PINS Advice Note 7 which is referred to was updated in June 2020, Advice Note 9 was updated in July 2018, Advice Note 12 was updated in March 2018 and Advice Note 17 updated in August 2019.	Legislation and guidance is set out in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.12)
EDC.1.171	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Surveys	<p>The submitted report has detailed that the following surveys were carried out in 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saltmarsh fish survey; • Intertidal habitat survey; • Subtidal habitat survey; and • Marine Mammal survey <p>The following surveys have/will be carried out in 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intertidal fish survey • benthic survey • saltmarsh survey <p>As such a full suite of surveys to assess the impact on the Thames and associated habitats has not been completed this year and is not proposed to be carried out and no information has been provided demonstrating why the applicant is satisfied why the existing data from 2016 is still valid, especially as this chapter acknowledges that marine environmental and ecological conditions in the tidal River Thames are subject to change over time (para 13.36) and also it is recognised that there are internationally protected fish (including eel), marine mammals and birds present. The applicant needs to clearly demonstrate why they are satisfied that updates of the existing survey data are not required. Alternatively updated assessments should be carried out.</p>	Survey information detailed in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.13)
EDC.1.172	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Surveys	The submitted information details that there is a proposal for a wastewater treatment facility and the report states that it is assumed at this stage that the water discharged from the outfall of the waste treatment facility would meet any water quality criteria required for consent and that consequently, this has not been considered further (para 13.43). However we highlight that it must be considered if the proposed WTW would result in an increase in nutrients (such as phosphorus and nitrogen) within the water which may have an impact on the designated sites downstream. We advise that any submission must fully assess this potential impact and, if required, identify suitable mitigation.	the wastewater facility is addressed in ES Chapter on Water Resources (document ref 6.1.17) and ES Chapter on Materials and Waste (document ref 6.1.19) and Utilities Statement (document ref 7.6)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.173	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Ecological Mitigation	<p>Limited information has been provided on what ecological mitigation is required to retain the ecological interest of the site and instead the report details that the following are the key mechanisms to implement the required mitigation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction and Environmental Management Plan • Operational Environmental Management Plan • Sustainable Drainage Scheme • Detailed Lighting Strategy • Biosecurity Risk Assessment and Plan • Emergency Incident Plan 	Ecological mitigation is set out in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.13)
EDC.1.174	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Ecological Mitigation	<p>The chapter states that the following areas (which it presents as 'embedded' mitigation although we do not think this is correct) are being considered but no detail is provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an area of managed alteration to the flood defences and riverbank profile along sections of the Kent Project Site is to provide additional saltmarsh habitat to mitigate loss of habitat at the Ferry Terminal; • intertidal terracing to mitigate intertidal mud habitat loss; and • (if required) a project-specific Biosecurity Plan to limit the risk of introduction of nonnative species. Given the very high percentage (c95%) of construction material which the applicant proposes to bring to the site by boat we recommend that this is required. 	Ecological mitigation is set out in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.13)
EDC.1.175	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Ecological Mitigation	<p>We highlight that until all the ecological surveys have been completed, including further investigations such as the sediment quality analysis which the applicant says is to be carried out (para 13.60) and it is fully understood what is present on site and also until there is some greater certainty about the number of vessels which will be used in the construction of the project (see para 13.117, for example) and operation of the project (see para 13.181) it is impossible to fully understand what the impacts will be, what mitigation is required and if it is achievable. We advise that this is information is required prior to identifying what mechanisms could be used to implement it.</p>	Ecological mitigation is set out in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.13)
EDC.1.176	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Ecological Mitigation	<p>We would also highlight that information needs to be submitted by the applicant to inform an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats regulations and a Marine Conservation Zone ('MCZ') assessment as part of the marine licensing application process. We note that the applicant states that for submission of the DCO a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) report, MCZ Assessment and a Water Framework Directive report will be provided – these should be consulted upon prior to submission of the DCO, not just provided with the DCO.</p>	The shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (document ref 6.2.12.4) and the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.13)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.177	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Water Framework Directive Table 13.1	In relation to the Water Framework Directive, Table 13.1 of this chapter suggests that WFD Article 4.7 could allow implementation of schemes that cause deterioration in ecological status for reasons of overriding public interest. This is not the case – a number of other conditions must also be met, for example all practicable steps are taken to mitigate the adverse impact on the status of the body of water and the scheme's modification or alterations of the water body cannot for reasons of technical feasibility or disproportionate cost be achieved by other means which are a significantly better environmental option. The applicant should refer to Article 4(7) of the WFD.	Directive referred to in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.13)
EDC.1.178	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Water Framework Directive Table 13.1	Table 13.1 is also incorrect in referring to the Water Resources Act 1991 as containing the water pollution offence – this is now in the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. The applicant should check it is considering and referring to up to date legislation.	Regulations referred to in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.13)
EDC.1.179	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Para 13.51	The report states the following: <i>Intertidal terracing is also being considered as an option to mitigate intertidal mud habitat loss as it is difficult to provide new areas of intertidal mud and as such, intertidal terracing may be considered as an acceptable alternative</i> (para 13.51). We highlight that where mitigation is proposed for one species/habitat there is a need to consider if the proposed mitigation will impact other habitats or species. For example if the proposal to create terracing is implemented there is a need to understand the area to be impacted and then consideration of will it have an impact on the creation/retention of other habitat/species mitigation or other requirements. The proposed development site has a lot of constraints (not just ecology) and therefore there is a need to ensure that there is clear overarching understanding of what is required for all the constraints to ensure that whatever mitigation is required can be implemented and be achieved.	Ecological marine mitigation is set out in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.13)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.180	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Para 13.78	We advise that when assessing the impacts and considering what mitigation is required there must not be reliance of stating that habitats are widespread. For example the report states the following: <i>Construction activities in the intertidal area are likely to disturb sediment in the areas immediately outside the construction footprint and intertidal species may be disturbed or displaced. Some individuals may survive such a disturbance, but some may be subject to injury/mortality. However, similar intertidal habitats are widespread in the tidal River Thames and the number of invertebrate individuals affected are considered to be negligible in relation to the wider population</i> (para 13.78). There is a lot of development within the Thames area and therefore cumulatively the loss of small areas of intertidal habitat could have a significant impact on the area of habitat and associated species within the area. When the impact on any habitat is being assessed the submitted information must clearly set out the area of habitat to be lost vs the area of habitat within the surrounding area – there must not be a reliance on the fact there is other habitat elsewhere within the Thames	Ecological marine mitigation are set out the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.13)
EDC.1.181	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Ecological Mitigation	The report highlights that there will be impacts associated with vibration, noise, disturbance (from boats) and lighting.	the environmental effects on ecology are addressed in the ES, including Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13)
EDC.1.182	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 13 Cumulative Effects	The chapter recognises that cumulative impacts need to be assessed but that has not been done yet. This is an important area that must be addressed and considered fully.	Cumulative effects set out in ES Chapters (documents ref 6.1.13 and 6.1.21)
EDC.1.183	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Temporary rights and access to land	Temporary rights and access to land – mapping of designated and non-designated heritage assets needs to be undertaken and safeguards put in place to ensure damage is not inadvertently caused	The Cultural Heritage ES Chapters sets out the various assets (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.184	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 4 Para 4.46	The Bakers Hole SSSI should also be considered in the Cultural Heritage section in terms of its Palaeolithic archaeology and the need to consider geological evidence to understand Palaeolithic archaeology	Referred to in the Cultural Heritage chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.185	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Para 5.23	The Kent project site 5.23 onwards should include description of cultural heritage.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.186	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Para 5.32	Welcome recognition of 1965 ‘super pylon’ as a local landmark but it also needs to be considered as an industrial heritage asset, in terms of views and setting etc.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.187	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Para 5.45 & 5.57	5.45 Land remediation proposals and 5.57 landscaping should be assessed for archaeological impacts.	These matters are captured in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.188	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Para 5.63 & 5.68	5.63 people mover and transit interchange and 5.68 access route - impacts on archaeological remains should be noted.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.189	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Para 5.75	5.75 river transport – heritage assessment of proposals at Bell Wharf is needed and appropriate mitigation.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.190	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Para 5.76 & 5.77	5.76 flood defence and 5.77 habitat improvement – archaeological impact assessment and appropriate mitigation is needed.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.191	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Para 5.66	5.66 construction activities – need for archaeological investigations has been noted but there is also a need for archaeological evaluation, impact assessment and mitigation through design first.	See Construction Method Statement (document ref 6.2.3.1) and ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.192	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5	Written schemes of investigation and Construction practice codes should also be agreed before consent is granted. The Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Transport Management Plan need to take full account of archaeological impact assessment and mitigation requirements.	See Construction Method Statement (document 6.2.3.1)
EDC.1.193	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 5 Fig 5.4	Fig 5.4 Land use plan - the whole of Bakers Hole SSSI/SM and adjacent nationally important non-designated Palaeolithic archaeology is shown as resort access – this introduces too much flexibility and uncertainty into the proposals and should be amended to show the agreed route.	See People Mover Route report (document ref 6.2.14.5)
EDC.1.194	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 6 Table 6.1	Ch 6 Scope of EIA and methodology Table 6.1 should be amended to include nonWorld Heritage Site internationally important heritage assets – the latter is based on political decisions not significance thresholds. Expert professional judgement should be used. Table 6.1 should also be amended for all levels of sensitivity to include nondesignated heritage assets as possible sensitive sites, see NPPF para 194 footnote 63. Again professional judgement should be used.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.195	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Para 9.390	Mitigation measures should be agreed with LPAs and statutory consultees before submission of the DCO. The ES should clearly describe any such measures, their likely efficacy and how they would be secured and delivered.	Mitigation measures discussed with Historic England and Natural England. See ES Chapter (6.1.14)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.196	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 9 Fig 9.5	Fig 9.5 – should include other important heritage assets.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.197	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 10	As noted above the impact on heritage assets at Bell Wharf needs to be assessed including from dredging.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.198	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11	Landscape and visual effects – Landscape Strategy document including planting proposals should take account of heritage assets. The landscape character assessment should take account of historic landscape character which at the moment it does not seem to include. The site is referred to as brownfield or having previous industrial use but the industrial heritage character needs to be assessed further.	Landscape strategy has been prepared alongside the heritage assessments (document ref 6.2.11.7)
EDC.1.199	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Table 11.4	Table 11.4 should include Springhead Roman town, St Botolph’s Church, All Saints Church, Northfleet historic town, and Swanscombe peninsula super pylon.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.200	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 11 Fig 11.2	Fig 11.2 - should include nationally important non-designated archaeological assets.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.201	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 14	It is not possible to comment on most of Chapter 14 or to develop an informed view of the likely environmental effects of the Proposed Development (and of any associated development) until the baseline assessment has been updated and the field evaluations carried out. In the absence of up to date information in the statutory consultation, a draft of Chapter 14 should be provided to the local authorities and statutory consultees for comment before it is finalised.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.202	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 14	Chapter 14 - the draft Archaeological desk-based assessment and the draft deposit model etc will need to be updated as noted above and stated in 14.3. The potential for survival of important industrial heritage remains should be considered in more detail rather than just assuming that recent industrial use will mean their wholesale removal. Further assessment by an appropriately qualified specialist will be required. Draft reports should be provided prior to submission of the DCO. It is disappointing that archaeological field evaluation has not yet been completed and reported on as this would allow consultees to develop an informed view on the cultural heritage and archaeological impacts of the Proposed Development. Draft reports should be provided prior to submission of the DCO.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.203	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 14 Para 14.6 - 14.8	14.6-14.8 (study area) - the 1km and 5km study areas appear arbitrary rather than being informed by the extent of the likely impact. For example, KCC's Specification for Desk-based assessment for areas with known Palaeolithic potential suggest that a 3km study area may be appropriate for Palaeolithic remains. The study areas should be tailored to take into account nuances in geology and topography, as per the 2020 Scoping Opinion	Study area explained in the ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.204	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 14 Para 14.8	14.8 - the ZTV and the locations of all designated and undesignated heritage assets need to be shown on detailed maps having regard to the comments made here and in the 2020 Scoping Opinion.	ZTV information provided (document ref 6.2.11.8)
EDC.1.205	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 14 Para 14.51 - 14.57	<p>14.51 -14.57 - as per the 2020 Scoping Opinion, the relevant law, policy and guidance section should be updated to refer to the following:</p> <p>International Agreements The Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe 1985</p> <p>National legislation The Protection of Military Remains Act 1986</p> <p>Relevant guidance KCC standard specifications for archaeological work (copies attached to the email) Historic England 2015 – Geoarchaeology: Using Earth Sciences to Understand the Archaeological Record Historic England 2020 - Deposit Modelling and Archaeology: Guidance for Mapping Buried Deposits</p> <p>The ES should include appropriate referencing sufficient to identify relevant source materials used to inform the assessment of significant effects.</p> <p>Palaeolithic desk-based assessment - more detailed assessment of impacts including sections, at the southern end of the people mover, transport access and transit interchange is required.</p>	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14) for relevant guidance
EDC.1.206	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 14 Para 14.125	<p>14.125 - in accordance with the 2020 Scoping Opinion, the assessment of impacts to archaeology in sub-tidal or inter-tidal areas should be informed by robust information.</p> <p>A comprehensive programme of inter-tidal walkover survey, marine geophysical and geotechnical investigation utilising the technology set out in the 2020 Scoping Opinion should be employed to consider impacts to archaeological features and deposits below Mean High Water Spring level.</p>	See ES Cultural Heritage Chapter (document ref 6.1.14) and ES Chapter on Marine Ecology (6.1.13)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.207	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 14 Para 14.225	The ES should also consider the effects of the long-term inaccessibility of archaeological sites caused by the Proposed Development	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.208	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 14 Fig 14.1 & 14.3	Fig 14.1 and 14.3 - Swanscombe skull SSSI and NNR should be included on plan of Kent heritage assets	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.209	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 14 Fig 14.3 to 14.7	Figs 14.3 to .7 need to be updated.	See ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.210	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18	Ch 18 - the impact of the proposals on the geological significance of Bakers Hole SSSI does not seem to have been assessed in this chapter or elsewhere in the PEIR. The assessment should take account of the fact that geological character and value contributes to Palaeolithic significance also.	Baker's Hole is captured in ES Chapter (document ref 6.1.14)
EDC.1.211	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Para 15.3	No mention of park activity noise in this initial setting out of impacts. Park activity noise is likely to be a significant issue if not adequately controlled associated with 77,000 people per day accessing this park. However, later review of the document details that to a degree this forms a facet of the assessment.	Noted, as discussed in the PEIR, this forms part of the noise assessment presented in the ES. (document ref 6.1.15)
EDC.1.212	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Table 15.1	Commitments made to consider aspects raised by PINS in the ES and DCO application, assumed due to the level of information available at the time of the PEIR being insufficient and still under development.	Noted
EDC.1.213	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Para 15.3 & 15.4	These paragraphs state that consultation with the LPAs and others, including EDC, will take place 'during the course of assessment work leading up to the ES and DCO application.' This consultation was not undertaken as part of the preparation of the PEIR and has not occurred to date.	Noted, and consultation undertaken (document ref 6.1.15)
EDC.1.214	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Baseline Noise Level Study— 15.15 to 15.43	We fully understand the challenges faced by the applicant in quantifying a relevant baseline for the development in the current noise climate, and appreciate the steps the applicant has taken in trying to work round this problem in the production of the PEIR in the way they have. However, although the methods used in the PEIR are acceptable at this point due to the COVID-19 situation, they are not sufficient to support the ES. Specific consultation with the LPAs and EDC needs be undertaken in the production of the ES to agree a robust and proportionate consideration of the baseline noise climate on and around the site and the locations at which this will be measured to robustly quantify the baseline, the cornerstone of the assessment.	Noted, and consultation undertaken (document ref 6.1.15)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.215	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Para 15.42	<p>Generally accepting of the proposals for construction modelling and assessment.</p> <p>However, the plant assumed to be used for the earthworks, paving, piling and general construction seem limited based upon the size and complexity of the project. We accept that the detailed construction information is likely to not be available until later in the project and as such the construction study supporting the ES will need to take full account of the construction programme information to ensure that any impacts are recognised fully.</p>	Noted, the construction scenario has been further developed to ensure a robust assessment can be undertaken and this will be supported by the CMS. (document ref 6.2.3.1)
EDC.1.216	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Para 15.72	<p>This is a large site and construction is identified over 6 main phases covering a long timeframe. Each of the six phases identified in paragraph 15.70 should be assessed rather than just 2020, 2038 and 2 “slice years”, with effects during each phase considered against the receptors anticipated at that phase. For example, the impact upon the operation of Gate 1 of Gate 2 being constructed should be assessed.</p> <p>It is accepted that this was not possible in the PEIR but by the time of the ES this information should be available and where each phase is not considered justification should be given.</p>	Noted, the construction scenario has been further developed to ensure a robust assessment could be undertaken and this will be supported by the CMS. (document ref 6.2.3.1)
EDC.1.217	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Para 15.73	Note that at this point in the drafting of the PEIR (July 2020) the assessment excludes building services noise and maintains baseline noise levels from rail sources unchanged.	Noted
EDC.1.218	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Para 15.83 - 15.86	<p>It is accepted that noise from screams would be dominant relative to the attractions, however, these would be impulsive with periods in between where screaming was not happening but “mechanical” noise from the rides may be apparent.</p> <p>There is no reason why in the noise model should not also include engines, gearboxes and other static noise generating equipment to consider the “whole” noise of the ride – the static plant aspect of the rides is being largely ignored in the methodology proposed.</p> <p>As such the methodology proposed to consider scream noise as Lmax levels</p>	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.15)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>is accepted, however, the whole noise from the ride (screams, mechanical etc) should also be considered in the ES against an accepted time base.</p> <p>Paragraph 15.86 notes that noise from cheers, shouts and music generated by the proposed rides will be dependent to some degree on the final selection and design of the facilities, their placement and orientation on site. As the applicant notes in chapter 1 of the PEIR the parameters for the proposed development should be sufficiently detailed to enable a proper assessment of the likely significant environmental effects, in line with Advice Note Nine: Using the Rochdale Envelope issued by PINS (July 2018, v3) and should be on a worst case scenario basis (as noted in paragraph 15.69 in relation to construction uncertainties.)</p>	
EDC.1.219	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Para 15.100 - 15.101 Operational noise from external event spaces	<p>The park is likely to operate amplified music to some degree on all open days, this is likely to be vastly in excess of 12 days per year.</p> <p>As such we do not agree that LA90 +15dB would be acceptable based upon the likely number of events and open days per year at the resort.</p> <p>The implementation of a limit of this nature is highly likely to result in complaints and be unacceptable to local residents. The LPA would be unlikely to accept this as a limit based upon the number of occurrences likely to be associated with the resort and therefore alternative limits for activity noise should be considered based upon the a much higher number of operational days per year.</p>	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.15)
EDC.1.220	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Table 15.18	Excludes activity noises associated with the resort. Not presented in the table currently	Noted, this has been addressed in the ES Chapter 15 (document ref 6.1.15)
EDC.1.221	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Figure 15.6	<p>Figure 15.6 is presented as a change contour.</p> <p>It would have been helpful to the reader to see the operational noise map to demonstrate the areas identified in the model as sources relating to vehicles, car parks, trains, activity noise etc. this is not clear from the image in 15.6 which is purely change.</p>	Noted.
EDC.1.222	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Figure 15.7	<p>Confirmation necessary as to whether this map is just vehicles accessing the car park or if it includes consideration of noise generated within the carpark.</p> <p>The only aspect of the resort on the north side of the River Thames is the car park and as such the impacts of this need to be fully considered including noise from the actual car park usage and not just vehicles accessing the facility.</p>	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.223	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Figure 15.8	<p>The plan would have benefitted from a clearer identification of where receptors are to consider the noise contours and the levels at these receptors to corroborate the conclusions presented in the following text.</p> <p>The contours are limited to Lmax levels associated with screams. We would also consider that LAeq,T noise from the site should be considered accounting for time corrected screams and mechanical noise from rides as well as noise associated with collections of people and piped music. Whilst we accept that this would require some lateral thinking to achieve, it is possible and should be undertaken to fully consider activity noise within the park and not to unduly dismiss what could be significant cumulative noise at the nearest sensitive receptors</p>	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.15)
EDC.1.224	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 15 Noise Para 15.151	<p>The chapter text does not “clearly” present this information, the report presents a qualitative assessment based upon a number of assumptions and recommends BPM.</p> <p>We accept that detailed construction information is rarely available at the PEIR stage and that more detailed assessment will inform the ES. However, at this point in time we feel that this statement could be misleading to the general public reading the chapter.</p>	Noted, the construction scenario has been further developed to ensure a robust assessment can be undertaken and this will be supported by the CMS. (document ref 6.2.3.1)
EDC.1.225	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Mitigation	No discussion of mitigation measures that would be implemented or investigated to control operational noise, limited to BPM construction mitigation – only mitigation of construction noise is discussed in the PEIR. The conclusions section (15.167) does not clearly record whether there are likely significant adverse effects caused by ride and scream noise or traffic noise, nor what mitigation is proposed.	Noted, likely significant effects are clearly identified in ES Chapter 15. (document ref 6.1.15)
EDC.1.226	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Mitigation	Draft DCO Requirement 9 states that “The noise level for the construction works measured at a noise sensitive receptor must not exceed Leq, 12hour 75 dB(A) wherever practicable, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the relevant planning authority.”	Noted. (document ref 6.1.15)
EDC.1.227	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Mitigation	Draft DCO Requirement 10 sets out the requirement for a scheme for monitoring noise during the operational phase, however, does not describe what action would be taken if monitoring were to identify that effects are greater than those set out in the ES	Noted, this has been addressed in more detail in ES Chapter 15 and associated documents. (document ref 6.1.15)
EDC.1.228	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Mitigation	Draft DCO Requirement 11 sets out the requirement to undertake further noise assessment should complaints for noise nuisance be received. However, does not describe what action would be taken if the assessment were to identify that effects are greater than those set out in the ES	Noted, this has been addressed in more detail in ES Chapter 15 and associated documents. (document ref 6.1.15)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.229	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Cumulative	Cumulative impacts especially with regard to major schemes in the area, including Ebbsfleet Garden City, needs to be considered in the setting of the future noise climate to adequately understand the future impacts of the resort – this has not been done in the PEIR.	Cumulative effects have been fully assessed in accordance with the PINS guidance note on CEA and reported on within the cumulative effects chapter. (document ref 6.1.21)
EDC.1.230	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.11	Given the size of the potential impacts and the use of the IAQM screening criteria could the Traffic Reliability Area be defined as the traffic changes are likely to get triggered some distance from the development, will the traffic model be capable of reliably assessing against the IAQM criteria.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.16)
EDC.1.231	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.16	EFTv10 now released.	Noted.
EDC.1.232	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.18	If two sources of backgrounds are being used this could lead to inconsistencies, why wouldn't the background maps be adjusted against local monitoring data as necessary as is best practice.	Noted, this has been reviewed and the best approach in line with established practice adopted and full justification for this approach provided in ES Chapter 16. (document ref 6.1.16)
EDC.1.233	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.20	Would be good to spell out what this entails e.g. DMRB type approach subject to any adjustments to DRMB figures recommended in the Scoping Opinion 2020	Noted, further detail has been provided as part of the ES Chapter 16. (document ref 6.1.16)
EDC.1.234	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Operation	No detail on how an assessment of impacts of the development in compliance with the EU Directive will be undertaken.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.16)
EDC.1.235	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.29	This may not be a definitive list of receptors – the list needs to be reviewed once traffic data has been received.	Noted.
EDC.1.236	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.35	Does this then follow that existing receptors where there are exceedances will also be considered significant?	Noted, terminology has been clearly defined within the ES Chapter 16 (document ref 6.1.16) to ensure that the reader is able to understand the justification the receptors and significance.
EDC.1.237	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.52	AQMAs in 16.2	Noted.
EDC.1.238	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.87	Road traffic emissions from construction not referenced	Noted, construction related air quality emissions includes consideration of construction related traffic movements. (document ref 6.1.16)
EDC.1.239	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Baseline	No confirmation that the baseline monitoring is sufficient to undertake the assessment. Northfleet Industrial; AQMA is designated over the site any relevant receptors in this location and is there a need to undertake additional particulate monitoring in this area?	Noted, further detail has been provided as part of the ES chapter. (document ref 6.1.16)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.240	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.74	Indicates that a Dust Management Plan will be prepared. How will this be secured as this is not mentioned as forming part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan that forms part of requirement 7.	The Dust Management Plan forms part of the Construction Management Strategy (CMS) (document ref 6.2.3.1)
EDC.1.241	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.74	There is no information provided about how these measures will be secured, and air quality or dust are not mentioned in the draft DCO. Will they be included as an item to be covered in the CEMP?	The construction mitigation measures form part of the Construction Management Strategy (CMS) (document ref 6.2.3.1)
EDC.1.242	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.77	If required, will monitoring also be part of the mitigation proposals, to ensure that they are effective?	Noted.
EDC.1.243	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 16 Air Quality Para 16.77	Evidence in relation to landscaping and zero emission technology (to avoid combustion plant) being a viable mitigation measure will be required if it is proposed to be utilised.	Noted, further detail has been provided as part of the ES Chapter 16.(document ref 6.1.16)
EDC.1.244	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk Para 17.4	The NPPF, 2018 is referred to – this is not the latest version of the NPPF	Noted, this has been updated in the ES Chapter 17. (document ref 6.1.17)
EDC.1.245	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk Para 17.32	Reference is made to Zone 1 depicting a <1 in 100 year probability – this is incorrect; Zone 1 is <1 in 1000	Noted (document ref 6.1.17)
EDC.1.246	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk Para 17.33	This paragraph acknowledges that the NPPF PPG also includes policy requirements linked to water supply, wastewater and water quality but only selectively quoting these requirements.	Noted (document ref 6.1.17)
EDC.1.247	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk Para 17.35	Reference to Dartford Development Policies Plan (2015) - this document was adopted in July 2017.	Noted (document ref 7.4)
EDC.1.248	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and	Paragraphs provide a description of existing flood defences at the Kent project site. No details of defence condition or TE2100 policy direction are provided.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES & FRA work (document ref 6.1.17)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		Flood Risk Para 17.119 - 17.120		
EDC.1.249	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk Para 17.125 - 17.126	Paragraphs provide a description of existing flood defences at the Essex project site. No details of defence condition or TE2100 policy regime are provided	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.17)
EDC.1.250	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk Para 17.36	WFD objectives for Thames Middle WFD waterbody are described.	Noted (document ref 6.1.17)
EDC.1.251	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk Para 17.87	The paragraph describes Water Framework Directive cycles and data availability, referencing cycle 1 and cycle 2.	Noted (document ref 6.1.17)
EDC.1.252	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk Para 17.143	This paragraph acknowledges that the FRA and drainage strategy should make an allowance for climate change.	Noted, the Water Resources and Flood Risk chapter of the ES has assessed in accordance with the FRA undertaken for the London Resort project. The basis for the calculations has been fully defined and justified and in line with guidance and best practice. (document ref 6.1.17)
EDC.1.253	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk Table 17.9	This paragraph provides information on the proposed assessment of cumulative and in-combination effects but does not specify a study area for the cumulative assessment.	Noted, the ZOI has been determined and cumulative effects are assessed on this basis and reported in the cumulative chapter of the ES. (document ref 6.1.17)
EDC.1.254	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	General	Aspects relating to Soils and Hydrogeology are not included within the PEIR. These aspects have not been scoped out and therefore relevant information should be included in all sections of the chapter and assessment undertaken. Further comments provided in Scoping Report review	Noted, further detail has been provided as part of the ES Chapter 18. (document ref 6.1.18)
EDC.1.255	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	General	Drawings to show baseline features e.g. superficial / bedrock geology and sources of contamination would benefit the reader and understanding of the ES. Spatial drawings showing areas of contamination identified by the investigations would also be beneficial due to the size of the site.	This information is contained within the appendices that support the ES Chapter 18. (document ref 6.1.18)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.256	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions Para 18.9	Consultation should be undertaken with all appropriate stakeholders during the EIA process to seek approval of the process being undertaken e.g. Local Authorities (contamination), Natural England (SSSI / Soils) and EA (Hydrogeology)	The PEIR provided a summary of the consultation taken up to the point of the consultation process. Engagement and consultation has been ongoing since this time and the full details of consultation and outcomes is provided in the ES Chapter 18. (document ref 6.1.18)
EDC.1.257	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions Para 18.12	This paragraph states - in principle no additional intrusive site investigation would be needed prior to DCO submission It is unclear if further investigation would be undertaken after submission but before DCO being granted.	Noted, the text has been clarified within the ES Chapter 18. (document ref 6.1.18)
EDC.1.258	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions Para 18.37	The NPPF is not quoted entirely accurately.	Noted, this will be amended in the ES chapter. (document ref 6.1.18)
EDC.1.259	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions Para 18.40	EA CR11 guidance is referred to but the EA issued an updated to this in June 2019 - Land contamination: risk management	Noted, this has been updated in the ES chapter. (document ref 6.1.18)
EDC.1.260	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions Para 18.41	A description of each Zone is provided and drawings are included in the Appendices. It would benefit the reader, if a description of what element / construction of the Proposed Development is occurring in each Zone so the impact of contamination present can be fully understood / assessed.	Noted, further detail has been provided as part of the ES Chapter 18. (document ref 6.1.18)
EDC.1.261	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions Table 18.6 / 18.7 / 18.8	A brief summary is provided of the previous investigation undertaken in each zone. Contaminants of Concern are present in some zones but no additional details provided (e.g. organic / inorganic). No comment is provided about gas monitoring data and if high levels are present around the existing landfills / limited groundwater quality data provided. Details of the assessment criteria used to determine of exceedances of soils / groundwater should be included to demonstrate the relevance to the Proposed Development.	Noted, further detail has been provided as part of the ES Chapter 18. (document ref 6.1.18)
EDC.1.262	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions Para 18.58	Bakers Hole (geological) SSSI is detailed as a receptor but few details are provided within the baseline section.	Noted, further detail has been provided as part of the ES Chapter 18. (document ref 6.1.18)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.263	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions Para 18.58	Botany Marsh is detailed as a key area of interest by EA. It is not included in baseline or as a receptor.	Noted, further detail has been provided as part of the ES Chapter 18. (document ref 6.1.18)
EDC.1.264	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions Para 18.86	Para 18.86 states that a code of Construction Practice will be employed. Is this referring to the Construction Environmental Management Plan secured through requirement 7 of the draft DCO?	Noted, the terminology used is consistent in the ES Chapter 18. (document ref 6.1.18)
EDC.1.265	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.2	Third paragraph refers to materials effects and paragraph 19.1 refers to materials management	Noted, the terminology used is consistent in the ES Chapter 19. (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.266	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.3	<p>This paragraph states that the “chapter focuses on operational as well as excavation, demolition and construction waste from the Proposed Development” and that “the materials management assessment focuses on the construction stage”. This indicates that there is a separate materials management assessment outside the scope of the chapter.</p> <p>This also implies that material consumption during operation is not within the scope of the assessment but it is not clear.</p> <p>The Scoping Opinion (ID 4.12.1) states that the Inspectorate does not agree to scope out materials consumed during operation.</p>	This is addressed in the ES (document 6.1.19)
EDC.1.267	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Table 19.1, 2014 Scoping Opinion Section 3.85	The Secretary of State requested that that the assessment accounts for materials to be removed from the site and to identify where potential traffic movements would be routed. The applicant responds in this chapter that this will be addressed in the ES and SWMP. There is no mention of how traffic movements associated with waste will be handled in the assessment	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.268	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Table 19.1, 2014 Scoping Opinion Section 3.86	The SoS requested that the ES should describe the method used to calculate the likely cut and fill balance of material. The PEIR states that “Excavation waste will be estimated following the cut and fill design.” but provides no method. The applicant responds in this chapter that this will be addressed in the ES and SWMP.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.269	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Table	The SoS requested that “The interrelationship between the chapter on waste and these other chapters should be clearly explained in the ES and cross referenced, where appropriate.” The PEIR only states that “interactive	Noted, this has been provided in detail within the ES, where it has been considered as part of the individual

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		19.1, 2014 Scoping Opinion Section 3.87	effects with other EIA chapters such as transport, air quality and water quality have been assessed.” with no clear explanation of the nature of their relationships. The applicant responds in this chapter that this will be implemented in the ES chapter.	topic assessments and also addressed through the cumulative chapter. (documents ref 6.1.19 and 6.1.21)
EDC.1.270	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.10	The PEIR states that the study area “includes three different areas of Kent, Essex and Thurrock.” Study areas are likely to vary according to the aspect of the assessment. The study area of the materials assessment is not clearly defined and usually differs significantly to the waste assessment.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.271	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.11	The PEIR states that “assessment considers waste generated within the Project Site and the effects that it may have on waste management infrastructure at local and regional levels.” It is not clear how effects will be measured at both the local and regional levels. Considering the effects of waste on local waste management infrastructure will produce a very different level of effect compared to effects on regional infrastructure.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.272	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.13	No specific data sources are provided.	Noted, all sources are fully referenced in the ES. (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.273	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.15	No details on the methodology which will be used to calculate waste generation figures.	The methodology used in calculating waste generation is clearly defined in the ES Chapter 19. (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.274	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.17	It is acceptable to include details on excavation materials within the soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions chapter. However, an estimation of the excavated materials should be included within this chapter and the SMWP.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.275	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.18 - 19.20	No mention of construction, demolition, excavation and decommissioning waste is provided in the Assessment of Effects section.	Noted, the effects of all phases of the Proposed Development has been considered and addressed. (document ref 6.1.19)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.276	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Table 19.2	The criteria for determining waste receptor sensitivity is defined by a percentage reduction but no indication what this relates to. The receptors are also not defined for waste. No reference to impact on human health.	This is addressed in the ES (document 6.1.19)
EDC.1.277	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.29 - 19.30	The “Uncertainties” presented are very limited. Any identified uncertainties should also be reduced as far as possible through further assessment or investigation.	Noted (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.278	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.31	The chapter does not list relevant legislation - please note PINs Scoping Opinion July 202 (ID 4.1.2.2)	Noted, this is covered in the ES Chapter 19. (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.279	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.38	Waste Management Plan for England 2013 is referred to. This is in the process of being updated and the new updated (or draft) plan should be referred to – consultation on the draft closed in October 2020.	Noted, where relevant plans have been adopted since the publication of the PEIR these have been addressed in the ES; for those plans in an advanced stage of production, these have been given appropriate weight and consideration in ES Chapter 19. (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.280	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.51	It is acknowledged that only steel and concrete are covered in the materials baseline in the PEIR due to limited availability of information.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.281	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.51	Current aggregate reserves available in Kent and details of minerals safeguarding areas within the study area should be included	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.282	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.52 - 19.56	Statista is referenced as a data source of baseline information for materials.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.283	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Table 19.5	The remaining landfill capacity should be presented by landfill type	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.284	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.98	Topsoil is not considered to be inert and metals are not considered to be non-inert.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.285	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.99	<p>The PEIR states that “the development will generate significant volumes of C&D waste” when no assessment has been carried out yet.</p> <p>The PEIR states that “the estimation will be based on industry standards, based on the development of new proposed gross floor areas.”</p> <p>The PEIR states that “the likely significance of effects from construction and demolition waste would potentially be moderate adverse” but no detail is provided on how the significance of effect was arrived at using magnitude of impact and sensitivity of receptors as per the methodology.</p>	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.286	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.100	The justification for the prediction of slight adverse effects on materials is weak.	Noted, further justification has been provided (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.287	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.101	The PEIR states that “the challenges associated with managing (operational) waste in multi-use environments are well documented.” but no references are provided.	Noted, appropriate references are supplied in the ES chapter (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.288	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Table 19.26	Table 19.26 presents the total estimated waste but there is no explanation as how the waste has been estimated	Noted, further detail has been provided in the ES. (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.289	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.104	The justification for the prediction of slight to moderate adverse effects in relation to operational waste (prior to mitigation) is weak.	Noted, further justification has been provided (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.290	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.105	This paragraph states that a SWMP will be prepared as part of the ES	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work and associated plans (document ref 6.1.19)
EDC.1.291	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Table 19.27	It is not stated whether the residual effect significance is significant in terms of the EIA regulations	Noted, the ES clearly states which effects are residually significant. (document ref 6.1.19)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.292	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.115	<p>This paragraph provides an uncommon definition of cumulative and incombination effects:</p> <p>“Cumulative effects are multiple effects on the same receptor, arising from a proposed development in combination with all developments that have been built and are operational. In-combination effects are those that might arise from the development proposed in combination with other plans and projects that are proposed or consented but not yet built and operational (i.e. those developments that are separate from the baseline)”.</p> <p>No criteria are provided that will be used to select other committed developments for inclusion in the cumulative effects assessment.</p>	Noted, the definition of cumulative effects that have been assessed are set out within chapter 6 of the ES and clearly defined and assessed as part of chapter 21 of the ES. (Document ref 6.1.16 and 6.1.21)
EDC.1.293	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 19 Waste and Materials Para 19.116	<p>This paragraph states that “waste management can have an impact on climate change and be impacted by climate change. It is not anticipated that there will be any direct impacts to the assessment completed”.</p> <p>It is not clear what the second sentence in this paragraph implies.</p>	Noted, a more detailed consideration of likely effects associated within the two topics areas is presented in the ES. (document 6.1.19)
EDC.1.294	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.2	<p>In line with current guidance (IEMA 2020 Guidance) the assessment should be split in three sections instead of in two:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GHG Emissions • Climate change resilience and adaptation • In-combination climate impact <p>It is recognised that the in-combination assessment has been carried out within other chapters, but at a minimum, a summary should be provided within the climate chapter.</p>	Noted, as identified, this is undertaken as part of the separate topic chapters, and also covered as part of chapter 21 of the ES (document ref 6.1.21). However, a brief summary will be provided in this chapter 20 for clarity (document ref 6.1.20).
EDC.1.295	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.7	Table 20.2 omits certain key pieces of legislation, policy and guidance.	Noted, these have been reviewed and contained within the ES where relevant, including Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.296	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Table 20.3	This table states that the Kent and Medway Climate Change Risk and Impact Assessment has been delayed. However, this report is available.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.297	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.13	This paragraph states that the decision to include or exclude a source of GHG is based on “The opportunities for design and construction decisions to significantly influence the reduction of a GHG emissions source”. However, we consider that the decision should not be based on the opportunities to influence the source. If the source emissions are high but there are no opportunities to reduce them, it could potentially be excluded?	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.298	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.14	The GHG emissions should be estimated and the data utilised for the estimations should align with the data presented within other chapters (e.g. materials, air quality, etc.)	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.299	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.16	This paragraph states “The scope of the assessment includes all works within the DCO order limits.” The study area should also include the area covered by the transport assessment for the study of material resources, waste and workers’ transport.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.300	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.17	Does the model account for land remediation, landscape works and planting? These can all increase or decrease GHG emissions.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.301	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.19	The paragraph states “The Proposed Development is targeting the achievement of net zero carbon emissions from operational energy. Therefore, it was not deemed necessary to quantify GHG emissions associated with operational energy.” It is considered that the chapter should present all GHG emissions associated to the operational energy to demonstrate that the net zero is achieved.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.302	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.21	Data from a baseline year should also be provided. The data provided by the transport consultants should include data with and without the Proposed Development	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.303	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.22	This paragraph only presents the study period for the operational phase. Separate study periods should be presented for the construction and operational phases.	Noted, this is set out within the ES chapter. (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.304	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.23	This paragraph refers to the construction and operation of the development. End of life stage should also be considered.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.305	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.25	This paragraph states that the cumulative impact of GHG emissions is major adverse. It also states, ‘It is assumed that any GHG emissions would be adverse’ but not justification is provided. For example, why would the negligible magnitude of impact presented in table 20.6 be negative?	Noted, justification of effects is provided in ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.306	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.28	This paragraph states that the criteria have been developed with reference to key pieces of legislation and guidance. References should be provided.	Noted, all sources are fully referenced in the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.307	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.35-20.36 & 20.59	<p>The limitations of the emissions factors themselves need to be addressed; acknowledging that they are considered the best available.</p> <p>The base data needs to be clarified. For example, have emission factors in ICE based on UK averages been used? There may be variation in carbon footprint simply due to geography and process in plant.</p> <p>In the event of uncertainty, worst case scenarios should be tested.</p>	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.308	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.37	<p>This paragraph states 'For the 'land' category, GHG emissions have been assumed to be zero as it is assumed that no activity is taking place here that results in the release of GHG emissions'. However, Emissions and Removals of Greenhouse Gases from Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland: 1990-2012 reflects that there will be emissions even if the 'land' category changes from the same to the same type.</p>	Noted (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.309	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Table 20.11	<p>Current baseline has not been presented.</p>	Noted, this forms part of the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.310	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.38	<p>Future baseline data should have been presented in the report.</p>	Noted, details are provided within the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.311	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.38	<p>This paragraph does not include references to the sources of data.</p>	Noted, all sources are fully referenced in the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.312	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.39 - 20.40	<p>GHG emissions from the development should be estimated.</p>	Noted, details are provided within the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.313	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and	<p>This paragraph states that the proposed development is aiming to achieve net zero emissions from operational energy and provides some examples of how this could be achieved. Also refers to the Energy Statement. However, it</p>	Noted, this forms part of the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		Climate Change Para 20.42	is considered that a summary of the outcomes from the Energy Statement and a detailed justification of how it net zero has been achieved should be included here.	
EDC.1.314	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.43	This paragraph states that the assessment of GHG emissions associated with the operational water consumption has not been undertaken as yet but not details of how this will be calculated have been provided.	Noted, this forms part of the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.315	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.44	This paragraph states that the assessment of GHG emissions associated with operational transport has not been undertaken as yet but not details of how this will be calculated have been provided.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.316	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Table 20.14	These tables should include mitigation measures that have been embedded within the Proposed Development and commitments, not only opportunities.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20). LRCH has been seeking EDC engagement
EDC.1.317	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.49 & 20.69	Mitigation measures for the operational energy emissions have not been included as the effects were deemed to be negligible	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.318	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.52	The PEIR states that it is not necessary to include a project by project cumulative assessment of climate change impacts “as it is carried out for many other environmental topics included in the ES” and because “cumulative and in-combination effects are inherently considered on a global scale...” This reasoning is unclear and insufficient.	Cumulative effects have been fully assessed in accordance with the PINS guidance note on CEA and reported on within the cumulative effects chapter. (document ref 6.1.21)
EDC.1.319	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.57	The criteria used to determine the consequence has been defined based on change, serviceability, capacity, loss of function and loss of asset. It is considered that the descriptions are weak.	Noted, has been reviewed and is more defined in the ES
EDC.1.320	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.60 - 2-.61	The future baseline does not include any climate projection for extreme weather events.	Noted, this forms part of the ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.321	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.60 - 2-.61	Current baseline data has not been provided.	Noted, this has been reviewed as part of the ES work (document ref 6.1.20)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.322	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.62	The methodology to identify and evaluate risks has not been defined. This paragraph states that it will be included in the ES. It is considered that the methodology should be included within the PEIR	The methodology is presented and justified in ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.323	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Chapter 20 Greenhouse and Climate Change Para 20.63	This paragraph states that the identification and evaluation of climate risks has not been completed and that will be completed for the ES. It is considered that an initial assessment should be included within the PEIR.	The methodology is presented and justified in ES Chapter 20 (document ref 6.1.20)
EDC.1.324	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p style="text-align: center;">CONTEXT</p> <p>C1 Understand and relate well to the site, its local and wider context</p> <p>C2 Value heritage, local history and culture</p>	<p>The scheme documentation includes detailed surveys and some analysis of the topography, landscape, ecology, land conditions, archaeology, visual impact and cultural heritage of the area.</p> <p>However, there is no consideration of the local built form in regard to patterns of urban structuring, and the local vernacular of architectural form, materials and detailing, that would help to inform the masterplanning of the interface sites and housing areas.</p> <p>There is also no overall analysis provided that brings together the individual subject-based baseline surveys and assessments, to establish an overarching design framework, against which the design strategy for the masterplanning could be tested.</p> <p>The consultation documentation focuses on mitigating the impact on the cultural heritage of the area (archaeology, historic assets etc), but does not extend this to provide a design approach for interface sites that recognises and celebrates this context within the design of the scheme’s urbanism, landscape and architectural design.</p> <p>It is recognised that the resort business model is predicated on creating thematic environments derived from brands and external environments beyond Ebbsfleet’s geography within the interior of the resort environs. However the expectation is that the sites on the edge of the resort, that interface with the public realm of Ebbsfleet, and specifically the housing areas, and the buildings, landscape and infrastructure within Ebbsfleet Central, should be designed to respond to Ebbsfleet’s cultural, environmental, social and economic context, and celebrate the cultural heritage of the area.</p> <p>This ambition is supported by the design approach set-out in the Ebbsfleet</p>	Parameters led approach. Schedule of Deliverables shared with EDC lists documents including Design & Access Statement. Details subject to Requirements. (document ref 7.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			Implementation Framework (Key theme 1 “Celebrate and reflect Ebbsfleet’s landscape, people and cultural heritage) and EDC’s suite of design guidance.	
EDC.1.325	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p style="text-align: center;">IDENTITY</p> <p>I1 Respond to existing local character and identity</p> <p>I2 Well-designed, high quality and attractive</p> <p>I3 Create character and identity</p>	<p>In general, there is insufficient information to assess the vision for developing an identity for the resort’s interface, and the associated buildings, infrastructure and landscape within Ebbsfleet Central.</p> <p>Local character There is no consideration of the local character of the surrounding settlements of Northfleet, Swanscombe, or the wider North Kent area, nor the principles of Garden City masterplanning as set out in the Ebbsfleet Implementation Framework.</p> <p>There is no identified design approach that sets out how local character will be used to inform the layout and design of buildings and landscape at the interface of the resort on Swanscombe Peninsula, or the infrastructure, buildings and landscape to be inserted within Ebbsfleet Central.</p> <p>A particular concern is the indicative masterplanning of the housing site. The current layout and associated urban design does not appear to have been informed by any analysis or understanding of the local character of landscape and built form in the area.</p> <p>Distinctive identity The documentation does not provide any detail on how the masterplanning principles and associated design strategies for buildings and landscape will create a distinctive identity for the places that interface with the theme park development or contribute to a distinctive identity for Ebbsfleet Central.</p>	Parameters led approach. Schedule of Deliverables shared with EDC lists documents including Design & Access Statement. Details subject to Requirements. (document ref 7.1)
EDC.1.326	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p style="text-align: center;">BUILT FORM</p> <p>B1 Compact form of development</p> <p>B2 Appropriate building types and forms</p> <p>B3 Destinations</p>	<p>The documentation is limited in detail in regard to the built form of the scheme, however the following concerns are raised;</p> <p>The absence of any detailed analysis of the local built form character leads to a built form that is not currently contributing to the creation of a distinctive identity derived from the local area.</p> <p>Back of house Site A The scale and layout of the back of house buildings for Gate A on the Swanscombe Peninsula site do not appear to have responded to the immediate context in terms of the general streetscape and the built form</p>	Parameters led approach. Schedule of Deliverables shared with EDC lists documents including Design & Access Statement. Details subject to Requirements. (document ref 7.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		<p>Walkable neighbourhoods Pattern of development Townscape legibility</p>	<p>that they address, and the current street layout and block structure is inflexible to future changes in function and use by the business.</p> <p>Housing site There is no narrative identified for the masterplanning of the housing site. The layout and associated built form should be informed by a clear narrative identified from the local context, to create not only a distinctive local character, but a strong, legible townscape within the housing site, that directly connects it with adjacent sites.</p> <p>A key issue for the built form of the peninsula sites is the three-dimensional nature of the site, and the elevated height of London Road which affords vistas down onto the site from surrounding streets and from Swanscombe and Northfleet in general. The built form will need to carefully consider the design of the roofs and the composition of the roofscape as a whole, to ensure that views down onto the site are attractive and contribute to the general landscape character of the area.</p> <p>Questions How will the built form be developed to promote sustainability and deliver a zero carbon scheme? How will the built form be developed to create a distinctive contemporary design language derived from an appreciation of the context?</p>	
<p>EDC.1.327</p>	<p>Ebbsfleet Development Corporation</p>	<p>MOVEMENT FRAMEWORK M1 An integrated network of routes for all modes of transport</p>	<p>The vision for the scheme to be operationally zero carbon, and to promote sustainable travel is welcomed, as is the high-level detail in regard to walking, cycling and public transport networks. However further detail is required to enable a design assessment.</p> <p>On the basis of what is presented, the movement framework appears to undermine the vision for sustainable travel, by prioritising private car access by way of a dedicated access road through Ebbsfleet Central, connecting visitors to over 10,000 parking spaces directly adjacent to the entrance plaza. This approach will make car access by far the most convenient and efficient mode of access to the Resort for many visitors and undermines the attractiveness and potential demand for sustainable travel modes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the imposition of a surface-level roadway through the heart of the Ebbsfleet Central development area conflicts directly with the Ebbsfleet Implementation Framework, compromising the quality of the proposed development, and could challenge the viability and deliverability of the scheme.</p>	<p>Sustainable travel options included. Access Road is subject to separate EDC discussion. (document ref 6.1.9 and 6.1.10)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>The Ebbsfleet implementation Framework establishes the clear principle of using a decked access road in order to integrate the two projects successfully (London Resort and Ebbsfleet Central), without impacting on the quality or deliverability of either scheme.</p> <p>A surface-level access road would lead to the following fundamental design issues for Ebbsfleet central;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Severely sever connectivity between the eastern and western halves of the Ebbsfleet Central development area. 2) Significantly reducing the developable land of the Ebbsfleet Central development area 3) Compromising the coherent nature of development parcels. 4) Reduce the walkability and significantly compromise the quality of pedestrian experience within Ebbsfleet central 5) Impact the air and water quality of Ebbsfleet Central, and specifically Ebbsfleet River Park. 6) Negatively impact on the landscape character, ecology, air and water quality, water systems and access to the Ebbsfleet River park. 7) Create excessive noise disturbance to the Ebbsfleet River park’s habitats, and development parcels running alongside the access road. 	
EDC.1.328	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p align="center">MOVEMENT FRAMEWORK</p> <p>M1 An integrated network of routes for all modes of transport</p>	<p>PEDESTRIAN PROVISION</p> <p>Pedestrian network</p> <p>The pedestrian network proposed within the documentation is generally aligned with the Ebbsfleet implementation Framework and provides reasonable pedestrian connectivity into the site. However insufficient information is provided to assess the full vision, design and specification of pedestrian provision, and the associated landscape, ancillary facilities and wayfinding infrastructure for the following areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilgrims way footpath connecting London Road with the resort entrance plaza. This will provide an important connection between Swanscombe Train Station and the resort, and this should not be ignored, but planned and designed for within the transport strategy and movement framework. <p>Swanscombe Peninsula Park pedestrian networks. The Green Infrastructure Strategy provides some basic details, but this need developing further.</p>	<p>Routes for all modes is set out in DAS and Transport documentation, including route from new Ferry Terminal to Ebbsfleet International (document ref 6.1.9 and 7.1)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.329	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p style="text-align: center;">MOVEMENT FRAMEWORK</p> <p>M1 An integrated network of routes for all modes of transport</p>	<p>Primary north-south movement corridor</p> <p>The scheme proposes a primary movement corridor on an approximate north-south axis that would connect Ebbsfleet International Railway Station with a proposed new Ferry terminal on the Thames riverside, providing a critical public movement corridor route through the centre of the development site, and ensuring access to the ferry terminal on the Swanscombe Peninsula.</p> <p>This axis also provides access for the Fastrack bus system, walking and cycling routes, as well as the resort’s own people mover. The ambition to support Fastrack connectivity, walking and cycling network access to both the resort and the Ferry terminal is welcomed, subject to the detailed design of this corridor (see public spaces)</p> <p>However, this primary connection also raises concerns in relation to its route, layout and the general vision of how the space will work throughout the day, and across the seasons. The ambition would be to develop this route as a safe, secure, active and attractive movement corridor that is safe, convenient and attractive for locals and visitors to use at any time. The current design proposes a footpath and cycle track through a relatively inactive part of the local area, with insufficient level of use, activities and passive surveillance along the length of the route between Ebbsfleet International and the entrance plaza to deliver a safe and attractive experience. How could this route be developed to provide this activity?</p> <p>Housing Site</p> <p>There is no pedestrian or cycling route shown on the pedestrian network map between the housing site and the entrance plaza. Recommend using the tunnels to provide this connection for staff, that could also serve as a strategic connection for the wider Ebbsfleet pedestrian network.</p>	<p>North-South movement corridor already included, embracing Pilgrims Way. Links between operational housing and plaza is captured in the Design and Access Statement (document ref 7.1) and Landscape documents (Appendix 11.7). Pedestrian access, including Pilgrims Way, is covered Public Rights of Way and Public Access Strategy (document reference 6.3.11.18).</p>
EDC.1.330	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p style="text-align: center;">MOVEMENT FRAMEWORK</p> <p>M1 An integrated network of routes for all modes of transport</p>	<p>Cycling provision</p> <p>The network map is generally aligned with the Ebbsfleet implementation Framework, however insufficient information is provided to assess the vision, design and specification of cycle infrastructure.</p> <p>The one departure from the Implementation framework is the failure to provide a cycle route connecting the Thames riverside to the west of the site, with the north-south movement corridor identified above. The peninsula site provides a strategic opportunity to create a flat cycle route to connect the western riverside sites with Ebbsfleet Central’s cycling network.</p>	<p>Cycling routes are embedded across scheme (document ref 7.1)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>The provision of cycle hire facilities is welcomed and should be integrated within a centralised cycle-hub serving both the resort transport interchange, and the International Station / Ebbsfleet Central area.</p>	
EDC.1.331	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p>MOVEMENT FRAMEWORK</p> <p>M1 An integrated network of routes for all modes of transport</p>	<p>Public Transport</p> <p>The masterplan has considered access by train, Fastrack, local bus services, private coach and taxi, and the network planning is generally aligned with the Implementation Framework.</p> <p>However, the current masterplan has not considered how arrival via Swanscombe Station should be planned, design and managed. While it is recognised that Swanscombe Station is very constrained by the topography of the site, the adjacent road network, and surrounding development, the proximity of the station to the entrance plaza combined with the anticipated upgrading of the North-Kent train line to provide a metropolitan type rail service into central London, will inevitably lead to visitors arriving through Swanscombe Station. The availability of this access point should not be ignored, and should be masterplanned within the site, along with any associated enhancements to Swanscombe Station.</p>	<p>The Public Transport Strategies (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendices TA-U and TA-V) detail the existing provision and proposes mitigation where demand is likely to impact the networks. LRCH is in discussion with local rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy and determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort; details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information. Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe Station.</p>
EDC.1.332	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p>M2 A clear structure and hierarchy of connected streets</p>	<p>The documentation provides insufficient information to assess the proposed layout and hierarchy of the street network, and the associated vision, design and specification of individual street types/ streets, public spaces within the scheme. (The term public spaces in this instance is understood as both publicly adopted public spaces, and non-gated 'semi-public' spaces that are open to the public within the resort site)</p> <p>The housing site and back of house site A are of particular interest, where EDC would welcome details of a clear design approach to the layout and hierarchy of streets and public spaces within these sites.</p>	<p>LRCH has undertaken a parameters led approach. The Schedule of Deliverables was shared with EDC lists documents including Design and Access Statement, which is now provided (document ref 7.1). Details subject to Requirements.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.333	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p align="center">M3 Well-considered parking, servicing and utilities infrastructure for all users</p>	<p>The current scheme includes up to 10, 000 parking spaces, alongside a dedicated staff car park, and specific parking provision for hotels and associated ancillary facilities.</p> <p>However, there is insufficient information in regards to the access to parking, the design of parking areas and parking structures, and the parking management approaches for the resort sites and the surrounding neighbourhoods, to be able to undertake a detailed design assessment.</p> <p>The provision of parking infrastructure needs to be carefully aligned with the mode share of more sustainable travel modes, to promote their use, and avoid the oversupply of parking. Phased delivery of the parking structures should be embedded within the delivery programme to facilitate this.</p> <p>Questions How does the scheme actively dissuade visitors from bringing their car, and use sustainable travel modes? How does the scheme integrate with Ebbsfleet’s wider sustainable travel systems, to reduce the duplication of travel systems, and provide a seamless integrated travel system across the local, regional and national scales? How has the scheme considered charging infrastructure for 10,000 cars? How will the scheme actively measure and monitor air quality within the Ebbsfleet valley, and mitigate issues that are detected?</p>	<p>There will be charges to park in the Resort carpark. The number of spaces has been calculated using the likely mode shares to the Resort. The Transport Assessment, alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel. An off-site parking strategy (Appendix TA-Y) has been written to outline the management of people parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The impact on air quality has been considered in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).</p>
EDC.1.334	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p align="center">NATURE</p> <p>N1 Provide high quality, green open spaces with a variety of landscapes and activities, including play</p> <p>N2 Improve and enhance water management</p> <p>N3 Support rich and varied biodiversity</p>	<p>The documentation includes detailed baseline surveys including a landscape and visual baseline assessment and a ‘Historic Landscape Assessment’, however there is generally insufficient information to provide a full design assessment of the proposed scheme, with only a single page Green Infrastructure Strategy providing any details.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Strategy The details referenced within the Green Infrastructure Strategy are aligned with the ambitions set-out within the Ebbsfleet Implementation Framework for Swanscombe Peninsula Park, providing a “showcase and enhancement of the natural features of the site and riverside location”, and including enhanced footpaths and trail, and structures / hides and towers for viewing the wildlife.</p> <p>However the scope of the strategy only extends to the Swanscombe Peninsula site, and there is no consideration of how the strategy extends to and connects with the wider green infrastructure networks across Ebbsfleet and the Thames Estuary , or the impact of the works within Ebbsfleet Central</p>	<p>EDC Implementation Framework referred to where relevant, though this is a global entertainment Resort so may not always be applicable. (document ref 7.1)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>/ and the associated access road and motorway junction upgrades on the Ebbsfleet River Park.</p> <p>The Ebbsfleet Implementation Framework sets out key principles for 'Bringing in the Green and the Blue (page 36) which should be adhered to, to create a continuous network that enhances all eco-system services, health and environmental conditions.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment fails to recognise the Ebbsfleet implementation Framework or the Ebbsfleet Public Realm Strategy, both of which include extensive detail on the strategic masterplanning of green infrastructure, landscapes and open spaces, and associated landscape character assessment, visions and design guidance for the planning and design of landscapes that cover the project area.</p> <p>Questions There is some information included in the Green Infrastructure Strategy on the proposals for habitat enhancement, but how will the scheme deliver and evidence net-biodiversity gain, and support biodiversity not just in the Swanscombe Peninsula Park, but across the landscape of the entire scheme?</p> <p>How has the impacts of climate change been considered within the landscape strategy and planting specification?</p>	
EDC.1.335	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p align="center">NATURE</p> <p>N1 Provide high quality, green open spaces with a variety of landscapes and activities, including play</p> <p>N2 Improve and enhance water management</p> <p>N3 Support rich and varied biodiversity</p>	<p>Impact of Access Road</p> <p>It should be noted that the Ebbsfleet River valley is a calciferous stream, and 1 of only approx two hundred in the world. The Implementation Framework has therefore identified the valley as the site of a linear park running its length from the source under the A2, through to its termination within Northfleet Harbour in the north, to protect and enhance the habitats within the area. To support this approach, the landscape and open space strategy for the consented planning permission for Ebbsfleet Central focuses development away from the river corridor in the southern areas of the site to the south of the A2660, to balance the intensity of urban development and the associated impact on the river corridor as it passes through Northfleet Rise. This southern area of the river corridor was planned to be a naturalised landscape character, to promote biodiversity. This approach has been incorporated into the Ebbsfleet Implementation Framework following discussions with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The imposition of the access road as currently detailed would therefore have</p>	<p>The Access Road has been subject to separate discussions with the EDC (document ref 7.1 and 7.4)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>a significant impact on this southern area of the Ebbsfleet River Park. The access road would firstly impinge on access to the park from Station Quarters North and South, but more importantly, a surface-level based access road would compromise the landscape character, ecology, water systems, air and water quality, and the general visual amenity of the park itself in this southern half of the park.</p>	
EDC.1.336	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p>PUBLIC SPACES</p> <p>P1 Create well-located, high quality and attractive public spaces</p> <p>P2 Provide well designed spaces that are safe</p> <p>P3 Make sure public spaces support social interaction</p>	<p>The current documentation fails to provide sufficient information to assess the design of the public realm, with no parameter plans, design codes or design specification for streets, plazas, parks or open spaces, and only basic specification of paths / tracks on the Swanscombe Peninsula provided in the one page Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>It is expected that a masterplan would set-out a strategic approach to the provision of public spaces, identifying the typologies and hierarchy of public spaces to be included within the scheme, and how they have been planned as a network to support a diverse range of functions and activities across the area.</p> <p>The masterplan should also consider the approach to the design of streets and open spaces appropriate for a Garden City, as set out within the Implementation Framework, and subsequently developed with more detail within the Ebbsfleet Public Realm Strategy.</p> <p>The current masterplan also raises some issues in regards to specific public spaces;</p> <p>North- South movement corridor A key concern is the vision for and design of the primary movement corridor connecting Ebbsfleet International to the entrance plaza, and onwards to the ferry terminal. Significant concerns are raised in relation to its route, layout and the general vision of how the space will work throughout the day , and across the seasons. The ambition would be to develop this route as an active and attractive movement corridor that is safe, secure, convenient and attractive for locals and visitors to use at any time. Currently however, there is an insufficient level of uses, activities and passive surveillance along the length of the route between Ebbsfleet International and the entrance plaza to deliver a safe and attractive experience.</p> <p>Pilgrims way The design of the Pilgrims Way route is critical to providing an attractive safe, and secure route between Swanscombe and its Railway Station, and</p>	<p>Public realm, spaces and places are integral to the masterplan for a global entertainment Resort, and are captured in the Design and Access Statemnet (document ref 7.1)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>the entrance plaza. The masterplan should set-out a concept design at an appropriate scale to explain how safe access will be provided for the numbers of people anticipated to arrive through Swanscombe Station, and specifically the design of the roads and junction around the station, connecting to Pilgrims Way.</p>	
EDC.1.337	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p align="center">PUBLIC SPACES</p> <p>P1 Create well-located, high quality and attractive public spaces</p> <p>P2 Provide well designed spaces that are safe</p> <p>P3 Make sure public spaces support social interaction</p>	<p>The current masterplan also raises some issues in regards to specific public spaces;</p> <p>North- South movement corridor A key concern is the vision for and design of the primary movement corridor connecting Ebbsfleet International to the entrance plaza, and onwards to the ferry terminal. Significant concerns are raised in relation to its route, layout and the general vision of how the space will work throughout the day , and across the seasons. The ambition would be to develop this route as an active and attractive movement corridor that is safe, secure, convenient and attractive for locals and visitors to use at any time. Currently however, there is an insufficient level of uses, activities and passive surveillance along the length of the route between Ebbsfleet International and the entrance plaza to deliver a safe and attractive experience.</p> <p>Pilgrims way The design of the Pilgrims Way route is critical to providing an attractive safe, and secure route between Swanscombe and its Railway Station, and the entrance plaza. The masterplan should set-out a concept design at an appropriate scale to explain how safe access will be provided for the numbers of people anticipated to arrive through Swanscombe Station, and specifically the design of the roads and junction around the station, connecting to Pilgrims Way.</p> <p>Boundary design of theme park site The design of the boundary to the resort will have a significant impact on a range of sites, streets, and the Swanscombe Peninsula Park, however there is insufficient detail currently on how this will be treated. It is expected that this will need to be developed in significant detail to understand the implications.</p> <p>Housing site A particular area of concern is the provision of open space within the housing site. How will the masterplan incorporate a range of high quality green open spaces that will support healthy and happy lifestyles for residents living within the housing area? How will the housing sites green</p>	<p>North-South movement corridor already included, embracing Pilgrims Way. The operational housing site will have open space. Resort boundary treatment is captured in the Design and Access Statement (document ref 7.1) and Landscape documents (Appendix 11.7). Pedestrian access, including Pilgrims Way, is covered Public Rights of Way and Public Access Strategy (document reference 6.3.11.18).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>infrastructure be connected to the wider green infrastructure?</p> <p>Ebbsfleet Central Plaza The proposed transport interchange is located on the site of the Ebbsfleet Central Interchange plaza. The Implementation Framework identifies this location as a key public space for Ebbsfleet, providing a significantly sized plaza that unifies the International Railway Station and the wider Ebbsfleet Central development with the large parkland on the former refuse site. The current resort masterplan suggests a greatly reduced plaza space, and clarification is sought on the vision for the space, and the need for a concept design to show how the plaza would work to support the required functions for the space.</p>	
EDC.1.338	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p align="center">USES</p> <p>U1 A mix of uses</p> <p>U2 A mix of home tenures, types and sizes</p> <p>U3 Socially inclusive</p>	<p>The masterplan is primarily focused around the provision of two theme parks set around an entrance plaza on the Swanscombe Peninsula. The entrance plaza sits on the north-south movement corridor, framed by hotels, entertainment, leisure and conference venues, and food and beverage outlets, that collectively form a major destination at a local, regional and potentially national scale. The location of these uses has a strong rationale fully aligned and integrated with the movement framework to create a legible, efficient spatial layout.</p> <p>Car parking structures sit to the east of the entrance plaza, with three transport interchanges provided at the ferry wharf to the north, the entrance plaza itself, and Ebbsfleet International to the south.</p> <p>Housing Site Housing site for staff is well located within a former quarry, adjacent to current housing developments at Craylands Lane and Croxton and Garry. This represents a sensible location for the housing site, and enables it to benefit from the residential character of this area, and to access the pocket parks, playgrounds and open spaces provided within these adjacent developments.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to providing a range of inclusive house types within the housing site that will enable a diverse range of people of all ages and abilities to be able to work and live within the resort.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to providing supporting civic facilities to support the health and wellbeing of the staff living in the housing site, and surrounding residents.</p> <p>Bamber pit</p>	Parameters plans, indicative layouts and schedule of floorspace is provided (document ref 7.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>The masterplan appears to show back of house / infrastructure within Bamber Pit, however no further details are provided. These buildings would sit within the area set out in the Ebbsfleet implementation Framework as forming part of the Ebbsfleet Central Park, and would therefore request further details of the function and use intended for the site, to understand how this could be developed to align with the ambitions for the Ebbsfleet Central Park.</p> <p>North-south movement corridor Consideration should be given to how uses could be accommodated along the North-South movement corridor, to provide activity and surveillance along this route, and create a safe and secure environment for pedestrian and cyclist movement between Ebbsfleet Central and the resort.</p>	
EDC.1.339	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p>BUILDINGS & HOMES</p> <p>H1 Healthy, comfortable and safe internal and external environment</p> <p>H2 Well-related to external amenity and public spaces</p> <p>H3 Attention to detail: storage, waste, servicing and utilities</p>	<p>The documentation provides insufficient information to assess the design strategy, vision, concept design, detailed design or specification of buildings within the masterplan.</p> <p>No details are provided for performance criteria for buildings in relation to sustainability, accessibility and servicing.</p>	<p>The Design and Access Statement and Design Code (document ref 7.1 and 7.2) capture the approach appropriate to a parameters led strategy. Details of the buildings will emerge at the requirements stage.</p>
EDC.1.340	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p>RESOURCES</p> <p>R1 Follow the energy hierarchy</p> <p>R2 Selection of materials and construction techniques</p>	<p>The documentation provides insufficient information to enable a full review of design to deliver sustainability and resilience.</p>	<p>An Outline Sustainability Strategy is provided (document ref 7.7)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		R3 Maximise resilience		
EDC.1.341	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p>LIFESPAN</p> <p>L1 Well-managed and maintained</p> <p>L2 Adaptable to changing needs and evolving technologies</p> <p>L3 A sense of ownership</p>	<p>The long term stewardship of Ebbsfleet Parks and open spaces is a critical concern, and a core aspect of the Garden City principles. Consideration should be given to how the management, maintenance and stewardship of parks and open spaces, landscape and civic facilities are aligned with or integrated within the emerging stewardship strategy for Ebbsfleet Garden City.</p> <p>Housing Site While it is recognised that the housing site is being designed to support staff of the London Resort, from a sustainability perspective it would be advisable to consider the housing types, layout, landscape and open space provision, and civic facilities provided within the masterplanning of the housing site to ensure adaptability in the longer term. This should extend to providing inclusive design of the housing, to support a broad range of residents.</p>	<p>The housing site is for operational purposes, forming part of Resort infrastructure. (document ref 7.1)</p>
EDC.1.342	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	<p>Draft DCO and DCO Requirements General</p>	<p>While it is noted that the new link road is to be "unadopted" EDC and DBC note that there is no provision in the dDCO that would deal with the process for the construction to an appropriate standard, of highways generally, and their subsequent handover and adoption in the case of highways, or works to existing adopted highways. While this is a matter primarily for the relevant highway authorities EDC and DBC is concerned to ensure that highways in and connecting to its areas are appropriately maintained.</p> <p>Similarly EDC and DBC wish to ensure that the link road does not form a barrier preventing the laying of utilities and other services in or crossing the link road, and other important services, are not impeded from serving the urban development area.</p>	<p>Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.343	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 2(1) Definition of relevant planning authority	<p>As drafted the definition of "the relevant planning authority" does not appropriately reflect EDC's planning functions for its urban development area.</p> <p>EDC's development area was designated by the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation (Area and Constitution) Order 2015. Its planning functions over its urban development area were transferred to it by the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation (Planning Functions) Order 2015 ("Planning Functions Order"). The effect of article 3(a) of the Planning Functions Order is that EDC is the local planning authority for the urban development area, for all purposes for Part 3 (control over development) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, save for in respect of section 61E to 61Q (which deal with neighbourhood planning).</p> <p>Once EDC has completed its statutory objective of the regeneration of the urban development area the Secretary of State may decide to transfer its planning functions and wind up the development corporations affairs. Should this occur then the reference in the definition of "Ebbsfleet Development Corporation" would ensure that the recipient of those planning functions would also fall within the definition of "relevant planning authority".</p> <p>The definition of "urban development area" cross refers to the Secretary of State's designation of EDC's urban development area by the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation (Area and Constitution) Order 2015</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.344	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 3(3) Development consent granted by the Order	<p>This article allows for the wholesale replacement of Work Nos.1 and 2. Unlike "maintain" (which includes "replace") this is not constrained to not giving rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects to those assessed in the environmental statement. At a minimum this wording must be added.</p> <p>The EM does not explain why this power is required in addition to the wide power to "maintain" in article 4, the definition of which includes "replace". Nor does it explain, if this power is different, how it is intended to differ from "maintenance."</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.345	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 3(4)	It is not clear how the parameter plans, works plans, highways plans and sections relate to one another. See comments below in respect of article 6.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO and associated plans (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.346	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 4 Maintenance of	Given the breadth of the power to maintain that is sought (including its wholesale replacement), it is appropriate that it is clear, for the avoidance of any doubt, that the power to maintain is subject to the requirements. This is	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		the authorised development	necessary to ensure that appropriate mitigation for the maintenance of the authorised development, in line with the environmental statement when it is complete, is secured.	
EDC.1.347	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 5(1) Maintenance of drainage works	Please correct the typographical errors identified.	Noted (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.348	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 6 Parameters of the authorised development	<p>Lateral deviations are determined by reference to the Works Plans.</p> <p>Vertical deviations are determined by reference to the Sections. No Section drawings have been provided for statutory consultation.</p> <p>Highway works may deviate vertically 1.5m upwards or downward by reference to the levels shown on the highways plans. No highways plans have been provided in the consultation.</p> <p>Given that both the highways plans and the sections have not been made available for the statutory consultation EDC and DBC are not able to provide a comprehensive view on this article. Given those limitations EDC offer the following comments and looks forward to further detail being made available to it in advance of LRCH submission of its application for development consent.</p> <p>Boundaries between the areas of numbered works shown on the Works Plans may deviate laterally by 20m either side. This is a significant deviation that may affect impacts, when those are appropriately assessed and it will be important that the environmental statement demonstrates how deviations have been assessed.</p> <p>Layered on top of the above permitted deviations is a requirement for the development to be carried out "within the parameters shown on the parameter plans". The parameter plans show particular subdivisions but these do not necessarily align with the numbered works shown on the Works Plans. It is not clear to what extent the Parameter Plans are intended to govern the lateral location of the numbered works, or the whether they are concerned only with the vertical parameters for those parts of the authorised development shown on the parameter plans.</p> <p>The parameter plans do not establish parameters for other key areas of the authorised development, for example, the highway works.</p> <p>LRCH should clearly explain how it envisages these plans are intended to</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>establish the parameters of the proposed development against which it will carry out its environmental assessment for the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of the authorised development.</p>	
EDC.1.349	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 8(4) Transfer of Benefit of Order	<p>There is a missing conjunction between article 8(4)(a) and 8(4)(b).</p> <p>It is suggested it should be an "or".</p>	Noted (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.350	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 10 Planning Permission	<p>Land in this context is insufficiently precise and it is suggested that it is replaced with the defined term "Order land".</p> <p>With respect to article 10(3) a resort operator is not a class of person to which section 264(3)(a) of the 1990 Act applies. It is therefore unclear what the purpose or effect is of this general declaration and no specific justification or explanation is provided in the EM.</p> <p>Amusement parks do benefit from permitted development (Class B of Part 18 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015) however such permitted development does not employ the concept of "operational land" which is the preserve of statutory undertakers.</p> <p>Note the heading in the EM refers to the heading for this article being "Application of the 1990 Act" whereas the dDCO refers to it as "Planning permission".</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.351	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 11 Application of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010	<p>The intention of the drafting appears, as is explained in the EM, to be to ensure that temporary construction, including temporary construction that may yet be in place for a long period of time, is made subject to CIL.</p> <p>EDC is supportive of this general principle.</p> <p>However, paragraph (2) is far from clear as to its scope. What would be temporary construction works and other temporary buildings? The Applicant should clarify this, perhaps by reference to a schedule.</p>	Noted (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.352	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 12 Planning Permission	<p>Note, this is the second article to be headed "Planning Permission".</p> <p>The use of "and/or" is generally considered to be inappropriate in a statutory instrument.</p> <p>There is an argument to say that this provision is ultra vires. The development within the scope of the section 35 direction is development for which development consent is required. There simply is no option to obtain planning permission for it. The section 35 direction is drawn in very broad terms covering "the project known as "London Paramount" at Swanscombe Peninsula and land to the south towards Ebbsfleet Station, Kent".</p> <p>In respect of (2) what functions will the undertaker have under the Highways Act 1980 that merits this "carve out"? It is not, nor will be, a highway authority.</p> <p>In respect of paragraph (3) EDC is concerned that this very widely drawn provision, which applies to planning permissions granted in respect of land within, or "adjacent to", the Order limits will have on its ability to properly discharge its development management functions for the Ebbsfleet Garden City. DBC have concerns that it will not deliver the housing, employment and infrastructure identified in their Local Plan. LRCH's justification for this provision in the EM does not explain why it is necessary or appropriate to interfere with planning permissions, in or on land adjacent to, the authorised development. Without any clear and precise justification, it should be deleted.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.353	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 13 Street works Art 14 Application of the 1991 Act	<p>We note the statutory authorisation for street works is intended to apply only to specified streets within Schedule 4, albeit that Schedule 4 has yet to be populated. EDC is supportive of an approach that would limit the street works authorisation to specified streets where it is required, rather than of general application within the Order limits.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, LRCH should clearly and precisely justify the powers sought.</p>	Noted (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.354	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 15 Power to alter layout, etc. of streets	<p>This article is drafted in incredibly wide terms and would authorise the alteration of any street within the Order limits <i>and any street having a junction with such street</i>, for the purposes of both construction and maintenance of the authorised development. This is therefore a wide ranging provision temporally and geographically, especially in light of their being no envisaged "end date" for the LRCH Scheme.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>This has the potential to interfere with the proper planning of the development envisaged in the Ebbsfleet Garden City and the wider area given that key distributor roads are included within the Order limits. It is not clear that LRCH, who is not otherwise a highway authority or other body with significant experience of the management of highways, streets and traffic, ought to be authorised to make such wide ranging alterations to the layout of streets. In this regard it is noted that consent of the street authority is required, where LRCH is not the street authority. However, that provision is subject to article 28 deemed consent provision.</p> <p>It is not clear that the environmental effects of such works have been considered in the PEIR and EDC and DBC would be looking to LRCH to ensure that such effects are thoroughly assessed, and the requirement for the temporal and geographical scope of the function is fully justified.</p>	
EDC.1.355	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 16 Permanent stopping up of streets and rights of access	<p>EDC and DBC note that Schedule 6, which sets out the streets and public rights of way to be stopped up under this article, has yet to be populated.</p> <p>EDC and DBC also note that very little information has been published during this statutory consultation in respect of stopped up, new or diversionary rights of way nor how the Applicant has considered what opportunities there may be to improve access to the rights of way network (per paragraph 5.184 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks). EDC and DBC consider this to be a missed opportunity to seek views of the relevant authorities and the public on its proposals in this regard.</p>	Clarification is provided (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.356	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Article 17 Temporary stopping up of streets and rights of access	Please correct the typographical error in the final line of paragraph (4) (reference to Part 1 of Schedule "78")	Noted (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.357	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 18 Access to and from works	<p>The power in this article persists indefinitely. LRCH has not set out in its Explanatory Memorandum why such a wide ranging power (affecting any highway within the Order limits) is required, beyond referring to the model provision. The exercise of the power should be limited to the construction phase.</p> <p>EDC and DBC also have concerns with the application of the deemed consent provision in and take the view that procedures in Part 2 of Schedule 2 (as is suggested are to be modified) should apply.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.358	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Article 20(7) Discharge of water	It is not clear why article 20(7) cross refers to article 50. Article 50 deals with amendments to provisions relating to compulsory acquisition compensation.	Noted (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.359	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 22(1) Authority to survey and investigate land	<p>Contrary to what LRCH states in paragraph 7.6 of the EM, as drafted, article 22(1) would authorise surveys or investigations of land beyond the Order limits. No specific justification is given for the requirement to carry out surveys beyond the Order limits, so the article should be amended to reflect the intention expressed in the EM.</p> <p>The article as drafted can be exercised for "the purposes of the authorised development". It is not limited temporally to the construction phase or to any other specific purposes relating to the authorised development. The Applicant has not justified why it would be appropriate for it, as a private commercial operation, to benefit from a power to occupy private land for the purposes of carrying out surveys without any meaningful constraint on its exercise temporally or geographically.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.360	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 23(2) Compulsory acquisition of land	<p>A "compulsory acquisition notice" as defined in article 2(1) of the dDCO, as a notice under section 134 of the Planning Act 2008. The purpose of a section 134 Planning Act 2008 notice is to notify the recipient that powers of compulsory acquisition have been granted in respect of their interest in land and to inform those persons, if aggrieved, that the DCO may be challenged under section 118 of the Planning Act 2008 within 6 weeks of its publication.</p> <p>The effect of this article would be to extinguish all private rights in land within the Order limits as soon as notice is served under section 134 Planning Act 2008. If the DCO is granted, a section 134 notice is required to be served on each person who would qualify under section 12(1) Acquisition of Land Act 1981.</p> <p>As the dDCO seeks authorisation of permanent rights over land required temporarily (see art 26 below) this would affect all land within the Order limits.</p> <p>This would be wholly disproportionate and would deprive persons of their interests in land before formal acquisition powers are exercised (if indeed</p>	Noted (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>they ever are required to be exercised).</p> <p>Given that Article 27 already deals with private rights (including the suspension of private rights during periods of temporary possession under article 33) and does so in a less disproportionate way, this provision should be deleted.</p> <p>Note, if LRCH deletes paragraph (2) it should also delete the definition of "compulsory acquisition notice" in article 2(1). In any event, it is not necessary to define that term given that it is defined in section 134(7) of the Planning Act 2008.</p>	
<p>EDC.1.361</p>	<p>Ebbsfleet Development Corporation</p>	<p>Art 26 Compulsory acquisition of rights and imposition of restrictive covenants</p>	<p>The EM at paragraph 8.9 indicates that the imposition of restrictive covenants is common place in Transport and Works Act 1992 Orders, PINS Advice Note 15 at section 24 discusses the circumstances where it may be appropriate for a DCO to authorise the imposition of restrictive covenants, where it states <i>"In order to enable the Secretary of State to consider whether the imposition of Restrictive Covenants is necessary for the purposes of implementing a DCO, and appropriate in human rights terms, applicants should be prepared to fully explain and justify the need for including such powers in the Statement of Reasons. DCO provisions seeking to impose Restrictive Covenants should not be broadly drafted and should identify the land to which they relate and the nature of the Restrictive Covenant."</i></p> <p>EDC and DBC note that LRCH is not consulting on the nature of the rights required or restrictive covenants to be imposed, or the justification for such rights. As such, its ability to meaningfully respond in its capacities as local planning authority and landowner is significantly diminished.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that it is not at this time in a position to engage on the substance of the justification for such powers EDC has serious concerns that dDCO would authorise the imposition of restrictive covenants and acquisition of rights over land over which temporary possession is sought.</p> <p>This is the case because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. article 23(1) authorises the outright compulsory acquisition of all of the Order land. 2. Article 26(1) includes a general power to impose restrictive covenants over land that might be acquired under article 23. 3. Article 26(2) "carves out" of the general power in article 26(1) the power to acquire rights and impose restrictive covenants over the Order land specified in Schedule 8. 	<p>Noted (document ref 3.1)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>4. However, article 33(10) while clarifying that the land for which temporary possession for the purposes of construction is authorised and ultimately to be detailed in Schedule 10 may not be acquired outright; it may nonetheless be subject to the acquisition of rights or imposition of restrictive covenants.</p> <p>Should it be the case that LRCH genuinely requires such wide powers across the Order limits, EDC and DBC would expect its Statement of Reasons to make a clear and convincing case that such a power is justified in the public interest and that the Book of Reference clearly spells out the nature of rights and restrictions to which the Order land may be subject.</p>	
EDC.1.362	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 30 Modification of Part 1 of the 1965 Act	Please correct the typographical error in article 30(3)(a).	Noted (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.363	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 33(2) & (10) Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised development	<p>As noted above in respect of article 26 EDC and DBC have serious concerns with the prospect of the acquisition of rights or imposition of restrictive covenants over land over which only powers of temporary use are sought. Such a wide general power over such land would need to be fully justified and the reference in paragraph 8.35 of the EM of it being consistent with articles 23 and 31 is inadequate justification for the disproportionately wide power.</p> <p>EDC and DBC has concerns that the 14 days notice LRCH is required to give before dispossessing a person of their land is inadequate and has not been specifically justified in the EM. This is particularly the case given that section 20 of the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017, when it comes into force, would mandate a minimum 3 month period of notice.</p> <p>In addition, this article would authorise the construction of permanent works on land possessed temporarily. The EM does not explain why this measure is required or is appropriate in the circumstances of this project.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.364	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 42 Felling or lopping of trees	<p>This article would authorise LRCH to fell or lop any tree, shrub or hedgerow "near any part of the authorised development".</p> <p>The effect of paragraph (4) is to authorise the removal of any such tree even were it subject to a TPO.</p> <p>EDC would remind LRCH of PINS Advice Note 15, section 22, which advises applicants to include a plan showing the location of any protected tree or protected hedgerows for which authorisation for the removal is sought. No such plan appears to have been included within the statutory consultation</p>	Noted (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			documents. Furthermore, the EM, while noting that this drafting follows the equivalent provision in the now repealed Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) (England and Wales) Order 2009, it does not justify why the inclusion of such a provision is justified in the circumstances of this scheme.	
EDC.1.365	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 43 Trees subject to tree preservation orders	Please see comments above in respect of article 42. It is not clear why two similarly worded articles are required or are appropriate in the circumstances of this project.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.366	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 45(1)(a)(i) and (2) Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance	EDC notes the two references to section 65 Control of Pollution Act 1974, which was repealed on 1 October 2015 by the Deregulation Act 2015 (see paragraph 11 of Part 5 of Schedule 13). EDC and DBC are not in a position to consider whether the defence provided by this article is appropriate in the circumstances of this scheme.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.367	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 49 Procedure in relation to approvals, etc., under Schedule 2	Please correct the typographical error in the penultimate line of paragraph (1) ("such agreement not to b"). Please see Part 2 of Schedule 2 for comments on the substance of this provision.	Noted (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.368	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 50 Disapplication and modification of legislative provisions	The purpose and effect of this article are unclear. The EM at paragraphs 9.27 and 9.28 refer to the modifications to compensation provisions in Schedule 9. That Schedule has already been introduced by article 26(3) and so it is unnecessary to introduce it a second time. Paragraph 9.28 refers to article 43 which EDC and DBC suspects is an incorrect cross reference, given that article 43 is concerned with trees subject to preservation orders. EDC and DBC suggest that the position would be clearer were this article to be deleted in the interests of drafting economy as it appears to serve no other purpose than to introduce Schedule 9. If it is intended to serve some other function, LRCH is invited to set out and justify that function.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.369	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 51 Permitted development	EDC and DBC have concerns that the effect of this provision is far wider than is explained in the EM at paragraph 9.29. The authorised development, as defined in article 2(1) comprises 28 numbered works, together with "further associated development". Not all of that development will comprise an "amusement park". If LRCH wishes the	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>certainty of such a declaration it should be related to an appropriately discrete parcel of the land within the Order limits that would be used as an "amusement park".</p> <p>EDC queries whether there is in fact any need to add any gloss on the application of permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015.</p> <p>EDC and DBC have serious concerns that it would be inappropriate to maintain, for example and without limitation, that the Essex Site or the Highway Works, the services and infrastructure works or the "conferention centre" would comprise an "amusement park" upon which it is appropriate to carry out the development permitted by Class B of Part 18.</p>	
EDC.1.370	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 53 and 54 Byelaws	<p>EDC and DBC note that LRCH is seeking the power to make byelaws for a broad range of purposes which are not limited by the scope of paragraph (2).</p> <p>In this regard it isn't clear why it would be appropriate to extend byelaw making powers, usually the preserve of local authorities or transport undertakers, to a private commercial developer. The EM does not justify why byelaw making powers are required, or are appropriate in the specific circumstances of this proposal.</p> <p>EDC and DBC also note that no Schedule containing byelaws has been provided, which has increasingly been the practice where byelaw making powers are sought in a DCO.</p> <p>EDC and DBC further query who would have the responsibility, and powers, to enforce such byelaws if they are made and whether LRCH has given any consideration to the resource requirements of the enforcing bodies?</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.371	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Art 56 Guarantees in respect of payment of compensation	<p>EDC reserves its position pending the opportunity to review LRCH's Funding Statement.</p> <p>EDC notes that the EM explains that the purpose of this provision is to ensure a suitable guarantee or appropriate form of security is in place prior to the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers. The relevant powers are listed in paragraph (2).</p> <p>It should be noted that other powers within the draft DCO would also give rise to a right to compensation for compulsory interferences with interests in land, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • article 16 (permanent stopping up of streets and rights of access); • article 17 (permanent stopping up of streets and rights of access); • article 21(protective works to buildings); • article 22 (authority to survey and investigate land); • article 24 (power to override easements and other rights); • article 37 (recovery of costs of new connection); • article 41 (temporary closure of, and works in, the River Thames; • article 42 (felling or lopping trees); and • article 43 (trees subject to tree preservation orders). <p>It is not clear from the EM why LRCH ought to be permitted to exercise the above functions before appropriate financial provision is in place.</p> <p>Additionally, given the limited information provided on the proposed timing of the build out of the proposed development it isn't clear that the 15 year limitation on the form of financial provision set out in paragraph (4) is appropriate given the uncertainties surrounding the timing of all of the authorised development coming forward. Several of the provisions listed in paragraph (2) may be exercisable beyond this 15 year period, for example, the power in article 34 to temporarily possess land for the purposes of maintenance (the five year maintenance period does not begin to run until the part of the authorised development to which it relates is completed).</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.372	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	New Article 57 Enforcement	This new article is required to ensure that there is certainty that EDC is entitled to enforce the Order within the urban development area.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.373	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Draft DCO and DCO Requirements - Schedule 1 Authorised Development	<p>Given the limited information available and the absence of other key plans that establish the spatial parameters of the proposed development it is difficult for EDC and DBC to comment on Schedule 1 in detail. In that context the following observations are offered.</p> <p>Schedule 1 ought to acknowledge the urban development area of Ebbsfleet Development Corporation.</p> <p>It is noted that there is an inconsistent approach to defining the maximum areas of the numbered works e.g. Work No.2 is expressed as being “the construction of buildings and facilities for tourism and leisure uses up to 22 ha in area include-“ whereas other descriptions of numbered works do not contain such helpful clarifications.</p> <p>The works listed under the heading "other relevant works" are of concern, in particular the very widely drawn paragraph (u) which would authorise anything necessary or expedient for the "use" of the authorised development.</p> <p>Finally it is noted that the LRCH is not specifying the location of construction compounds. Given that such compounds are likely to be a concentration of environmental effects relating to noise, air quality, traffic, the water environment, and subsequent effects on ecology, it will be important that the flexibility to site such compounds anywhere within the Order limits is clearly assessed in the environmental statement and appropriate enforceable measures are in place to mitigate and regulate those environmental effects.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO and associated plans (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.374	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Draft DCO and DCO Requirements - Schedule 2 - Part 2 Requirements General	<p>EDC and DBC note that it is LRCH’s intention to bring forward the authorised development in phases. EDC has no concerns with the principle of that approach.</p> <p>However, it does have some concerns that the use of the term “No phase of the authorised development may commence” as the trigger for the obligation to discharge requirements is uncertain. This is because the term “phase” is defined by reference to the written scheme to be submitted under requirement 5. If no scheme is submitted, yet nonetheless development commences, the requirements featuring that drafting would be unenforceable.</p> <p>EDC and DBC have suggested the outline of an approach and would expect LRCH to address the point wherever it arises in the requirements for the</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			draft DCO submitted with its application for development consent (save in requirement 5 itself for which a different approach would be appropriate – see below).	
EDC.1.375	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R1 Interpretation	LRCH should provide a definition for "operational use" so it is clear what is meant by that trigger when it is employed in the requirements	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.376	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R2 Time limits	<p>In order to reflect the assumed development timescales in the consultation documents, development needs to commence within the standard 3 years, not 5 years.</p> <p>In addition, uncertainties surrounding when, whether and what form LRCH's proposals for the development of Swanscombe peninsula would come forward have persisted for many years, since at least from the date of the Secretary of State's section 35 Planning Act 2008 direction in May 2014. This has exerted a blighting influence on the development of EDC's development area. If LRCH's proposals are granted development consent then it is important that they are progressed promptly to limit any further harm caused by uncertainty.</p> <p>As such, it is considered that a standard three year time limit on commencement is required.</p> <p>A 3 year commencement limit would not wholly address this concern, as only modest operations on the land would be sufficient to meet the definition of "commence" in article 2(1). Consequently, further phasing requirements are proposed, please see requirement 5 below.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.377	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R3 Design Drawings	<p>EDC and DBC notes that the design drawings referred to in this requirement have not been published for consultation. Consequently, EDC reserves its position to comment further once that further level of detail becomes available. It is not clear at this stage which parts of the authorised development would be encompassed by the design drawings.</p> <p>In the meanwhile EDC and DBC offer the following observations. At this stage EDC has significant concerns that only "general accordancy" is required with the design drawings, but welcomes the confirmation that a materially new or materially different environmental effect would constitute a departure from "general accordancy". However, EDC and DBC is concerned that this is an exclusive test, that is to say, it sets the yardstick by which "general accordancy" is measured only in terms of environmental effects. While environmental effects are important, it can be envisaged that departures from the design drawings could be material in planning terms in respect of</p>	Further plans are included with the submission as per the Schedule of Deliverables (document refs 2.4)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>the proper management of the emerging Ebbsfleet Garden City, yet not hitting the high threshold of a materially new or different environmental effect. At a minimum, paragraph (2) should be amended to make it clear that other factors may be of relevance to the determination of "general accordance" with the design drawings.</p>	
EDC.1.378	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R4 Detailed design approval	<p>EDC welcomes the general principle of the requirement for the detailed design to be in accordance with the detailed design statement.</p> <p>However it has a number of concerns with the requirement as currently drafted.</p> <p>Firstly, it would appear to be the case that LRCH intends to produce the detailed design statement with its application for development consent and that the document would become a document certified under the Order, should it be made. EDC and DBC would welcome early consultation on the substance of the detailed design statement in advance of the submission of LRCH's application. EDC and DBC's further comments below are without prejudice to any further comments it may have once it has had sight of the detailed design statement.</p> <p>Notwithstanding their in principle support of an appropriate design statement, EDC and DBC would expect that the relevant planning authorities ought to also be responsible for approving the detailed design itself, before commencement.</p> <p>Secondly, EDC has concerns regarding the propriety of the detailed design statement being "reviewed and updated by agreement with the relevant planning authorities". To the extent that the document is to be updated it should be via a formal application under the requirements to which Part 2 of Schedule 2 applies. This is to ensure that any updates are appropriately considered and consulted upon. This is particularly important given that the proposed development straddles multiple local planning authority areas.</p> <p>Thirdly, sub-paragraph (3) is drafted in confusing language and lacks certainty. It is unnecessary to refer to any updated detailed design statement as this matter is covered in requirement 1(3). EDC has suggested proposed amendments to refer to the development being carried out in accordance with the approved detailed design statement to achieve this.</p> <p>Fourthly, LRCH have not justified why only Work Nos. 1 and 2 are to be governed by a detailed design statement or approved by the relevant</p>	<p>LRCH has sought to discuss the masterplanning and related matters with the EDC (document ref 3.1 and 7.1)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>planning authority. EDC and DBC consider that such measures should extend to the whole of the authorised development.</p> <p>Finally, EDC notes that paragraph 4(2)(f) refers to “nightclubs” which are not expressly provided for in Schedule 1 (authorised development) and, if such is proposed, it ought to be.</p>	
EDC.1.379	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R5 Phases of development	<p>EDC welcomes the principle of this requirement, which would require LRCH to submit a phasing plan, setting out phasing details including ecological mitigation, earthworks, drainage and mains services.</p> <p>However EDC and DBC do have concerns with the drafting and with the scope of what must be included in the phasing scheme.</p> <p>In terms of the drafting, the “trigger” point of “no phase of the authorised development may commence...” is defective. “Phase” is defined in paragraph 1(1) by reference to the written scheme to be approved under requirement 5. It is therefore circular. If LRCH were to commence construction without first having obtained the approval of the phasing scheme, there would be no “phase” against which compliance would be measured. EDC has suggested amendments to address this issue.</p> <p>Additionally, paragraph (3) refers to a “phasing plan” and it is not apparent whether this is intended to be a separate document (in which case it ought to be subject to approval under paragraph (1)) or part of the written scheme.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above in respect of requirement 2, EDC and DBC consider that it is of paramount importance that appropriate provisions are in place to ensure that adequate detail of each phase is provided, that each phase is completed and brought into operation promptly and that appropriate provision is made for the monitoring of the effectiveness of mitigation employed at each phase.</p>	Further plans are included with the submission as per the Schedule of Deliverables (document refs 2.4)
EDC.1.380	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R6 Ecological management plan	<p>EDC and DBC broadly welcome the principle of a requirement requiring the approval of an ecological management plan to secure on-site biodiversity mitigation.</p> <p>EDC and DBC would expect the application to detail the extent of the biodiversity loss and include a clear outline of how biodiversity net gain would be achieved. The requirement should also properly reflect the established hierarchy of seeking to avoid biodiversity loss in the first instance, where that is not possible seeking on-site compensation, then off-site compensation before considering further “offsetting”.</p>	The management plan forms part of the DCO Deliverables (document ref 6.2.12.3)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			Where offsetting is proposed EDC would expect details of the offsetting proposal to be made available to the examination to enable proper scrutiny of the proposals.	
EDC.1.381	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R7 Construction Environmental Management Plan	<p>EDC and DBC note that at this stage the contents of the CEMP and the range of other measures to be incorporated within it, is not available.</p> <p>EDC and DBC are however very concerned that the requirement would require only "general accordence" with the measures outlined in the approved CEMP. This would seriously undermine the ability of the requirement to be enforced and as such EDC and DBC are of the firm view that only "accordence" (and not "general accordence") with those approved measures is sufficiently precise and enforceable.</p> <p>EDC and DBC are also concerned at the proposed "tail piece" in sub-paragraphs (2) and (5). Given that the draft DCO accommodates changes to approved documents in requirement 1(3) and includes a process for the approval of requirements in Part 2 of Schedule 2, the formal process should be used to ensure transparency.</p>	The implementation plans form part of the DCO submission (document ref 6.2.3.2)
EDC.1.382	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R8 Approval and implementation of construction mitigation plans	It is noted that a significant number of the plans, strategies and schemes referred to in the PEIR do not appear to have been reflected in the requirements. The proposed amendments reflect the plans, schemes and strategies identified as a result of that review.	Management plans form part of the DCO submission (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.383	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R9 Construction hours and noise	It is noted that paragraph 15.153 of the PEIR indicates that normal construction hours will be between 08:00 and 18:00 and the requirement ought to reflect the basis of the assessment. The appropriateness of other measures within this requirement will be considered in the light of the corresponding noise assessment, once available.	Further information on construction hours is contained in the ES and supporting documentation (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.384	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R10 Noise during the operational phase	<p>In respect of paragraph (2) it is not clear why BS4142:1997 is referred to as an appropriate standard to employ considering it has been updated several times in the intervening period and that the latest standard is BS4142:2019.</p> <p>In respect of paragraph (6) it is not clear what the "health and safety requirements" would be that would prevent the use of broadband reversing alarms. These matters ought to be addressed by LRCH.</p> <p>While the requirement does require monitoring, it contains no measures</p>	Further information on operational hours is contained in the ES and supporting documentation (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			requiring action to remedy any unacceptable impacts that may be identified by such monitoring.	
EDC.1.385	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R11 Monitoring of complaints	<p>EDC is supportive of the inclusion of a requirement to respond to noise complaints. However, as drafted the requirement would require only the monitoring of noise complaints, it would not compel LRCH to take any steps or measures to remedy those complaints where the monitoring concludes that they were justified.</p> <p>As drafted, the requirement does not set any time frame within which the monitoring is required to be undertaken.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.386	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R12 Access by construction traffic	The relevant highway authority ought to be consulted on the appropriateness of the construction traffic accesses.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.387	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R13 Provision of landscaping	<p>EDC and DBC welcome the general principle that details of landscaping should be subject to the approval of the relevant planning authorities. It also notes that at this preliminary stage details of the required landscaping mitigation remain to be assessed as such it is not clear at which stages or phases relevant landscape mitigation must be implemented. It therefore reserves its ability to comment further on this aspect in due course.</p> <p>As drafted, the requirement does not specify the minimum scope of the landscaping strategy. EDC and DBC suggest amendments are made to address these matters.</p>	An Outline Landscape Strategy (Document reference 6.2.11.7) and Landscape Management Plan (Document reference 6.2.11.8) is provided.
EDC.1.388	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R14 Replacement planting	No justification has been provided for the "tail piece" at the beginning of the requirement consequently EDC and DBC recommend that it is deleted.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.389	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R15 Implementation of landscaping and replacement planning	<p>EDC and DBC note that landscaping relating to works other than Work Nos. 1 and 2 is to be maintained for a period of five years. LRCH will have to demonstrate in its application the appropriateness of this period.</p> <p>EDC and DBC consider it is also inappropriate for such works to be carried out in "general accordance" with the relevant standard, full accordance should be required.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			The requirement is silent on the period for maintenance of landscaping relating to Work Nos. 1 and 2. EDC would anticipate that it ought to be maintained throughout the operation of the authorised development.	
EDC.1.390	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R16 Retention and protection of existing trees and hedgerows	Measures to protect existing trees and hedgerows are welcomed. The appropriateness of the measures contained in this requirement will be considered once further detail concerning LRCH's proposals become available. It is considered that consideration should be given to naming further consultees that may have an important role to play in approving such measures, including Natural England.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.391	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R17 Fencing and other means of enclosure	EDC suggests minor amendments are made to paragraph (2) to correctly use the term "authorised development" and to remove the unnecessary reference to details being "from time to time" approved. The latter being unnecessary as it is addressed in requirement 1(3).	Noted. (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.392	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R18 Lighting details	<p>The reference to "approved from time to time" is unnecessary as this is dealt with in requirement 1(3).</p> <p>It is considered that insufficient information has been provided to justify the exclusion of lighting visible only from within the authorised development, from the scope of this requirement. In particular the effects of lighting on any onsite ecological mitigation or compensation are an important consideration.</p> <p>EDC notes the reference to details of the lighting of gantry cranes and would expect the environmental assessment of landscape and visual effects to fully assess the use during construction or operation of gantry cranes.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.393	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R19 Flood risk and surface water discharge	<p>Generally it is noted that this requirement appears to be in an embryonic and outdated form, noting in particular with respect to paragraph (3) that consents under section 23 Land Drainage Act 1991 would be issued by the "drainage board concerned" in relation to ordinary watercourses rather than Environment Agency, the latter of which is responsible, under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 for the issue of flood risk permits in relation to main rivers. EDC urges LRCH to carefully review and update this requirement in the light of the existing legal landscape.</p> <p>Generally the requirement ought to be clear about which body is ultimately responsible for discharging that part of the requirement, again this should reflect the existing legal landscape, see paragraphs (4), (5), (7)</p> <p>Paragraph (5) should require consultation with HS1.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>There is a conflict between paragraph (5), which requires details to be approved by the relevant planning authority and requirement (6) which passes the responsibility for approving variations to the approved details to the Environment Agency or LLFA, following consultation with the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>Paragraph (7) ought to be clear as to the process for the approval of the Surface Water Drainage Strategy rather than leave it to be prescribed by the Flow and Water Management Act 2010.</p> <p>In paragraphs (8) and (10) the references to "any variations to the details agreed in writing by the relevant planning authority" is unnecessary and ought to be deleted; this matter is dealt with by requirement 1(4). EDC also reserves its position as to whether the scheme ought to be implemented sooner than the completion of the authorised development. Given the multi-phase nature of LRCH's proposal it is concerned that critical mitigation may never be implemented if later phases are not brought forward.</p>	
EDC.1.394	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R20 Contaminated land and groundwater	<p>This requirement addresses contamination known to be present prior to the commencement of development. It does not deal with measures to address any unexpected contamination encountered during construction. Given the nature that CKD tipping and the deposition of river dredgings have taken place in the area (which is acknowledged in Chapter 5 of the PEIR) the requirement ought also to cater for appropriate mitigation to be employed where previously unknown contamination is encountered during construction or maintenance.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.395	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R22 Geology	<p>EDC and DBC support the principle of ensuring that geological conservation is given appropriate regard.</p>	Noted (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.396	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R25 Highway works	<p>This requirement appears to be inconsistent with article 18, which gives the LRCH the power to form accesses to the highway. Consent under article 18 is required to be given by the relevant planning authority, whereas approval under this requirement is to be given by the relevant highway authority.</p> <p>EDC and DBC would suggest that matters referred to in paragraph (1) ought to be for the approval of the relevant planning authority, following consultation with the relevant highway authority.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.397	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R26 HGV Traffic	<p>While the full results of transport and other assessments are awaited, EDC and DBC would anticipate that it would be necessary for HGV movements to avoid these junctions at peak times.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.398	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R27 Scheme of marking	The approval of the scheme of marking should be for the relevant planning authority, following consultation with the relevant highway authority. This strikes an appropriate balance between the expertise of the highway authority coupled with accountability at a local level.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.399	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R28 Highway signage plans	It is considered that the "tail piece" is unnecessary as requirement 1(3) already contains a formal mechanism for the approval of amended details.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.400	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R29 Traffic Incident Management Plan	It is considered that the relevant planning authority ought to be consulted on the approval of the Traffic Incident Management Plan.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.401	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	R30 Residential amenity: information dissemination and complaints handling	EDC and DBC are supportive of the principle of a requirement dealing with the dissemination of information to residents and complaints handling. EDC and DBC would like to see the requirement set out in further detail the scope of the complaints handling procedure together with a clear duty on LRCH to investigate complaints and take remedial action, to log complaints and actions to investigate and remediate them and for that log to be made available to a relevant planning authority or environmental health officers on request.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.402	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Draft DCO Requirements - Requirement for regulating worker accommodation	It is considered that it is essential that appropriate requirements are in place to regulate the design of any "related housing" and to ensure that such accommodation is used only for the purposes of accommodating workers.	LRCH has taken a parameters-led approach. Further detail is provided in the DAS and Design Code (document ref 7.1 and 7.2). Design is subject to Requirements
EDC.1.403	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Draft DCO Requirements - Transport	It is noted that LRCH greatly relies on the use of the river for the transportation during the construction and operation of the authorised development. EDC and DBC will want to be assured that there are enforceable measures securing appropriate sustainable transportation.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.404	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Draft DCO Requirements - Maintenance and replacement	EDC and DBC consider it essential that appropriate requirements are in place to regulate the effects of the maintenance of the authorised development under article 4 or its replacement under article 3(3), particularly in view of the wide power to maintain that LRCH seeks.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.405	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Draft DCO Requirements - Decommissioning	EDC and DBC will want to be assured that the DCO makes appropriate provision for the decommissioning and restoration of the site should it cease operation.	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.406	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Draft DCO and DCO Requirements Schedule 2 - PART 2 - Procedure for discharge of Requirements, Paragraph 31 Applications made under requirements	<p>It is noted that the time periods within which certain actions must be taken are very short. While it is acknowledged that the LRCH's proposal have been subject to a direction under section 35 of the Planning Act 2008, deeming it to be a nationally significant infrastructure project, LRCH's proposals are for a scheme the nature of which is unlike other projects that have progressed through Planning Act 2008 regime. Given the clear differences, it is apparent the precedent drafting presented (which does not follow the precedent drafted appended to PINS Advice Note 15) here is ill-suited to a complex scheme of a different nature to that usually consented under the 2008 Act.</p> <p>Given the limited detail of the LRCH proposals that are available to date EDC is concerned that much of the important detail will be left over to approval under requirements. There must be adequate time available to it for that detail to be properly scrutinised.</p> <p>The key concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the relevant planning authority is afforded only 7 days to determine whether or not further information is required to determine an application. Given the complexity of the proposal and the commensurate length and complexity of the documents submitted for approval, combined with the need to draw upon internal and possibly external expertise, it will, in practice, be virtually impossible to adequately scrutinise the documentation to a standard that it is confident no further information is required, within 7 days of receipt. • where additional information is provided, the 4 week determination period starts on the day following receipt of that information. The only provision dealing with the scenario whereby the additional information supplied is also insufficient, is that the undertaker may appeal if it disagrees with the relevant authority (see paragraph 33(1)(d)). • it is afforded only one business day to prepare and issue the consultation to a requirement consultee from receipt of the application. This affords a relevant authority no meaningful period of time to handle such consultations. • named consultees are given a maximum of 21 days within which to request any additional information. In practice this will be shorter given that such 	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>requests are required to be transmitted to the relevant planning authority which must in turn request the additional information within that 21 day period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is prevented from requesting further information if requests are not made within the specified, and very short, time periods. • despite paragraph 32(2)(a) recognising the possibility that applications could be invalidly made, there is no provision terminating the "clock" on such a determination. <p>These short time periods and the limitations placed upon the relevant planning authority and other requirement consultees are inconsistent with EDC's duties under the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 in respect of subsequent applications (see regulations 22 to 24).</p> <p>At a minimum EDC and DBC would require an 8 week determination period and sufficient time to seek the views of relevant consultees.</p> <p>Furthermore the term "business days" is not defined in either article 2, or paragraph 1 of Schedule 2, and it ought to be for clarity.</p>	
EDC.1.407	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Paragraph 32 Fees	<p>While EDC and DBC welcome the provision of a fee in connection with the processing of approvals under the operative provisions of the draft DCO and its requirements, it is concerned to ensure that the fee is commensurate to the resources that handling such a complex scheme will require. This concern is heightened by the very short time frames specified in paragraph 31.</p> <p>EDC and DBC is also concerned with paragraph (2)(b) which would require it to refund or credit against a future application, a fee paid in connection with an application where that application is considered to be invalid. EDC and DBC's public resources should not be expended reviewing deficient applications.</p>	Further information is provided in the revised Draft DCO (document ref 3.1)
EDC.1.408	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Other documents - Combined Section 47 and Section 48 Notice	No comments to make	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EDC.1.409	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Other documents -Guide to Consultation	<p>It is noted that COVID-19 restrictions have curtailed the traditional consultation methods employment with major developments, for example, public exhibitions. We also note the on-line and digital consultation methods employed by LRCH to engage with interested parties. However, we do have some concerns regarding the effectiveness of digital methods or reaching some members of the public and concern that some parties may be suffering from “consultation fatigue” as this is the 5th round of consultation in a process that may well seem to the public as very “stop/start”. The offer of telephone surgeries is welcomed, however, digital awareness to access the on-line material is required to find out about such surgeries.</p> <p>We also note that schools and other educational facilities within the core consultation zone have been consulted, however, between the start of the academic year and the 21st September deadline; it is unclear how much meaningful consultation would be possible.</p>	<p>As set out in the Consultation Report(document ref 5.1), LRCH believes its consultation was robust and had an appropriate reach. Consultation was delivered as set out in the SoCC. Public health and safety remained the priority throughout consultation. Households, businesses and community groups were informed about the consultation through multiple methods, including more than 105,000 leaflets posted to households and businesses in the local area, adverts in local newspapers, notifications online, emails and press coverage. A freepost phonenumber and postal address was available and widely advertised, including on the notification leaflet posted to households, for anyone not comfortable with digital methods. Hard copy materials were available to order on request.</p> <p>The Zone approach ensured that local residents were informed about the consultation through multiple communication methods. This was supplemented with wider activity, including online promotion, to ensure that anyone with an interest in the Proposed Development had the opportunity to get involved and provide feedback, regardless of geographic location.</p> <p>The high volume of responses, significantly higher than received during the 2015 consultation, indicates that interest in the London Resort is high, and that the consultation was accessible.</p>
EDC.1.410	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Other documents -Feedback form	<p>Questions 1-6 all ask whether the respondent supports the proposed approach to the issue detailed in those questions. We feel that this terminology may unduly restrict the comments of the respondent. It is not until question 9 that respondents are asked for their “thoughts” and there is only one question (Q10) that asks for any further comments. We feel that good practice would be to ask what respondents think about each issue raised, rather than seek to elicit support or otherwise.</p>	<p>Each question asked respondents to indicate to what degree they agreed or disagreed with each element of proposals. Each question also provided space for open responses, inviting respondents to provide feedback in their own words and on topics of their choice. An open question was also provided at the end, inviting any further comment on any topic area. The summary issues tables available in The Consultation Report (document ref 5.1) sets out the consultation process that has been undertaken, summarises the responses</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				received and how these have been addressed, demonstrating that respondents were able to and did provide feedback on a wide range of issues.
EDC.1.411	Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Other documents -Feedback form	Q1 also states that the “transport strategy includes ferry terminals, transport interchanges, improved links to Ebbsfleet International Station, and agreements with Thames Clipper and Port of Tilbury London, to maximise use of the river, rail, local public transport, walking and cycling.” EDC do not feel that the use of non-private car means of transport have been maximised and to present such a statement as fact is misleading.	Each question asked respondents to indicate to what degree they agreed or disagreed with each element of proposals. Each question included space for open responses, to ensure that people could provide feedback in their own words and on topics of their choice, and an open question at the end, inviting any further comment on any topic area.
EA 1.1	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Overall the PEIR hasn’t provided robust information on how the design of the project and development of the masterplan has avoided or reduced impacts on the ecology of the site.	The Chapter 12 of the ES (Document reference 6.1.12) has detailed how the design of the project and development of the masterplan has avoided or reduced impacts on the ecology of the site.
EA 1.2	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	There is also a lack of detail around the flood risk work and how the project is working to achieve future increased flood defence crest levels.	Further detail has been provided within Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment and Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.
EA 1.3	Environment Agency	Project description	No information is presented on the offsite compensatory habitat. This is of significant concern given the scale of the likely impact of the development on the site.	The approach to off-site mitigation is contained in Chapter 12 (document reference 6.1.12), and Appendix 12.10
EA 1.4	Environment Agency	Waste and materials	No detail has been provided regarding how works can be implemented within the constraints of the historic and permitted landfills. This must be agreed in principle prior to DCO application, as how the changes required on permitted sites will affect environmental controls and monitoring is critical.	Chapter 18 of the ES, Soils, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions (document reference 6.1.18), includes assessment of the contaminated waste derived from the existing landfill areas and estimated volumes of these materials. A breakdown of excavation waste has been outlined within Chapter 19 of the ES (document reference 6.1.19) - Waste and Materials - including assumptions of the hazardous waste portion.
EA 1.5	Environment Agency	Project description	We are also concerned about the timescales for the project and the project’s ability to deliver all outstanding information in time for the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission.	The London Resort project has been emerging for a number of years during which reports and assessments have been undertaken. The DCO suite of documents contain the required information
EA 1.6	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	There is generally insufficient detail provided to allow us to make a full assessment of the proposed development. No assessment of flood risk has	Further detail has been provided within Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment and Chapter 17 of the ES

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			been included, and the Water Resources and Flood Risk section does not address the relevant issues related to flood risk or mitigation measures.	(document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.
EA 1.7	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	The scale of the plans and lack of detail on the existing features makes it difficult to assess proximity issues. The Gate 1 and Hotel zones appear close to the line of the Flood defences. From the extent of the 'Transport Land' and 'Back of House' (Blue and Brown zones) relatively high buildings would be allowed close to the river. More detailed plans and cross sections with plenty of dimensions are needed to show the relationship between the extent of the different zones and the existing and proposed ground profiles and the existing and proposed flood defences. This must also include the proposed future ground profiles and flood defences for flood defence crest raising before the year 2070. Without clear proposals for the flood defence works presented in 3D and the access spaces to inspect, maintain, raise or renew them it will not be possible for us to fully assess that aspect of the scheme.	Further detail has been provided within Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment (document ref 6.1.17 Appendix 17.1) including proposed realignment of flood defences and proposed illustrative cross-sections through flood defences.
EA 1.8	Environment Agency	Greenhouse gas and climate change	There is no mention the effects of climate change on the tidal flood defences. It must be acknowledged that it will be a key consideration in both the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and the Environmental Statement (ES) for appropriate design of new or works to existing flood defences.	Consideration of the effects of climate change has been taken into account in Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment and Water Resources and Flood Risk Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.
EA 1.9	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	More information should be provided on the proposed treatment of the fluvial open channels and their vegetated buffer strips and the culverts and outfalls that allow discharge to the Tidal River Thames.	Further detail has been provided within Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment including proposed realignment of flood defences and proposed illustrative cross-sections through flood defences.
EA 1.10	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	We are also unclear how the project will prevent an increased flood risk to HS1.	The 60-year period that you note is in relation to GHG emissions and is the typical design life of a non-residential building, as per BS EN 15978:2011. For the effects of climate change on the Proposed Development (resilience and adaptation) we have gone beyond this and used UKCP18 projections up to the 2090's. Additionally, a 100-year design life has been assumed in the flood risk assessment (document ref 6.2.17.1).
EA 1.11	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	The document states that floodgates will be removed from the design where possible. Floodgates create a weak point in the flood defence line and therefore if the Developer proposes to keep any floodgates, we will need sufficient evidence to show why an up and over ramp could not be installed to allow access to the jetty for us to approve this proposal.	Floodgates are not included in the proposed development. Further detail has been provided within Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.12	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p>In the description they reference an ‘earth berm’ as the flood defence, however, there is also a flood wall with floodgates on the site. There is recognition for the need to raise the flood defences to the TE2100 future levels, however, there is no supporting evidence for how this will be done. We need information on the type of defence raising, how they will approach the raising (i.e. will it be raised in one go or in phases) and evidence that the current foundations/ground conditions can support this raising to the necessary future TE2100 levels supported by results from site investigations and structural calculations.</p>	<p>The site is primarily defended by earth berms and high ground. Limited areas of flood wall and flood gates are also present and the description in the chapters has been updated accordingly. Further description and detail can be found in Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment including proposed realignment and future raising of flood defences.</p>
EA 1.13	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p>There is acknowledgement that there is likely to be silt present in the culverts draining the main river into the Thames Estuary, however, there is only reference to a CCTV survey of this culvert. Based on recent experience (which we can share), the CCTV had to be abandoned after a short distance and although there are two manholes, they are very difficult to use due to their size. Therefore we need to understand if any provision is being made to assess the silt volume in the structure before a CCTV inspection is carried out. There is no mention of what the future plan for the culverts is. If the existing culverts are to remain, they need to be improved as they are nearing the end of their asset life and will not be fit for purpose for the lifetime of the development. If it is a possibility that the developer is considering relocating the drainage into the estuary for the entire site, the existing culverts will need to be decommissioned. Any installation of gravity outfalls will also need to consider the impacts of sea level rise on these structures.</p>	<p>Refer to Appendix 17.2 Surface Water Drainage Strategy for more information. New outfalls are proposed into the River Thames and will be designed to accommodate sea level rise.</p>
EA 1.14	Environment Agency	Project description	<p>It is not clear whether the footprint of Bell Wharf Jetty will be the same as what is currently there. We need this confirmed as we would not favour encroachment into the river.</p>	<p>The works to Bell Wharf Jetty are contained in Chapter 3 of the ES (document reference 6.1.3) - Project description.</p>
EA 1.15	Environment Agency	Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions	<p>It is possible for contaminant within the land being protected by revetment to enter into the Thames estuary if the revetment around the peninsula is not maintained. It is the Developers responsibility to ensure pollution prevention is in place and therefore must evidence how the revetment will be maintained to ensure this.</p>	<p>The need for pollution control associated with construction activities in such areas of sensitivity is recognised and understood. The planned mitigation and Remediation Strategy incorporate provision for pollution control measures for all such surface water bodies including the River Thames. Further information is available in the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.16	Environment Agency	Relevant law and policy	<p>Section 3.51 should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Thurrock Surface Water Management Plan (July 2014) · Thurrock SFRA 2018 is the latest (not 2009/2010) · Thurrock Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015 · The Draft EA National Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England was laid before parliament on 14 July 2020 and it is currently awaiting Secretary of State approval (link to document here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-strategy-for-england--2) <p>The Secretary of State has recently published a central government policy statement on flood and coastal erosion risk management which has been informed by the EA's consultation exercise for the updated National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy, this was published in July 2020 (link: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-policy-statement)</p>	<p>These references are captured in various specialist ES Chapters including Chapter 10 of the ES River Transport, Chapter 13 Marine Ecology & Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.13) and Chapter 17 of the ES on Water Resources and Flood Risk</p>
EA 1.17	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p>Sections 3.51 to 3.55</p> <p>It is worth noting that Thurrock Council are also a Lead Local Flood Authority under the terms of the Flood & Water Management Act 2010 although currently they seek assistance from Essex County Council for the approval of development related SUDS and surface water management designs linked to the land use planning process.</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation with Thurrock and Essex has been undertaken.</p>
EA 1.18	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p>The Essex County Council USDS Design Guide can be viewed here: https://www.essexdesignguide.co.uk/pdf/SuDS_Design_Guide_2020.pdf</p> <p>Essex County Council also provide an Outline and Detailed drainage design checklist:</p> <p>Outline: https://flood.essex.gov.uk/new-development-advice/how-to-design-suds-in-essex/outline-drainage-design-checklist/</p> <p>Detailed: https://flood.essex.gov.uk/new-development-advice/how-to-design-suds-in-essex/detailed-drainage-design-checklist/</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation with Thurrock and Essex has been undertaken.</p>
EA 1.19	Environment Agency	Project description	<p>5.7</p> <p>The section only refers to flood defence works on Kent site, no mention of flood defences on Essex site.</p>	<p>This is captured in Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.</p>
EA 1.20	Environment Agency	Project description	<p>5.57</p> <p>It is not clear on what earth shaping is being done, and whether the project proposes to raise ground levels. We seek clarity on this, and the proposed levels if raised. There is a proposal to plant trees on the periphery of London Resort. We will need to understand the distance of these trees from the flood defence toe as if too close they could adversely impact the structural integrity of the flood defence.</p>	<p>This is captured in Chapter 3 of the ES (document reference 6.1.3) - Project Description and Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.21	Environment Agency	Project description	<p>5.84 The section mentions the demolition of structures. We would like it clarified if this just referring to the existing Jetty or if is it inclusive of other flood risk assets, including the existing culverts.</p>	<p>This is captured in Chapter 3 of the ES (document reference 6.1.3)</p>
EA 1.22	Environment Agency	River Transport	<p>Structures very close to and encroaching into the river are normally opposed unless they are accepted as being necessary for a river dependent use and needed mitigation is included. A significant increase in vessel movements in the River Thames is proposed including an extension to the Thames Clipper service from London to Swanscombe and Tilbury. The ES supporting the DCO should assess the possible effects of vessel wash from the Thames Clippers and other increased vessel movements. That assessment should include impacts on wildlife, the foreshore, flood defence structures and other river users. The stability and integrity of tidal flood defence walls can be undermined and foreshore habitat damaged by scour generated by waves. Baseline and ongoing foreshore profile, wave energy monitoring and sediment modelling may be required, along with the provision of long term contingency and mitigation plans.</p>	<p>The landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development at the Kent and Essex Project Sites is considered within Chapter 11 of the ES (document reference 6.1.11) and relevant appendices. The effects of the Proposed Development are considered across a range of Landscape Character Areas (at national and local level) and visual receptors, such as residents, road users, public rights of way users and those using the river and rail network in close proximity to the Project Site. The Landscape Strategy and Landscape Masterplan (Document reference 6.2.11.7) provide the details of mitigation measures. The assessment of noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development, including river traffic, and proposed mitigations, are available in the noise and vibration chapter of the ES (Chapter 15 - document reference 6.1.15). The assessment of emissions from the proposed development, including traffic, and proposed mitigations are available within the Air Quality chapter of the ES (Chapter 16 - document reference 6.1.16). The impact of river traffic on marine species are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13). The Lighting Statement (document reference 7.9) ensures that lighting through construction to post completion of the Proposed Development is in accordance with best practice industry guidance. Flood risk to the proposed development and any potential increase in flooding to other areas have been assessed and mitigated. Detail is available in the Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.23	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	10.9 This paragraph refers to dredging works, but it is not clear what the extent of these works will be or how close they will be to the flood defence. The Developer will need to demonstrate that any dredging works will not negatively impact the structural integrity of the flood defences.	Further detail has been provided within Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment including plans and cross sections of proposed realignment and future raising of flood defences.
EA 1.24	Environment Agency	River Transport	10.37 This section refers to the assessment of 'Contact hitting a stationary object'. We would like to understand this better, and whether this include an assessment of the consequences of a potential collision into the flood defence.	Please refer to the River Transport chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.10).
EA 1.25	Environment Agency	Landscape and visual effects	Please note that flood defence embankment are normally planted with grass which is regularly cut to prevent larger vegetation taking hold and to allow for asset condition inspections. Trees and larger vegetation should not be allowed as that is incompatible with maintaining a flood embankment.	This is noted and allowed for in the Landscape Strategy (Document reference 6.2.11.7)
EA 1.26	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	The PEIR should include DEFRA/Environment Agency National Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England Sept 2011 and its draft replacement (May 2019) which is currently awaiting approval from Government following a consultation period which closed in May 2019. The consultation should also include: · Thurrock Surface Water Management Plan (July 2014) · The latest Thurrock SFRA 2018 (not 2009/2010) · Thurrock Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015 Name correction: Thurrock Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015 – not Thurrock Flood Risk Management 2015	Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk - has been updated accordingly. LRCH has not able to locate a copy of 'Thurrock Surface Water Management Plan (July 2014)'.
EA 1.27	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.9 The second bullet point sets the baseline in relation to the design lifetime of the development. That lifetime is not specified within the chapter. Given the fact that some theme parks in the UK have been operational for 100-years we believe that the development lifetime should, for the assessment of all issues, be taken as 100-years.	Development lifetime has been assessed as per EA request; refer to Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment for more information.
EA 1.28	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.14 Please note that notwithstanding the method of assessment the sensitivity of receptors and the magnitude of change/impacts, we would oppose changes that create an increase in flood risk to the existing built environment outside the site. For example a small increased flood risk to commercial or retail would not be acceptable.	Noted, the development does not increase flood risk offsite. Refer to the Appendix 17, Flood Risk Assessment for more information. Noted. Wording has been updated in Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			The section also states that the entire Essex Site benefits from flood defences, however this is not the case as the majority of the Tilbury Cruise Terminal buildings are riverward of the defences.	
EA 1.29	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.72 For additional information, rocks were able to fall down in front of the tidal flap and this jammed the outfall shut which caused the near flooding of CTRL in 2013. Following this, the Environment Agency installed gabion wing walls either side of the outfall to prevent this from happening again. Since this incident, we have not yet had an issue with rocks jamming the outfall flap shut.	Noted. Information has been added to Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment to provide historic context.
EA 1.30	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.74 There is a ditch to the east of Black Duck Marshes that is non-main river. This drains through a secondary culvert which connects to the large intermediate concrete chamber. There is a flapped discharge point within the chamber and it is possible that this is silted and holding the flap shut, consequently affecting the drainage of Black Duck Marshes. This should be considered when assessing the drainage of the site and maintaining the hydrological conditions in the marshes.	Noted
EA 1.31	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	Figure 17.1 We do not believe the illustration of the 'Ordinary watercourse-culverted' is a formal culvert, unless the Developer could provide some further information to support this. We think it is possible that this has been mistaken for drainage discharge points which are sumps within the valley of the two embankments which drain through the revetment and are flapped.	Noted
EA 1.32	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.83 The two unnamed rivers are known as Pincocks Trough (Unnamed Main River (Tilbury East). Chadwell Cross Sewer feeds into this and is the Eastern boundary of the site. Also note World's End Pumping Station on Pincocks Trough. The Unnamed Main River (West) is known as East Tilbury Dock Sewer.	Noted
EA 1.33	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.125 The existing tidal flood defences alignment referred to does in fact run through the entire length of the "terminal buildings" and in some stretches are "free-standing" and in others are "grouted" to the internal face of the external walls of the buildings' northern faces. The flood defences (steel walls & floodgates) run along the northern	Noted. Wording has been updated to Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			boundary of the Cruise Terminal buildings. The defences are either freestanding within, or grouted to, the buildings.	
EA 1.34	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p>17.128</p> <p>Tilbury East Dock Sewer is drained purely by gravity outfall, whilst Chadwell Cross Sewer is drained by both gravity and pumped outfalls. The capacity of each of these systems is considered to have already been exceeded by existing development.</p> <p>We would like to refer to Tilbury Integrated Urban Design Model 2015 - a collaboration between us, Thurrock Council and Anglian Water.</p>	Noted
EA 1.35	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p>17.141</p> <p>Tidal The recently updated flood risk assessment climate change allowances for sea level rise – UKCP18 – was published on 17th Dec 2019.</p> <p>Fluvial Please note that we have been informed that work is ongoing to reflect the latest UKCP18 projections for peak river flow and peak rainfall intensity within Flood Risk Assessment climate change guidance on gov.uk, the current guidance being based on UKCP09 projections. However, we have been informed by our National Senior Advisor that it is unlikely that there will be any published update to the FRA Climate Change Guidance relating to peak rainfall or peak river flow before the end of 2020.</p>	Noted this has been included in the Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment.
EA 1.36	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p>17.147</p> <p>The risks to the water environment during demolition and construction include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Flood risk associated with basement excavations. <p>It should also include Flood risk associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · overland flow due the development. · how the project could impact the rate of inundation and where/how breached flows would accumulate behind the sea defences. · location of surface water balancing facilities. 	Noted.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.37	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.177 The paragraph refers to an assessment on the effect on the marine environment from increased marine traffic. We need to understand if this include the possible impact on the foreshore from increased localised wave action and the impact this could have on the integrity of the flood defence.	Noted.
EA 1.38	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.181 The flood risk mitigation must also apply to offsite effects.	Noted.
EA 1.39	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.188 We look forward to discussing the specific details of the Kent Project site flood defence improvement further prior to the submission of an FRA.	Consultation with the EA has been ongoing since the PEIR.
EA 1.40	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.190 It is difficult to see how the applicant will be able to demonstrate workable solutions to the flood defence raising required to demonstrate that the development is safe in flood risk terms for its lifetime without first undertaking the needed ground investigations works and at least initial geotechnical design work. The design should not just ensure that future defence raising is possible but also possible without undue cost and difficulty, without the inclusion of flood gates or other movable flood defences. All new structures forming the flood defences need to be designed for the development lifetime and all existing elements being retained must be shown to have at least the development lifetime remaining. Intrusive river wall investigation works will be required for any sections of wall that are to be retained. Detailed ground investigation works will be required to establish the stability of the existing high ground, earth embankments and the viability of proposed earth defence raising. All relevant modes of failure need to be assessed for the current and future scenarios including the wall failure modes and slip failure, bearing capacity failure, uplift and blow out in the hinterland. Higher water levels can reduce inter-partial friction increasing the fragility of earth embankments.	Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment makes reference to the requirements needed for future raising of flood defences, including maintenance to inform the spatial layout of the masterplan. Consultation with the EA will continue post DCO to ensure that the adequate ground investigations and analyses are undertaken to inform the detailed design. Further details have been provided in the Flood Risk Assessment Appendix 17.1.
EA 1.41	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.191 We welcome further discussions regarding possible realignment of the existing defences in the locations in advance of the FRA submission.	Consultation with the EA has been ongoing since the PEIR.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.42	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.192 We welcome the inclusion of details previously provided to the applicants regarding future aspirations to realign the tidal defences in the vicinity of the Cruise Terminal. However, despite the statement that these works are “part of a wider Tilbury waterfront area for defence improvement by the EA” these works are being proposed as part of the future aspirations of the Thames Estuary 2100 Plan. There appears to be more focus and connection to defence requirements and TE2100 for the Kent site throughout the document and appears somewhat overlooked for the Essex site. Please note that there will be monitoring of existing flood defences assets during construction phase to ensure there is no detrimental impact to the defences and that monitoring will be continued post construction phase.	Reference to the existing defences and the refurbishment of the Tilbury Cruise Buildings has been made in Appendix 17.1 (document ref 6.2.17.1) Flood Risk Assessment.
EA 1.43	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.194 This should be with the 1 in 100-year plus climate change flood outline.	Noted and amended in the Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) and Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment.
EA 1.44	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.203 The consultation should also include KCC.	Undertaken and outlined in Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17)
EA 1.45	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.210 As mentioned above, the drainage into these systems are at capacity so surface water runoff into main river will need to be minimised.	Noted.
EA 1.46	Environment Agency	Greenhouse gas and climate change	Chapter 20 recognises that the assessment must include Climate Change Mitigation and also Climate Change Adaptation and resilience. However, it then does not include anything on flood risk mitigation to address sea level raise or increased rainfall intensity.	Section B of the ES chapter regarding greenhouse gases and climate change (document ref 6.1.20) provides a climate change resilience risk assessment. Additionally, a section on climate change adaptation and resilience has been incorporated into each technical chapter.
EA 1.47	Environment Agency	Greenhouse gas and climate change	20.56 States that the project lifetime is considered to be 60 years. We disagree that this is a reasonable estimate of the lifetime of the development given the long period before the second phase will be completed and the fact that some other Theme Parks in the UK have been operational for 100-years.	The 60-year period that you note is in relation to GHG emissions and is the typical design life of a non-residential building, as per BS EN 15978:2011. For the effects of climate change on the Proposed Development (resilience and adaptation) we have gone beyond this and used UKCP18 projections up to the 2090’s. Additionally, a 100-year design life has been assumed in the flood risk assessment. (document reference 6.1.17)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.48	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The masterplan shows green corridors around the proposed car park and facilities on the Essex side. The wildlife value of these corridors needs to be assessed and improved wherever necessary to provide wildlife gains on the north side of the estuary, rather than just focusing all of mitigation and compensation on the south side. Possible corridor improvements could include bee banks, wildflower sowing and creation of bare ground for invertebrates etc. The car park areas could also have fringe habitats for wildlife. We hope an opportunity is not missed while rightly focusing on the Kent side where impacts could be more serious.	The final version of the ES includes mitigation measures for construction stage embodied carbon and lifecycle embodied carbon that reduce significance to Moderate Adverse. Further information is available in the ES chapter regarding greenhouse gases and climate change (document ref 6.1.20)
EA 1.49	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<u>Kent Site</u> Waste Water location and its potential impact on the Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) should be included in the EIA. The flows in terms of physical impact as well as the chemical or temperature change will all need to be considered, and the placement of the outfall is therefore crucial. It is not acceptable to exclude this. No information is presented on the offsite compensatory habitat. This is of significant concern given the scale of the likely impact of the development.	The net zero commitment relates to operational energy emissions, as per the UKGBC definition. The commitment does not cover electric vehicle charging and other commercial process loads, nor does cover operational water emissions. GHG emissions associated with operational waste have not been scoped into the assessment as these are likely to be slight in comparison to the overall lifecycle GHG emissions. GHG emissions associated with land use change have been considered within the ES chapter regarding greenhouse gases and climate change (document ref 6.1.20).
EA 1.50	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<u>Tilbury Pier Extension</u> The ES will need to confirm why dredging will not be required, i.e. we will need to see current depth and sediment information to confirm that there is sufficient water to avoid this. This applies to both sites.	The assessment of the effects of climate change on the Proposed Development has now been completed and has been included in the ES chapter regarding greenhouse gases and climate change (document ref 6.1.20).
EA 1.51	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<u>Designated Sites</u> It would have been helpful to have provided more information on the MCZ and SSSI at this stage, as these are our main areas of concern. Saltmarsh and Mudflat losses should be provided in the context of the inner Thames area, rather than looking at the entire estuary. Saltmarsh in particular is a very rare habitat upstream of Gravesend and many areas of inter-tidal mud are heavily impacted by river uses on the Thames. There needs to be an explanation of why rare priority habitats are not being avoided in the hierarchy of assessing the environmental impact, particularly given their rarity in this part of the estuary, and the legal protection afforded the inter-tidal mud within the MCZ. Loss off mudflat within the MCZ is not compatible with the requirements of positive management of the site. Any loss of priority habitat should be fully compensated for.	A Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8) has now been completed, providing further detail on impacts and mitigation.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.52	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Sub-tidal losses</u> Given the legal protection afforded to the tentacle lagoon worm, the MCZ designation, and therefore for the high priority of retaining sub tidal habitats at this location on the Thames, we question how these losses are being assessed as minor adverse.</p>	A Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8) has now been completed, providing further detail on impacts and mitigation.
EA 1.53	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Lighting</u> Lighting levels may be similar to other developed areas along the Thames, but we need to understand the baseline change on the site. This includes taking into account the fact it provides a darker area for nocturnal species to utilise, which may aid breeding success, or its use as a refuge. Changes in hydrodynamics and sediment accretion and erosion are particularly pertinent to the MCZ and saltmarsh areas. No information is presented on how this modelling will be conducted. We are not aware of any known modal for the specific vessels proposed to be used at this site. Therefore this needs a much better explanation.</p>	A lighting assessment has been completed (document reference 7.10) and the results have been incorporated into the ecological impact assessment in Chapter 12 (document reference 6.1.12). A Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8) has now been completed, providing further detail on impacts and mitigation.
EA 1.54	Environment Agency	Water Resources	<p><u>Flooding and water</u> No explanation of changing water levels on the peninsula since the first survey. There appears to be a lack of detailed knowledge and explanation of the site at present. There is no details on how flood risk management will work in the future; and how this will relate to the impacts on biodiversity and the proposed mitigation strategy. There is no mention of the proposed water from groundwater supplies and whether this is likely to impact any receptors at the site, or within the vicinity. As this is part of the project it needs to form part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The current map shown as the drainage infrastructure is inaccurate. There is no outfall under the defence at Black Duck Marsh. We believe there is a culvert that travels from the north east part of Black Duck Marsh to the culvert that outfalls into the Thames, east of Bells Wharf. We have no information on the condition or operation of this culvert. The applicants should fully understand how this operates, and in particular how this relates to how the water levels have risen on Black Duck Marshes since the first ecological assessments back in 2012.</p>	Further detail has been provided within Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment and Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.
EA 1.55	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Landscape</u> The impacts on landscape, need to feed into the ecological impact assessment. Arboricultural Impact Assessment information has not been provided in the PEIR so we cannot at this stage see which trees are being retained or removed as part of this proposal. It would have been helpful to include this information at this stage. Claims that Black Duck Marsh is avoided are not accurate, as the current proposal includes a road through the edge of Black Duck Marsh on what is currently flooded woodland. To build this road there would clearly need to be significant amounts of infilling</p>	An arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) is included as Appendix 12.9 (Document Reference 6.2.12.9).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			of this part of the marshes, exposing them to very significant construction and operational impacts.	
EA 1.56	Environment Agency	Noise and vibration	<p><u>Noise Assessment</u></p> <p>The noise measurements being taken have not considered ecological receptors and have only taken into account human features of the surrounding area. There is no baseline data from along the River Thames, or from the proposed retained area of Botany Marshes, close to the actual development site. It is only assessed on its eastern edge adjacent to the industrial area. The vibrational impact of any construction work close or in Black Duck Marsh will need to be considered. Proposed mitigation will need to factor in ecology.</p>	These items are included in the Noise and Vibration Assessment provided in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15)
EA 1.57	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Green Infrastructure Plan</u></p> <p>This plan is full of a lot of ‘buzz’ words, but doesn’t provide any meaningful detail on how the green infrastructure plan will genuinely improve surrounding/retained areas of habitat. The plan doesn’t even accurately provide a layout of the proposed development. There is a clearly a lot more detail required. As mentioned elsewhere we are unlikely to agree to the saltmarsh enhancement at Black Duck Marsh, as this old embankment is still an important anchor in front of the modern flood defence, and effectively forms part of it. Additionally, there is a lack of detail regarding the quality of the existing habitat, which we believe is good, and needs no attempts to “enhance” it. For areas of Broadness Marshes we will need to see far more detailed baseline vegetation surveys on what currently occupies these areas. We will also need information on ground conditions so that it can be checked that the proposed enhancement is viable, and likely to work. We will need to see how the quality of habitats as well as the extents will be enhanced and managed over the remainder of the site, as this is still unclear.</p>	The Landscape Strategy Document (document reference 6.2.11.7) provides an evolution of the principles outlined in the Green Infrastructure Plan at the PEIR Stage.
EA 1.58	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Fisheries</u></p> <p>Generally, the PIER documents correctly characterise the main fisheries receptors and issues that we would expect to see. As work progresses we would expect to see more detail on specific elements of the scheme and would encourage regular meetings/discussions with the developer’s teams and other regulators to ensure early identification of any new risks or changes to what has been described. The proposed Combined Heat and Power plant should be discussed in the future ES, with specific reference to its fisheries implications. The screening proposed and how this will mitigate its impacts. The ES should include mention of the future fisheries potential of the Ebbsfleet and other waterbodies on site.</p>	Impacts on fish are considered in Chapter 12 (document reference 6.1.12) and Chapter 13 (document reference 6.1.13) of the ES. The CHP Plant is no longer part of the development proposals.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.59	Environment Agency	River Transport	<p><u>Chapter 10: River Transport</u> This identifies a significant increase in river traffic and the environmental impact of this upon the marine environment will need to be assessed. PINS have also identified this risk. We will need to coordinate its review of this with MMO and PLA. See additional comments below on Chapter 13.</p>	The impact of river traffic on marine species are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13).
EA 1.60	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Chapter 12: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology</u> The chapter identifies the Tilbury Port side of being of low ecological value due to mainly hard standing (which will be low value) but also mentions areas of bare ground. We would like to better understand what assessment has been undertaken to determining the low ecological value of these areas of bare ground, particularly for terrestrial invertebrates.</p>	An initial scoping study was completed in April 2020 along with a single invertebrate sampling event in May 2020. As described within the Ecology Baseline Report (Document Reference 6.2.12.1), following the May sampling event, on account of its relatively small size and unexceptional grassland and scrub habitat, it was decided that no further sampling would be undertaken in Area 19 - Tilbury Docks, Essex. The habitat selected tentatively within the scoping study, comprised a short stretch of road verge grassland and scrub habitat around TQ 64582 75464. Thus, no further sampling was undertaken within the Essex Project Site, with all remaining sample areas being located in the Kent Project Site.
EA 1.61	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Table 12.3: Summary of the distinctiveness and value of habitats within the Project Site</u> We would like to clarify how areas of swamp/reedbed has been assessed in terms of intrinsic value For example, the reedbed habitat area is exceptionally extensive, and a rare habitat type for south east England, but only gets County level of interest. We would therefore question the assessment.</p>	Areas of swamp/ reedbed have been identified, mapped and described following completion of a Phase 1 Habitat Survey, completed in accordance with the industry-standard Joint Nature Conservation Council (JNCC) (2010) 'Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey - A Technique for Environmental Audit'. In assessing the importance of this habitat, consideration has been given to it's status as a Priority Habitat, it's current condition, and Local Wildlife Site selection criteria. On balance, it was considered that the reedbed was of County level.
EA 1.62	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is mentioned, although no information is presented in the PEIR review. The River Metric will need to be utilised for the River Ebbsfleet due to the proximity of the road to the watercourse. We need confirmation that this has been carried out for the watercourse to enable the use of the BNG tool. Generic information appears to be used on different habitat and species assessments. It should be tailored to the habitat and species. We therefore question how this has been carried out.	Within the current draft of the Environment Bill, as submitted to Parliament, Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) are exempt from the requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Nevertheless, the Applicant is submitting the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 on a voluntary basis to demonstrate a commitment to delivering net gain in accordance with the NPPF (see 'Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment', Document Reference 6.2.12.2). Due to the limitations of the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 tool, in that indirect (degradation) impacts upon linear features cannot be

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				calculated, no assessment of impacts upon rivers has been made within the metric. No direct, measurable (for the purposes of BNG calculations) loss of length of either the River Thames or River Ebbsfleet are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development. The potential for indirect effects to the River Ebbsfleet are addressed within the Ecological Impact Assessment presented in Chapter 12: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.1.12).
EA 1.63	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The habitat information is very simply displayed with very little detailed information. The site is more complex than this, and the mix of vegetation communities should be correctly provided. For example the modern flood embankment, and the older embankment seaward of it have very different habitat types, and the seaward area has a variety of vegetation communities. This variety and interest is not captured in the basic mapping. In this respect the proposed saltmarsh creation is unlikely to be an acceptable option at Black Duck Marsh. For Broadness Marsh more detailed information on the proposals are needed. The layout of the development in relation to Black Duck Marsh appears likely to have a very significant impact on the marsh due to its proximity, lack of buffer and indeed its intrusion into the wetland at the eastern edge close to Bells Wharf. This is not discussed or justified within the PEIR. The height and proximity and damage caused by the positioning of these features is likely to have a significant impact on the marsh and the wildlife utilising it. Particularly breeding birds.	The habitats present on the Project Site have been identified, mapped and described within Chapter 12 through a combination of industry-standard Phase 1 Habitat Survey, and detailed botanical survey where areas of higher botanical value are present. A detailed description of the habitats present is provided within the Ecology Baseline Report (Document Reference 6.2.12.1).
EA 1.64	Environment Agency	River Transport	It is unclear if impacts of additional river traffic has been assessed at West Thurrock Lagoon and Marshes SSSI. An assessment of the significance of change close to the inter-tidal areas and saltmarsh will need to be taken into account.	This is included in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13).
EA 1.65	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	12.97 The Breeding bird assemblage is assessed as County Level significance. However in the 2017 survey data it suggested it was of Regional importance for the number of species of conservation significance. It needs clarification how these assessments have been determined.	The valuation of the breeding bird assemblage has been reviewed following feedback from consultees and analysis of surveys results. Consequently, the assemblage is valued at Regional level.
EA 1.66	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	12.150 We are seeking clarity on what mitigation is intended for the stated 15% net loss.	Within the current draft of the Environment Bill, as submitted to Parliament, Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) are exempt from the requirement to deliver 10% net gain. Nevertheless, the Applicant is submitting the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 on a voluntary basis to demonstrate a commitment to delivering net gain in accordance with the NPPF (see

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				'Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment', Document Reference 6.2.12.2). The principles underpinning the off-site mitigation are provided within the 'General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation' (Document Reference 6.2.12.10).
EA 1.67	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	12.151 Ideally BNG work should be carried out on site, or directly, adjacent to the site. We would welcome any ideas or plans that may be being considered for this, and would therefore consider the River Ebbsfleet river corridor and the Swanscombe Marsh waterbodies as ideal areas for habitat creation and improvement works.	Chapter 12 of the ES: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.1.12) of the Environmental Statement provides a comprehensive package of mitigation measures for terrestrial and freshwater species/species assemblage recorded within the Project Site. A suite of on-site habitat creation and enhancement measures of benefit to terrestrial, aquatic and marine habitats and species is provided, and illustrated within the Landscape Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.7).
EA 1.68	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	12.154 Fish are not specifically mentioned in this section of the report. However, whilst the PEIR does not anticipate any significant issues with regard to freshwater fish populations within the Ebbsfleet River and the other waterbodies on site, there is considerable scope for improving these habitats to a condition where fish would be able to utilise them. The ES should briefly consider future potential for fish populations and identify any elements of the London Resort proposals that would jeopardise such future improvement. Any works to any unsurveyed waterbodies may also show fish to be present, therefore dewatering of any of these areas may need to consider fish rescue and relocation as a possible contingency.	With respect to the River Ebbsfleet mitigation will be limited to habitat creation and enhancement of habitats within the floodplain adjacent and associated with proposed drainage features. No habitat measures are proposed to the Rivers Ebbsfleet itself given its engineered nature and role in flood defence, whilst a fish assemblage will be constrained by the presence of significant culverts preventing movement between the River Thames and Ebbsfleet, regardless of implementation of habitat features specific to this species group. Nevertheless, Chapter 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.12) considers the potential impacts on a fish assemblage with due regard to objectives of the WFD. A summary of this assessment is further provided within a WFD Screening Assessment prepared specific to the River Ebbsfleet and provided at Appendix 12.8 of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.12.8). Improvements to the water quality within retained waterbodies on Swanscombe Peninsula will be made, to the benefit of fish and other aquatic species.
EA 1.69	Environment Agency	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Table 12.5 The hydrology to maintain and enhance Botany Marshes Local Wildlife Site needs to be clearly considered and hydrologically calculated for this area. It will need enough water quantity and quality to maintain it. The edge effect of building over the rest of Botany Marshes will need to be fully assessed for	Assessment of the hydrological impacts of the Proposed Development is provided within Chapter 17 of the ES: Water Resources and Flood Risk (Document Reference 6.1.17), and potential ecological effects within Chapter

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			both the construction and operational stage. Many issues such as the proximity of the new road to River Ebbsfleet are not considered or summarised in this table. We would need to see the detailed assessment and information to agree with the bold claims regarding the residual impacts of the development and the level of certainty. Particularly regarding disturbance from noise, lighting, hydrology, contamination risk and likelihood of the success of mitigation and compensation schemes. It is unclear how magnitude has been determined.	12 of the ES: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.1.12).
EA 1.70	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.12 Boat wash, from fast ferry/passenger vessels should be assessed with regard to the effects of greatly increased boat movements, combined with high energy, fast moving vessel wash upon intertidal habitats. Especially in the jetty areas where vessels will be accelerating and decelerating at all points of the tide. Maintenance dredging requirements should also be considered within the ES.	The potential effects of boatwash has been considered in the River transport and marine ecology chapters of the ES (document refs 6.1.10 and 6.1.13). Maintenance dredging has been considered in the ES.
EA 1.71	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.36 It is important to note that if there are major changes to the scheme that then led to different areas of the site or different habitat types undergoing changes or losses, then additional survey work may be required in order to assess these changes. For example; relocation of the jetty structures, capital dredging of foreshore areas and similar activities.	Noted
EA 1.72	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.43 We disagree with this assumption. The physical footprint and impact of the proposed discharge will need to be considered as part of the ES. This assessment should include the discharge and the infrastructure needed, including the physical footprint of the outfall structure, any proposed scour protection, location and impact of any pipeline, construction method and duration (marine works on the foreshore would need to be assessed). Appropriate mitigation would need to be identified and agreed for these impacts.	The potential footprint of outfalls and cofferdams associated with construction of the outfalls within the intertidal zone, including saltmarsh habitat, has been included in the ES based on consideration of their proposed locations. Effects of the discharge have been considered. Duration of works and detailed methods have been considered in the ES.
EA 1.73	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.49 Any lighting used should be aimed away from the water in order to prevent any disturbances to migratory marine species. Direct lighting of the watercourse should be avoided.	Noted. This mitigation for lighting has been included within the ES and the Outline Lighting Strategy (Document 7.10: Lighting Statement).
EA 1.74	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.50 We seek clarity on whether the saltmarsh habitat mitigation will be like for like in terms of area.	The area of saltmarsh to be created will be greater than that lost within the infrastructure footprint. It is proposed that approximately 3 ha will be created which is stated in the ES (details in ES Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.75	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.51 Intertidal terracing is not the same in terms of like for like mitigation in regards to the loss of mud flat. We would be happy to assist in providing further guidance on the intertidal terraces. There are features and design options that will optimise utilisation of terraces by fish.	Intertidal terracing is not compatible with the saltmarsh creation design and has been removed from the mitigation proposed for the Proposed Development
EA 1.76	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.59 We would welcome the avoidance of dredging. However, if this changes, a new assessment will need to be carried out. We recommend closed bucket dredging is the best method to avoid extensive suspension of sediment into the estuary. Dredging activity is best performed in the winter months, when water quality impacts will be less. For information, upstream of Tilbury Lock there is a long standing agreement with the PLA that here should be no dispersive maintenance dredging activity June to August due to the large numbers of sensitive juvenile fish, spawning activity and higher risk of hypoxia events in summer months. This period may need to be extended to include the spring (March - May) at sites close to spawning areas. The ES should look at any maintenance dredging requirements for the proposed boat operations associated with the London Resort, during both the construction and operational phases. Regular dredging will cause a degradation of functional subtidal habitat.	The potential for dredging has been assessed as part of the requirements under Option C only within the ES. This has also been considered within the Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document ref 6.2.13.). Noted. The advice for the best practice has been considered.
EA 1.77	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.71 We would like clarification on the estimated amount of saltmarsh that will be recreated with the defence realignment.	It is proposed that approximately 3 ha will be created which is stated in the ES Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3).
EA 1.78	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.73 The ES should consider any negative impacts of the loss of contiguous foreshore from the jetty and Ro-Ro area upon juvenile fish species and migratory species (e.g. elvers) passing the site on their upstream migration within the estuary.	These effects have been considered within the marine ecology chapter of the ES -see paragraph 13.161-167. (document ref 6.1.13).
EA 1.79	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.78 Saltmarsh is not widespread on the Thames, this statement is inaccurate, as the vast majority of this habitat has been lost and new areas that have colonised do not have the ecological quality of older, long-established saltmarsh habitats.	This statement was in relation to intertidal mud. Text in the ES has been updated to reflect this (see paragraph 13.85 of document ref 6.1.13).
EA 1.80	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.84 The Tentacled Lagoon worm is only known from this stretch of the Thames, therefore any displacement is unlikely to be 'negligible'. The species also has full legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, and as the reason for the designation of the MCZ. Therefore it is inaccurate to assess	The assessment for disturbance and displacement within the subtidal habitat has been assessed to be of minor significance for <i>A. romijni</i> and negligible for all other organisms following the methodology outlined in the marine ecology chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.13).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			the displacement 'negligible'. There are also underwater noise and piling risks associated with this site.	
EA 1.81	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.88-13.93 – Increase in underwater noise and vibration We believe that the impact upon fish, particularly migratory activity, may still be significant with the mitigation measures proposed. The risk is particularly associated with the jetty construction and marine works. Consideration should be made to avoid percussive piling during those sensitive periods when fish will be migrating past the site.	The effects of underwater noise and vibration from piling have been assessed see paragraphs 13.102 to 13.142 of the marine ecology chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.13).
EA 1.82	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.90 The statement seems to state an appropriate size and hammer energy for a worst-case scenario, but it should also consider piling duration and the time of year that it will take place. The ES should look at planned piling activity as a specific issue with regard to fish, as has been done for the PEIR. This should look at proposed piling methods, duration of piling work, the hammer size and energy and the noise and vibration transmitted to the marine environment. We would want confidence that migratory fish are able to pass the construction sites where piling is taking place and that at least half of the river width is available for them to do this in terms of the transmitted noise and vibration through the water column and riverbed. This should look at a behavioural response as being significant, rather than permanent or temporary injury or mortality. The ES should further consider how far the above thresholds will extend from the piling site, the duration of the piling work, the sensitivity of the likely fish species and life stages present and implications upon migratory behaviour. Cumulative effects should also be assessed if piling work is to be performed concurrently at the Essex and Kent sites. Avoiding percussive piling activity might provide further mitigation at sensitive times of year when fish are activity migrating past the site. Wherever technically feasible we would request that non-percussive methods of piling are adopted in order to reduce any impacts on aquatic life that may be in the vicinity. If percussive piling is deemed to be the only feasible way to achieve the design depth, then we would want a technical justification for the reasons that other piling methods are not viable, and that also details the specific fish protection/mitigation measures to be adopted. We also request that a soft start method be adopted, for all piling methods in order to allow any marine life to move away from the disturbance before any physical damage occurs. As an example: For the Tideway Tunnel project the period April to September was identified as the sensitive period when adult and juvenile fish (of a range of species) would be actively migrating, this period was extended to March to September for sites	This is considered is both Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13) and the Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>near spawning areas. In the London Resort Area, there will be adult European smelt aggregating and moving upriver to spawn in the Wandsworth area in late February to early March. This is a short lived species, so disruption to its migration that reduced natural recruitment could be significant. Juvenile eels will also be moving upstream at around this time. We need to ensure that they are able to pass the site during this migration period. The future ES needs to clearly identify the mitigation measures appropriate for the avoidance and reduction of adverse impacts upon resident and migratory fish, and key life stages e.g. adult smelt and glass eel/elver upstream migrations.</p>	
EA 1.83	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p>13.164 We would like to understand the definition of “localised impacts”.</p>	<p>As per CIEEM guidance (2018), the magnitude of impacts is considered in terms of local, regional and national extents. ‘Localised’ where used as a general term is referring to impacts extending tens or a few hundreds of metres from an impact source.</p>
EA 1.84	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p>13.166 We are concerned about how this is being modelled, and the provisional assessment is therefore questionable at this stage. The overnight lighting of all the structures needs to be factored in. The impact on the estuary and the potential impact of additional lighting needs to be understood. It is noted that the Clipper frequency is based on the current Woolwich Ferry visits – it needs to be assessed what the actual frequency will be for the development.</p>	<p>Details of the hydrodynamic modelling approach are provided in a standalone report (H R Wallingford. 2020. The London Resort: Hydrodynamic and sedimentation assessment)</p>
EA 1.85	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p>13.212 These mitigation measures identified by the PIER will reduce the negative impact, but only if fully adopted. The ES need to be explicit about what measures will be used. The adopted mitigation requirements should then also be clearly identified in the Construction Environmental Management Plan and also communicated in tender documents, so that future contractors are aware of what piling equipment to obtain, when its use would be appropriate and any other mitigation measures that apply. For example, avoidance of certain sensitive periods, or low tide percussive piling will limit the constructors working window, so will come under pressure from contractors. They will need to be clearly defined and stated in the CEMP and preferably in tender documents to ensure that the mitigation is delivered. Please also be aware that non-percussive/vibration piling techniques will avoid any negative impact upon migrating fish and can be used all year</p>	<p>Noted. A Rochdale Envelope approach has been applied to the project for all activities as described in ES chapter one: Introduction (document reference: 6.1.1). As requested, information relating to the realistic worst case scenario for piling activities (including the parameters stated) has been provided and forms the basis of the assessment for each effect/receptor pathway.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			around. Additional mitigation measure for consideration could be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Limit percussive piling to the winter months when migratory activity is less. · Use of silent/hydraulic piling methods, if technically feasible. · Acoustic shielding around the pile being driven (if percussive). 	
EA 1.86	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.201 All discharges to the River Thames do however have to determine impacts on the MCZ and river habitats.	Noted.
EA 1.87	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.211 Any groundwater use requires EIA of impacts on surrounding waterbodies.	Noted.
EA 1.88	Environment Agency	Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions	<u>Chapter 18: Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions</u> Criteria for determining sensitivity and effects is very crudely done. It isn't clear how the site fits into this criteria.	Assessment has been advanced and completed. The sensitivity of each receptor is now identified with justification provided. Potential effects are defined and further described in Chapter 18 of ES (document reference 6.1.18).
EA 1.89	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	We expect to see more detail in the next stage about the proposed wastewater provision, and the on-going negotiation with Southern Water regarding treatment. We would also like to see a consideration, based upon these discussions, of the impact of additional domestic waste flows on the receiving treatment works, and the permit implications thereof. We would point out that whilst temperature itself has no EQS criteria in a waterbody, thermal effects of discharge of heated water could hypothetically affect other WFD physio-chemical elements (for example dissolved oxygen levels) which do come under the regulatory regime. Therefore an appropriate level of assessment for thermal impacts will be part of the wider WFD assessment required, though discharge temperature of may be controlled within the discharge permits required, and the permitting teams will advise on this. Since specific chemical water quality matters cannot really be further progressed until sediment samples have been provided and their results incorporated into a WFD assessment, as is proposed, we are satisfied that the document covers WFD water quality at the conceptual scale and that the detailed assessment is planned to be delivered within the Water Framework Directive Assessment stage where it will be required to support a DCO in relation to marine licences usually required.	Noted.
EA 1.90	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	Most marine receptors said to have minor adverse effects. This doesn't seem unreasonable but is difficult to agree with until we see more detail in the Residuals around Water Source Heating Pump/Combined Heating Pump (WSHP/CHP) intake and discharge seem to be missing from this assessment. Some reference is made to these plans without further information and will need to be assessed appropriately if part of the final submission. Water	WSHP/CHP is no longer a part of the project proposals. More detail substantiating effects is provided in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			Quality is not considered as a receptor which may be reasonable in an ecology report but should be included somewhere within the documents.	
EA 1.91	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.57 These activities will equally apply to water quality as it does to marine ecology, and there is a natural linkage between marine ecology and water quality.	This comment is noted
EA 1.92	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.59 and 13.60 Comments relating to water quality and construction impacts are noted and we agree with them. We note the current proposals do not include dredging, but that there is acknowledgement that should this change, a full WFD assessment for dredging will be required. We note also that in-combination effects may arise where external dredges are being carried out in the vicinity of works for this project. Tilbury 2 Port maintenance dredge might be one such example.	Potential impacts of dredging are considered in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13).
EA 1.93	Environment Agency	Marine ecology and biodiversity	13.220 There is an assessment of potential effects on the water environment attributable to warming due to climate change , which might also summarise possible effects due to direct warming from thermal discharges should they not be sufficiently regulated.	Noted
EA 1.94	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	17.4 We are pleased the WFD assessment will be presented as a standalone document in the appendix. We would request that any information used within the assessment should be presented within this appendix as an integral part of the WFD assessment, and not simply cross-referenced back to sections of other chapters.	Noted.
EA 1.95	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	Table 17.1 – Paragraph 3.35 We refer to Appendix 1 and previous comments relating to future water column and biota chemical baselines. Whilst the objectives in the next RBMP may or may not remain similar to the last cycle, the ability to comply with WFD as a whole may be compromised by the tighter EQS limits we will be required to meet due to adoption of the revised 2013 EQSD.	Noted.
EA 1.96	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	Table 17.3 – Criteria for determining receptor sensitivity There is a requirement for ‘no deterioration’ of status, and this is considered by EU courts to function at the sub-element level. This means that deterioration of a PAH compound (a sub –element of the Priority Hazardous Substances element) would still count as deterioration. The final classification (‘moderate’ – but now based on multiple failures of sub-elements, rather than simply TBT) would remain as ‘moderate’, but we would not be able to advise WFD compliance if sub-elements were predicted to deteriorate as a consequence of the activities proposed. Since it is quite likely that the 2021 baseline (or even the 2020 baseline-	Noted.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>should you wish to calculate it using WFD rules) will appear worse than the last 2015 classification purely due to tightened EQS limits, the justifications for compliance may need a robust numerical treatment to convince us any failing sub-element will not fail worse “with” the development going ahead. The terms major, moderate minor and negligible with reference to changes in water quality are not defined in this document, and are entirely subjective. WFD does not deal in these relative terms: the water quality either meets the EQS limits, or it does not, following the activity. If it did not even meet the limits prior to the activity, then it will not comply after the activity, unless the activity improved water quality. If the activity results in any deterioration of water quality that can be detected as an increase in an already-failing baseline then it has failed to meet the “no deterioration” test. Deterioration does not fall into major, moderate, minor or negligible classes at WFD sub-element level, deterioration is simply not permitted without a WFD exemption.</p>	
EA 1.97	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p>17.18 We would suggest adding the revised Environmental Quality Standards Directive(2013) since this is the daughter directive to WFD and the chemical concentration limits set out there are incorporated into WFD .</p>	Noted.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

EA 1.98	Environment Agency	Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions	<p><u>Groundwater and Contaminated Land</u></p> <p>Developments proposed on top of permitted landfills must not compromise the operator’s ability to manage and monitor their site in accordance with their permit. We must be notified by the landfill operator before any infrastructure is installed, if the development is likely to have an impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The inspection, maintenance and/ or integrity of the landfill cap · The restoration profile · Landfill gas management, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Monitoring fugitive emissions o Gas abstraction infrastructure, including replacement o In-waste gas monitoring · Maintenance and monitoring of leachate infrastructure · Maintenance and monitoring of groundwater infrastructure · Surface water management and/ or the quality of run off · Obtaining topographic surveys · Any monitoring to provide evidence that the waste is ‘stable’ for a surrender application · Access by appropriate vehicles for any of the above (for example drilling rigs) · Site security <p>Landfill operators must put procedures in place to ensure they continue to comply with their permit conditions (and Landfill Directive, article 13(c) requirements, where applicable). We will require a construction quality assurance (CQA) plan where an engineered cap is present. At design stage if boreholes are required to be drilled through landfills, proposals for these works must to be submitted by the landfill operator to the Environment Agency. These proposals should include how the works will be undertaken to ensure impacts on the environment are minimised (e.g. no drilling through the base of landfill). We strongly recommend that you contact the operators of these landfills to find out about existing infrastructure to help inform your design options, for example concerning transport options.</p>	Noted and acknowledged throughout Chapter 18 of the ES (document reference 6.1.18), and the ‘Avoidance and mitigation measures’ section.
EA 1.99	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p><u>Sustainable Drainage Systems</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Infiltration sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) such as soakaways, unsealed porous pavement systems or infiltration basins shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to the water environment. 2. Infiltration SuDS have the potential to provide a pathway for pollutants and must not be constructed in contaminated ground. They would only be acceptable if a phased site investigation showed the presence of no significant contamination. 3. Only clean water from roofs can be directly discharged to any soakaway or 	Noted.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>watercourse. Systems for the discharge of surface water from associated hard-standing, roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall incorporate appropriate pollution prevention measures and a suitable number of SuDS treatment train components appropriate to the environmental sensitivity of the receiving waters.</p> <p>4. The maximum acceptable depth for infiltration SuDS is 2.0 m below ground level, with a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base of infiltration SuDS and peak seasonal groundwater levels.</p> <p>5. Deep bore and other deep soakaway systems are not appropriate in areas where groundwater constitutes a significant resource (that is where aquifer yield may support or already supports abstraction).</p> <p>6. SuDS should be constructed in line with good practice and guidance documents which include the SuDS Manual (CIRIA C753, 2015) and the Susdrain website.</p>	
EA 1.100	Environment Agency	Water resources and flood risk	<p>17.210</p> <p>This section refers to liaising with Thurrock Council and Essex County Council, but not the Environment Agency. Whilst not lead regulator, we would welcome liaising with us with respect to water quality of the proposed surface water drainage scheme. Please follow our SuDS information above. It is considered unlikely that infiltration SuDS will be suitable for the Essex Project site.</p>	Noted.
EA 1.101	Environment Agency	Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions	<p><u>Chapter 18: Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions</u></p> <p>The chapter makes reference to Buro Happold (2020) The London Resort. Phase 1 Geo-environmental Assessment – Essex Project Site in appendix which has also been reviewed. The risk assessment concluded that the risk to groundwater and surface water were low (Table 6-3). The report recommended groundwater is also monitored. We agree that this should be carried out so that the risk to groundwater and surface water can be further refined, and we would suggest that it should not be excluded at this stage (it was excluded in table 7-1) without further evidence and would depend largely on the scale of development, amount of disturbance and final surface covering of the proposed development.</p>	Noted and agreed. The design and implementation of any ground investigations will be subject to agreement with local authority and EA regulators, as well as other stakeholders.
EA 1.102	Environment Agency	Draft DCO	<p>Comments were submitted separately on the Corequisite that 'We need a requirement to ensure that; No works are carried out under any approved scheme that interferes with the permit requirements of landfill sites with extant Environmental Permits, without formal agreement in writing by the EA for permit variations...'</p>	A requirement has been added to 10(4) to secure this. The revised Draft DCO is provided at document ref 3.1.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

FC.1.1	Forestry Commission	Landscape and visual effects	Ancient woodlands ¹ and ancient or veteran trees ² are acknowledged as an irreplaceable habitat and a part of our Historic Natural Heritage. Not all ancient woodland sites are registered on the Ancient Woodland Inventory. Small and linear ancient woodlands that may have not been included will have equally importance due to the ecological network they underpin. There are several blocks of ancient woodland within or directly adjacent to the proposed DCO boundary and we would expect the environmental statement to recognize their importance and state how they will avoid, reduce, and mitigate impact.	There will be no direct impacts on ancient woodland as a result of the Proposed Development as described in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.9). Indirect impacts are considered in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12).
FC.1.2	Forestry Commission	Landscape and visual effects	It is not possible to compensate fully for the loss of any irreplaceable habitat such as ancient woodlands, therefore, the Forestry Commission recommends: . doing everything possible to avoid the loss or damage to ancient woodland and veteran trees; . where this is not possible, a significant package of ecologically significant compensation, which collectively delivers ecological enhancement to our ancient woodlands and veteran tree infrastructure, is secured in perpetuity.	There will be no direct impacts on ancient woodland as a result of the Proposed Development as described in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.9). Indirect impacts are considered in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12).
FC.1.3	Forestry Commission	Landscape and visual effects	We would expect to see a thorough assessment of any loss of all trees and woodlands (not just ancient or veteran) within the project boundary and the development of mitigation measures to minimise any risk of net deforestation as a result of the scheme. A scheme that bisects any woodland will not only result in significant loss of woodland cover, but will also negatively increase the ecological value and natural heritage impacts due to habitat fragmentation, and a huge negative impact on the natural plants and animals' ability to respond to the impacts of climate change. o We have read the arboricultural report but do not feel it is sufficient in detail for us to assess fully the impact of the project. For example, although the report ranks the condition of the trees from A to C and U, it lacks detail in how these conclusions were drawn. Further reference from the BS standard should be included where appropriate. o It should also be noted that the arboricultural assessments do not take into account or explain how these woodlands are functioning as an ecological unit – where some trees may be considered in poor condition from an arboricultural point of view, they may be providing valuable habitat for other organisms as part of the woodland's ecological unit	An updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.9) provides more detail with regard to tree loss and mitigation. The ecological value of the woodland habitat is considered and assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12).
FC.1.4	Forestry Commission	Marine ecology and biodiversity	Where woodland loss is unavoidable, we would expect to see significant compensation and the use of buffer zones to enhance the resilience of neighbouring woodlands. These zones could include further tree planting or a mosaic of semi-natural habitats. o The consultation documents mention off-site mitigation for habitat loss but does not state where this would take place, the size or which habitats it	As above

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>will include. We would expect to see this detailed in the Environmental Statement, and would prefer to see the proposals before submission of the DCO; it would be unlikely that we could agree a Statement of Common Ground without this information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o As a rough guide, we would expect to see compensatory planting in the region of around 20:1, compensation to loss. o We note that removal is mentioned in the landscape assessment as having the potential to cause impact, but not in the terrestrial ecology assessment. We question why this is the case. 	
FC.1.5	Forestry Commission	Materials, energy and waste	As previously mentioned in our EIA scoping response, we would encourage the London Resort to use locally sourced timber, FSC- and Grown In Britain-certified, in construction of appropriate structures.	Noted
FC.1.6	Forestry Commission	Land Transport	We would like to see reference to how this project will influence and interact with other major projects in the area, notably the Lower Thames Crossing which, if approved, will have a significant impact in the local area in terms of weight of traffic, movement of people, accessibility for visitors, as well as the impact upon the environment during and post construction.	The London Resort scheme has considered the effects of other projects, including the Lower Thames Crossing within Chapter 9 of the ES - Land Transport. (document ref 6.1.9)
FC.1.7	Forestry Commission	Terrestrial ecology and biodiversity	<p>We would to see more detail on how carbon neutrality and biodiversity net gain will be achieved, both during construction and during operation and how emissions will be limited and offset. It is disappointing to see that these figures have not yet been calculated and there are no plans to offset carbon use during construction. Creation of additional new woodland, either within the DCO boundary, or as off-site planting, will help offset future carbon emission, with the expectation that new woodland will be created with the following principles in mind:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Right tree, right place – i.e. suitable for the location planted, and not to the detriment of other habitats. o Connectivity – it is preferred that new woodlands created link existing woodlands, especially ancient woodlands, rather than be created in isolation on a small scale. o Access and recreation – where possible, newly created woodland should be designed for the enjoyment of residents and visitors, while not negatively impacting existing woodlands, especially those with statutory designations, such as Darenth Wood SSSI. o Resilience – species choice must be considered when considering the likely impact of climate change. o Future management – poorly managed woodlands provide minimal benefits. Newly created woodlands should be designed with access for management of timber, wildlife, and visitors. 	A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment has been completed (Document Reference 6.2.12.2). A tree planting strategy and species selection strategy is described in the Landscape Strategy (document reference 6.2.11.7) and tree protection and management is described in the arboricultural Impact assessment (document reference 6.2.12.9)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

FC.1.8	Forestry Commission	Terrestrial ecology and biodiversity	The above woodland creation for net gain and carbon neutrality would be in addition to the creation expected to compensate for woodland loss as a result of construction of the resort.	Woodland is one of many habitats to contribute to biodiversity net gain and carbon neutrality. Habitats have been considered more fully in a comprehensive biodiversity net gain assessment (document reference 6.2.12.2)
FC.1.9	Forestry Commission	Terrestrial ecology and biodiversity	Where trees are to be planted, either as woodland blocks or street and landscaping trees, we would like to see how the London Resort will approach ensuring good biosecurity protocols are in place to prevent the introduction of pests and diseases. All trees should be of native-grown stock to help reduce this risk.	A tree planting and management strategy is described in the Landscape Strategy (Document reference 6.2.11.7) and Landscape Management Plan (Document reference 6.2.11.8)
GBC.1.1	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	This response represents the views of Gravesham Borough Council on the proposed London Resort on Swanscombe Peninsula on the basis of the consultation material published on 27 July 2020. It ignores any additional information that may have been provided since and any previous material, although that is relevant to the evolution of the scheme and may be incorporated in the consultation material any case.	Recognise that many consultation comments now overtaken
GBC.1.2	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	Comments were made on the Environmental Scoping document on 20 July 2020 and PINS issued its response dated 28 July 2020. It is appreciated that the consultation material could not in practical terms take either of these, or the comments of other parties, into account. They will need to be taken into account in the submission documents for the DCO application. This is also in a context where there will be ongoing discussions on issues, which may allow agreement to be reached on technical matters, impacts and their mitigation.	GBC comments notes and the DCO suite of documents do take these matters into account
GBC.1.3	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	The proposal is primarily located in Dartford Borough, with elements in Gravesham and also north of the Thames in Thurrock. Dartford, Gravesham and Thurrock are the Local Planning Authorities. The Transport Authorities are Kent County Council and Thurrock in their respective areas, with Kent County Council dealing with County level matters. The development management authority for much of the proposal is the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation. These comments do not attempt to distinguish, for the most part, between these bodies, although the detail will be a matter to be sorted out in the DCO in respect to requirements, section 106 and other matters. That said the comments are primarily focussed from the Gravesham perspective.	Noted, and recognise the careful liaison between authorities, and the on-going joint LPAs meetings.
GBC.1.4	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	An information only report was taken to the Council's Cabinet on 7 September 2020 setting out the nature of the proposals, the documents supplied, the works that are in Gravesham, some of the obvious benefits and examples of matters that require further investigation.	Noted, and GBC information is taken into consideration in the DCO suite of documents

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.5	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	Although a draft Development Consent Order (DCO) was published as part of the consultation, these comments do not directly deal with that document, which will be subject to ongoing discussions, except in so far as the comments below have implications for its content. It is pertinent to note that the DCO process assumes that the development can be precisely defined and therefore the requirements necessary for regulating the construction and operation clearly defined.	Noted, and discussions are on-going regarding the wording of the draft DCO
GBC.1.6	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	A major overarching factor in the analysis of the implications of this proposal is that there are no direct comparators in the United Kingdom, and relatively few overseas. It is not therefore possible, on many matters, to provide a comprehensive factual base from which consider local impacts. This affects both the applicant and those seeking to analyse it.	Noted. Careful choices for assessment and comparison purposes have been identified wherever possible.
GBC.1.7	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	Allied to this point is that the development does not operate over 'traditional' hours and can therefore have significant implications at times and places which would not normally give rise to concern. For example, the site is currently indicated as closing at 23:00, which potentially puts traffic on roads and the public transport system when they would normally be very quiet. Some facilities in the publically accessible central core may wish to operate later. It will therefore be necessary to consider appropriate mechanisms for suitable forms of control over the operation of the resort to ensure that any identified impacts that emerge (now or when built) can be mitigated or removed altogether.	Noted, as a unique form of development there will need to be discussion regarding the necessary controls
GBC.1.8	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	Allied with this is the impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on long term patterns of behaviour. This makes updating difficult, for example traffic surveys, and raises questions about what the new 'normal' is (or is not). The Council is hopeful that it should be possible to agree some scenarios to be tested for the major uncertainties this raises.	Noted. The effects of Covid19 have been considered by the specialist in their various chapters.
GBC.1.9	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The Council broadly supports the proposal as it offers significant economic and job opportunities for Gravesham residents. These will come from both the construction process and development when in full operation. There are opportunities for local businesses to provide goods and services both during construction and when in operation, as well as the opportunities that may arise from the numbers of visitors expected to be drawn to the area. The Council will be keen to work with the project to see how these benefits can be maximised.	Agreed. The Applicant has consulted with the Council to discuss ways in which these benefits can be maximised. As described in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7), an Employment and Skills taskforce has been set up and further engagement will be undertaken as the strategy evolves.
GBC.1.10	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	The masterplan is broadly supported, subject to the comments elsewhere in this response, as a basis for further discussion and development. Whilst the reasons for phasing Gates 1 and 2 are understood it will be necessary to examine how the implications of a site under construction and in operation	Noted. The GBC support for the masterplan is welcomed. There is on-going dialogue to ensure integration into the locality is achieved.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			at the same time can be resolved. Overall there is a need to better understand how the Resort interacts with the development around it.	
GBC.1.11	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	There are however implications, because of the land take, on the overall development of the Ebbsfleet Central area through loss of land to transport infrastructure and potentially a refocussing of the type of development. There are some important environmental issues to be addressed. It is important that, insofar as is possible, that the combined impacts of the major local schemes are taken into account. As well as Ebbsfleet Central area, these include the rest of the major developments already underway in the area, Lower Thames Crossing, and developments in Thurrock and Medway, all of which may be relevant.	The Order Limits have been revised and reduced in the area of Ebbsfleet Central. The inclusion of other relevant developments in the assessment work has been done.
GBC.1.12	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	The Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and appendices contain a large quantity of information and a large number of commitments to further steps and analysis that is going to be undertaken. Until this work is done it will not be clear if there are solutions to identified issues or whether new matters emerge. The timescale for achieving this on current intentions is very tight and the Borough Council would be concerned about an incomplete application being made.	Noted. The PEIR provided the level of information available at the time of the Stage 5 statutory consultation. Since the end of consultation LRCH has been developing the final ES in discussion with relevant consultees.
GBC.1.13	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	The topics are examined in the order of PEIR. The nature of the development is taken as in the description set out in PEIR, the draft DCO and other documents and is not repeated here. Appendix 1 contains some more detailed comments on parts of the PEIR.	Noted.
GBC.1.14	Gravesham Borough Council	Project description	The analysis of alternative possible sites for the proposed development is noted but not subject to any further comment.	Noted.
GBC.1.15	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	A project of the scale and ambition of the proposed London Resort will have a significant impact on the local area and its economy. The construction and operation of the attraction itself, scale of its development footprint, associated visitor economy opportunities as well as indirect and induced job creation associated with the resort, which will create an additional economic multiplier over time. At this stage, a number of other opportunities are anticipated to generate benefits for the local and regional economy, which have the potential for significant positive impact upon local communities.	Agreed. These aspects are considered in Chapter 7 of the ES (document reference 6.1.7) and the Economic and Regeneration Statement (document reference 7.5).
GBC.1.16	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The proposed emphasis upon modular construction methods to build out the site and key elements of the attraction, could be an opportunity to develop comparative advantage within local and regional supply chains, where innovative new solutions are required to construct, operate and manage the resort.	Agreed. Extent of offsite construction activities are estimated within Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7). Likely geographical extent of these impacts is hard to reliably quantify, but the council's desire to build on the opportunity is supported.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.17	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The scale and concentration of businesses within related sectors is likely to generate agglomeration benefits, which improve the competitiveness of these clusters and raise the Gross Value Added (GVA), with the associated benefits of typically higher skilled and higher paid employment and business opportunities.	Agreed. These aspects are considered in Chapter 7 of the ES (document reference 6.1.7) and the Economic and Regeneration Statement (document reference 7.5).
GBC.1.18	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	Learning and skills development, to create career pathways for new entrants to the job market and for re-skilling older workers. The scale and range of functional specialisms could be expected to stimulate the local availability of new training options and qualifications. A standalone employment and skills strategy which goes into greater detail regarding expected job roles and skill sets, has been offered and would be well received.	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) is submitted alongside the DCO. This will evolve over the examination period following discussions with stakeholders and the Employment and Skills Taskforce.
GBC.1.19	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	In support of wider 'place shaping' ambitions for Gravesham and the North Kent functional economic area, there is an opportunity to maximise local economic benefits by co-ordinating future plan making and potentially specific geographical measures to encourage a high quality associated retail, hospitality and leisure offer across the Borough as well as the resort itself.	Agreed. The Applicant has and will continue to engage with the council to ensure local economic benefits are maximised and opportunities to co-ordinate plans and offer complementary space are taken up.
GBC.1.20	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	Similar to the above, there are likely to be opportunities to drive physical and social regeneration, through the identification of borough-wide assets such as facilities / venues, talent development initiatives and local voluntary / public sector organisations able to benefit from links with the resort, in terms of complementary activities. These might involve social or commercial objectives.	Agreed. The Applicant is working with various stakeholders in the borough to facilitate partnerships and ensure that the benefits of the London Resort are maximised. The London Resort aims to build on existing success stories and the links that the councils already have within their local community. One example is the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) which outlines that the London Resort proposes to work with education partners to develop a London Resort qualification.
GBC.1.21	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	It would be expected that the application will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A thorough record of all businesses trading from premises within the Project Site Boundary (PSB) and also a record of all employment land or related premises situated fully or wholly within the PSB. Bespoke company data is widely available, enabling an accurate listing of businesses within the subject area; including the site and type of individual businesses, · Early and meaningful engagement with building materials and construction businesses operating in the Botany Marshes area, which could identify opportunities to use their local knowledge and capacity to supply materials during the construction phase of the London Resort project. As significant local employers, providing a range of skilled employed opportunities, these businesses play an important role in sustaining and creating local 	Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) of the ES outlines how the businesses and jobs trading from the PSB have been identified. The chapter and appendix provides detail of the methodological approach and the business types, including industry, business size, proportion of bad neighbour uses etc. It also acknowledges that engagement is underway with these businesses and outlines the plan for continued engagement. Chapter 7 also provides detail on the jobs and visitor modelling. Appendix 7.5 and 7.6 presents the detailed

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>employment in the area. Their contribution to the local economy is valued and should be enhanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The source data and assumptions used to inform modelling to estimate the number of direct and indirect jobs and other economic activity likely to be created, as well as breakdowns of visitor typology such as staying visitors and day trippers, for example. · As mentioned above, a detailed employment and skills strategy is expected. 	<p>jobs and visitor methodology. An Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) is provided.</p>
GBC.1.22	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	<p>From the Local Plan perspective, there are potentially significant changes in land use, employment floorspace, retail and service provision and pressures on the housing market. Although there are a number of development opportunities within the urban area, which this proposal may well indirectly assist in bringing forward, there could be pressures for additional land release which raise environmental and Green Belt issues.</p>	<p>Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) considers these issues. It considers the impact of the London Resort on existing employment floorspace and the impact on the functional economic market; the impact on the housing market due to the demand created by workers and visitors; and it considers the retail and leisure impact.</p>
GBC.1.23	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	<p>Leisure and retail provision, primarily in the publicly accessible parts of the development could have implications for such provision in Gravesend Town Centre, which the Local Plan makes the primary centre in the Borough. The Council would therefore be concerned about impacts on the Town Centre, but equally is aware of the opportunities for complementarity and attracting resort visitors, particularly those staying, with a distinctive offer. It is important that a development the size of the resort engages with the local community through appropriate mechanisms both from the perspective of local residents but also the business community.</p>	<p>The impact on retail and leisure, including the impact on the town centre, is considered in the Retail and Leisure Impact Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9). Per this comment, it acknowledges the possibility for both trade diversion and additional spend due to the visitors at the London Resort and the distinct offer provided.</p>
GBC.1.24	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	<p>Fastrack / bus / rail /ferry access to Gravesend is important in that context. Equally the concern on the transport front is that regeneration and its transport trips can be accommodated as expected, and the Resort has not removed capacity in the overall system.</p>	<p>The Public Transport Strategy details the existing provision and proposes mitigation where demand is likely to impact the networks.</p>
GBC.1.25	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	<p>Existing businesses will be displaced by the construction process with implications for employment and the functions those businesses perform in the local economy. This may also apply indirectly to other businesses where land owners seek higher rents or labour costs rise leading to movement or closure. In Gravesham the indirect implications for businesses served by Lower Road / Manor Way (Northfleet) are not clear both in terms of potential access constraints and in the longer term. Some of these businesses are well placed to be part of the supply chain for the Resort.</p>	<p>Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) considers the impact of the displaced businesses on local industrial capacity in the CSA and the possibility that displacement of business floorspace - industrial floorspace in particular - would exacerbate the wider trend of industrial displacement (explained in the chapter).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.26	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The current proposal includes the provision of 500 homes, which is welcomed as providing a buffer against additional demand in the local housing market. Logically there will be demand across Dartford and Gravesham for housing for employees, some of which will be permanent / long term and some of which will be temporary to cope with summer peaks. Both these may place stress on the local housing market, whether for purchase, rent or in the social sector.	Agreed. The impact of the workers on the housing market is considered in Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7).
GBC.1.27	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	Land take in Ebbsfleet Car Park C for a multi-storey car park along with uncertainty over what is proposed since a set of options has been suggested with no clarity. The Borough Council would be very concerned over anything that substantially removes development land in Gravesham as that potentially has knock on implications for the Local Plan and the Green Belt. Ebbsfleet Development Corporation is carrying out masterplanning exercises on central Ebbsfleet and the Blue Lake area and it is essential that the proposals are integrated together and not treated as discrete elements. See also the comments on Northfleet Station below.	Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) considers the land take impact of the London Resort on development land.
GBC.1.28	Gravesham Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The introduction of new population into the area, as noted under health, has implications for the provision of a wide range of community services from open space to social services. Detailed discussions will be needed to tease out what those impacts may be and what can be done to mitigate them. This will require engagement with the local community as well as the relevant providers.	Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) describes the impact of the London Resort on community uses, community facilities and public services. This has been informed by engagement with local authorities and other stakeholders. A list of engagement activities can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference 7.1).
GBC.1.29	Gravesham Borough Council	Human Health	The urban areas of North Kent have a poor record on health for a variety of reasons, including the legacy of chalk quarrying and cement manufacture. The AQMA at Northfleet for dust is evidence of this. It is important to note that using figures for Dartford and Gravesham at local authority level can hide that there are very significant differences historically between the urban areas north of the A2 and rural areas. New development (and therefore its population) and the passage of time will no doubt narrow that difference.	These are important factors and are considered in Chapter 8 of the ES (document ref 6.1.8). The issue of health inequality within the study area was additionally raised during individual consultation meetings with health authorities on both sides of the Thames. Both the area north of the A2 below the Thames and the area surrounding Tilbury to the north of the Thames face health outcomes significantly worse than those across the wider boroughs within which they lie. Within the health assessment as much data as is available is presented for local health outcomes at a level smaller than local authority, which enables the consideration of localised health inequalities. Specific data have been provided by Thurrock Council to outline the health inequality experienced in areas north of the Thames, and this has been incorporated into the assessment. It is not always possible to present data detailing health

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				<p>outcomes at a geography smaller than a local authority area and where it is not available data are presented at the lowest available geography.</p> <p>It is anticipated that new development in the EDC and the vicinity of the London Resort will narrow the differences in health inequalities in the future. However, to provide a conservative assessment of health impacts, the positive impact of potential new development has not been considered within the determination of effects.</p>
GBC.1.30	Gravesham Borough Council	Human Health	The proposed development offers a significant amount of employment opportunities which should have beneficial implications for the overall population. There are also obvious potential negative effects from noise, air quality, dust and related matters dealt with elsewhere as well as the introduction of significant numbers of people (employees, visitors etc.) into a relatively small geographic area.	Acknowledged - these positive and negative health effects are considered in Chapter 8 of the ES (document ref 6.1.8).
GBC.1.31	Gravesham Borough Council	Human Health	<p>The following concerns will need to be addressed and whether significant mitigation or other measures put in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Impact of the construction process, including temporary labour, and the implications for local medical services (including for example access to Darent Valley Hospital as well as its capacity); · The same in relation to operation of the resort with employees and visitors which will bring significantly higher numbers of people to the area who may have short term medical needs; and · Any implications for loss of open space and access links (including cycle routes) – though equally there may be opportunities to enhance these as is already happening within and around the Garden City by the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation 	Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.7) and Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8) of the ES consider the effect of the London Resort, both during construction and operation, as well as the effect on open space and public rights of way. The health effects of a change in traffic and active transport are considered in Chapter 8.
GBC.1.32	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	Travel to / from the development is one of the greatest areas of concern expressed by local residents and are an important driver of air quality and noise impacts. In summary the proposed transport strategy is to build a new dual carriageway from the Ebbsfleet A2 Junction into the site, with other access points limited to buses, local deliveries and emergency services. Usage of public transport will be encouraged using a mixture of bus (including Fastrack), rail and ferry, combined with 10,000 car parking spaces and encouraged potentially by pricing policies. The proposals at Tilbury for a multi-storey car park and a ferry connection to Swanscombe introduce a whole new element compared with earlier versions of this scheme. It is also proposed to use this route in the construction phase for materials.	Agreed

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.33	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	The Borough Council raised a number of transport issues in its environmental scoping response about transport (see para's 4.28-4.49 of that response), both in regard to the completed development but also the construction phase. The latter takes place in the context of existing transport infrastructure and also the delivery of many other projects locally, in particular Ebbsfleet Garden City development and Lower Thames Crossing. It will be necessary to consider the combination effects including the capacity of the local labour market and the provision of sufficient accommodation for labour drawn from further away. In the case of the Lower Thames Crossing, if permitted, construction will potentially coincide with the rebuilding of the A2 east of Gravesend.	Volterra have undertaken a separate assessment of local labour. This has fed into the traffic distribution used for the assessment of the construction traffic.
GBC.1.34	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	The Borough Council welcomes the objectives of the overall transport approach but there are a whole series of details that need to be evidenced so that it is clear that it can actually be delivered. On traffic modelling the Borough Council has already made clear that reliance on LTAM outputs (which also went into A2 Bean & Ebbsfleet junctions sub model) are not sufficient both because of omission of potentially significant development and because it is not multi-modal. The new KCC transport model would be the robust way of approaching this issue.	It is noted that GBC have concerns over the HE traffic modelling. A separate note has been prepared explaining the traffic modelling has been based upon the A2B&E traffic model that was approved during 2020.
GBC.1.35	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	All modes face the issue of whether they can deal (including the knock on impacts) with the peaks that the resort makes across the day, including at unusual times. Use of the 85% percentile has been agreed by Kent County Council, but that leaves 54 days that exceed that level. The difference between 38,000 daily visitors and 53,000 as the top limit is a 39% increase, with additional staff and visitor trips. There needs to be a clear strategy as to how the trips and parking will be managed on peak days. This also applies to how Resort peak demand will managed in the run up to 10 am opening, late afternoon / early evening (when the normal evening peak occurs) and at closing time.	The exceedance of the 85% percentile only occurs during weekends and holiday periods. That being said, the parking provision and assessment accounts for these days (fully occupied). The Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) sets out the relevant measures that would be introduced to manage the demand during those peak periods to reduce the overall impact.
GBC.1.36	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	Rail services need to be fully explored as to how they may need to be modified to meet the needs of the resort – the 10 am start and with potentially significant numbers leaving late in the evening on some days at least. This is an area where the implications arising from COVID in the longer term are particularly unclear. Network Rail is currently studying the North Kent line and technical work funded by MHCLG is underway on possible Crossrail extension or other means of serving development in the wider riverside corridor.	The Rail Transport Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-U) details the existing provision and proposes mitigation where demand is likely to impact the networks. LRCH is in discussion with Network Rail and other local rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy and determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort; details are outlined. within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information. The Travel Demand Management Strategy sets out how LRCH intends to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.37	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	The proposals for Ebbsfleet International and the connecting bus link present a coherent package. The North Kent line is a different matter as use of Greenhithe station is not enforceable. Swanscombe is the closest station but is physically unsatisfactory in a number of ways. It will be used by staff and visitors so it needs to be able to cater for the demands placed upon it. Two obvious options are widening the Swanscombe High Street bridge into a station building with lifts etc., but that still leaves the issues of getting on foot to the resort. A connection off the down end of the platform's end could well be a more fruitful avenue to explore and picks up on the link from Ebbsfleet International. The ability to link by means of tunnelling through the chalk spine could also be explored.	Ebbsfleet International is being promoted as the primary station for rail access. The Rail Transport Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-U) details the existing provision and proposes mitigation where demand is likely to impact the networks. LRCH is in discussion with local rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy and determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort; details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information. Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe Station.
GBC.1.38	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	Northfleet station could also have a role to play, although access by road is through narrow streets and should not be encouraged. Staff may wish to walk down the hill to the back of house area assuming there is a pedestrian entrance from the Lower Road direction.	Northfleet will form a minor part of the access strategy.
GBC.1.39	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	Gravesham supports the desire as set out in Ebbsfleet Development Corporation's Implementation Framework ³ to link Northfleet Station with Ebbsfleet International. The Borough Council needs a guarantee that the London Resort proposal would not in any way preclude that desire.	LRCH are supportive and do not preclude this coming forward.
GBC.1.40	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	River transport ideas from Tilbury of 'park and glide' are innovative, but it is unclear how this could be delivered in practice. Substantial evidence is needed that such car trips from north of the river could be made to divert to Tilbury, especially in the context of the Lower Thames Crossing being delivered in 2027/8 as there will be then simplistically two routes to the main resort from the north. Although there is a ferry element the bulk of the journey will still be a car-based one and does not offer the same level of convenience that onsite parking offers.	The proposal to use north of the river takes account of the distribution of visitors so that those originating from north of the Resort can be diverted into Tilbury for parking. It should be noted that through the ticketing strategy, visitors will pre-book parking and directed to the most appropriate car park.
GBC.1.41	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	A degree of reliance is placed on modal shift / car park space capping and it is necessary to know how this can be made to work in practice (see comments above in para 29). Parking is a constraint but the local councils will need to know how the booking system is going to be managed and what happens when capacity is reached. On street parking in Swanscombe, Northfleet or Ebbsfleet Central, albeit with a walk, may be seen by drivers as much more attractive and flexible than paying high parking charges. This matter was raised in the previous consultations and needs to be examined in detail to see what management measures may need to be put in place (CPZ, parking restrictions, etc.). This could have a major potential impact on local residents, existing and future.	LRCH has undertaken a worst case highway impact assessment using mode shares based on full car parking occupancy. The Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) outlines how LRCH will seek to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes. An off-site parking strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-Y) has been written to outline the management of people parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.42	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	Although water taxis are mentioned there does not seem to be attention made to road taxis which form part of the transport mix. Provision needs to be made for these in the transport hub and the Borough Council would expect the DCO to make provision for Gravesham taxis to pick up.	Appropriate provision has been made for taxi style drop off and pick up at the London Resort with associated traffic movements assessed. Provision for Gravesham taxi's will be agreed with the local authority.
GBC.1.43	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	The development boundary extends along the A2 at Pepper Hill as an extension of the Ebbsfleet junction improvements (and also to Northfleet Substation East for electricity supply). In highways terms it is not clear what this is for and whether it involves changes to the road layout or is more related to matters like signage. On the latter point, the Ebbsfleet junction will be serving many destinations so clear routing is needed (albeit less of an issue in the era of Satnav and autonomous vehicles).	The design of the Ebbsfleet Junction is now based upon an upgrade of HE approved scheme and will continue to accommodate all movements.
GBC.1.44	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	The A2260 Ebbsfleet junction on the A2 is already being improved by Highways England in a scheme currently under construction. It is important that whatever is proposed at this junction caters for the development traffic from the area as well as that generated by London Resort, and does not indirectly cause problems on the existing and future local road network. It is particularly important to ensure that the smooth operation of Fastrack and local bus services in the area is not disrupted as this would undermine the public transport ethos.	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and will include assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models. LRCH has been liaising closely with Highways England and will continue to do so. Highways England have recently begun their improvement scheme for the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction. The improvement design for the Ebbsfleet junction will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic.
GBC.1.45	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	The Peninsula has a number for Public Rights of Way as well as a number of informal routes. DS1 and NU1 now form part of the national Coastal Path. These form an important local link and should be enhanced. As the Borough Council understands it Lower Road/Manor Way/Green Manor Way are not PROW but highways not maintainable at public expense. This is confirmed by Schedule 1 and Schedule 3 Part II of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link Act 1996 under Works 10G, 10H and 10 J.4	Noted
GBC.1.46	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	Given the narrow width of A226 Galley Hill Road, including having a footway only on one side in part, it is highly desirable to have an east – west route through the site for walking and cycling as well as north - south. Ebbsfleet Development Corporation has carried out work looking at the various links in the area and will be able to assist in this matter.	Noted - LRCH have identified a walk / cycle strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 - Appendix TA-T) notably for those accessing from either the east or west of the London Resort, which includes a new route through the staff accommodation in Craylands Pit. It is noted that the EDC will also be introducing new east / west connections which will further support active travel in this area.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.47	Gravesham Borough Council	Land Transport	Access to the resort by the emergency services needs to be understood as planning will need to deal with the possibility of the A2 being or becoming blocked. It is assumed that they will be able to use access on to Manor Way, Swanscombe and Lower Road onto the A226.	The London Resort has been designed with multiple access points to allow for quick access for emergency response vehicles at all times. The access strategy for the Resort has been developed to keep Resort traffic off the local road network and to keep it on the strategic road network, in particular the A2 which is currently subject to Highways England's improvements at the Bean and Ebbsfleet junctions.
GBC.1.48	Gravesham Borough Council	River Transport	Comment has already been made on water-based transport as part of the overall travel mix. In particular it is important that the Tilbury Ferry (Tilbury to Gravesend Town Pier) be retained and enhanced as a basis for making much better use of the river for local transport and strengthen north – south connections. The statement at para 10.61 is welcomed, however the development boundary covers the entire Tilbury landing stage. Gravesham owns the Town Pier and Pontoon and is keen to see greater use of these to support the economic regeneration of Gravesend Town Centre.	The Tilbury to Gravesend ferry will be retained
GBC.1.49	Gravesham Borough Council	River Transport	There are, in effect, two river transport markets. A long distance (Thames Clipper) service for Resort visitors and also commuters into London. There is also what might be termed a local market for resort, employment, school, etc. traffic between Swanscombe Peninsula, Grays (as a potential ferry destination not mentioned in PEIR), Tilbury and Gravesend, and possibly other destinations.	Noted
GBC.1.50	Gravesham Borough Council	River Transport	The chapter notes some of the potential impacts on the river and its margins viewed as a transport corridor. The Borough Council has made representations on the Tilbury 2 port extension DCO application over noise, air quality, lighting and disturbance. It is important to treat the river and the adjoining banks as a unit for this purpose and examine the implications for a significant increase in traffic on this stretch of the river. This is particularly relevant for traffic outside the normal working day and taking into account the influence of the tides on river traffic.	The landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development at the Kent and Essex Project Sites is considered within Chapter 11 of the ES and relevant appendices (document ref 6.1.11). The effects of the Proposed Development are considered across a range of Landscape Character Areas (at national and local level) and visual receptors, such as residents, road users, public rights of way users and those using the river and rail network in close proximity to the Project Site. The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) and Landscape Masterplan (document ref 6.3.11.15) provide the details of mitigation measures. The assessment of noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development, including river traffic, and proposed mitigations, are available in the noise and vibration chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.15). The assessment of emissions from the proposed development, including traffic, and proposed mitigations are available within the Air Quality chapter

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				of the ES (document ref 6.1.16). The impact of river traffic on marine species are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES (document ref 6.1.13). The Lighting Statement (document ref 7.9) ensures that lighting through construction to post completion of the Proposed Development is in accordance with best practice industry guidance.
GBC.1.51	Gravesham Borough Council	River Transport	The river is proposed to be used for bringing in materials as well as supplies / waste during operation. The Borough Council welcomes this as a general principal but will need to see more detail as to the actual implications and practicality. For example during construction it would be illogical for goods / lorry movements coming from south of the river to travel north of the river only to come back again by water Options for the use of rail can also be explored given the availability of existing rail freight sidings at Northfleet.	There is an Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2) to manage the impacts, a consolidation centre will be located and it is expected that 80% of construction materials will arrive via the River. A 2023 construction scenario has been assessed in the transport modelling and is presented within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
GBC.1.52	Gravesham Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	The London Resort is major proposal and will contain buildings of a significant height and scale, as witnessed by the parameter plans (summarised in para 11.70). These provide a great deal of flexibility on what the actual scale of development is and it is important for any assessment to give a clearer idea of what is actually involved and what it might look like. Audiences include those using the development (inside it), those approaching it on transport links, and the wider residents and those passing by as opposed to travelling to the site. It will also introduce a significant amount of lighting into the area with visual effects compared with current levels.	A Lighting Statement has been submitted (Document Reference 7.9) that will be secured as a requirement of the DCO.
GBC.1.53	Gravesham Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	Paragraph 11.18 makes reference to 2km and 6 km distance bands but both distances need to be considered in context and account taken of the actual zone of visual influence. From Swanscombe Peninsula there are views up and down the river toward Cliffe in the seaward direction and the Queen Elizabeth Bridge (and beyond) up stream. It is important therefore that the analysis is not unduly constrained by arbitrary distance limits since long distance views are potentially significant as well and flat landscapes have a tendency to be undervalued.	The study area was increased to 8km in agreement with Kent Downs AONB and Natural England.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.54	Gravesham Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	It should also be noted that there is a difference to the main development (Gate1, Gate 2, central core, etc.) which will be read as a unit from any distance and the outlying structures on the tip of the peninsula or elsewhere which will potentially be much more prominent as a result of their relative isolation. This particularly applies to work 14c (with AOD height of 27m) – described as an energy centre, with a variety of possible locations within the development area.	No response required.
GBC.1.55	Gravesham Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	Parameter plans imply structure heights of up to 100m AOD. Most of the site in Kent is in the order of 2-3m AOD, so some potentially very large and bulky buildings are being injected into a landscape that is relatively flat. Even some of the structures within former quarries appear to protrude above the sides of these. That said there are some larger structures in the vicinity such as 400kV electricity pylon (open structure 196m high), Seacon and Britannia Refined Metals in Northfleet.	No response required.
GBC.1.56	Gravesham Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	The legacy of chalk quarrying means that there are significant white cliffs, which makes the local landscape quite distinctive, and also that some key infrastructure sits on chalk spines (e.g. A226 Galley Hill Road, North Kent Railway line). Historically there has been large scale development in close proximity to residential properties (e.g. now demolished Northfleet Cement Works) so this gives opportunities (as found with the tunnels beneath Northfleet) but also constraints from the lack of accessibility due to height differences.	No response required.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.57	Gravesham Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	From parts of Northfleet there will potentially be significant views into the development. Residences on the slope up to Northfleet High Street are potentially directly affected. Views from further afield are also relevant, e.g. from properties on Springhead where there are views down the valley and out to the peninsula. Consideration should be given this, though complicated by ongoing development, to adding a viewpoint from there to the list. Viewpoint 50, from the Tilbury Ferry, needs to be appropriately located for the impacts on Gravesend riverside (or alternatively an extra point added).	The effects upon receptors is summarised within ES Chapter 11 (Document Reference 6.1.11) with full detail of assessment at construction contained within Appendix 11.2 (Document Reference 6.2.11.2) and operation within Appendix 11.3 (Document Reference 6.2.11.3)
GBC.1.58	Gravesham Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	Para 11.73 suggest that NKL line travellers are receptors. The line is on embankment and a bridge over HS1 between Swanscombe and Northfleet stations so they will have significant views over the site, especially on trains stopping at both stations which move slowly due to the short distance involved between them. HS1 travellers will see much less as they are descending into, or emerging from, the Thames Tunnel	The effects upon this receptor is summarised within ES Chapter 11 (Document Reference 6.1.11)
GBC.1.59	Gravesham Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	In the Ebbsfleet there was always an intention to have large scale buildings which is implicit in the outline consent, along with access roads. The dual carriageway does introduce a larger linear feature than would otherwise have been expected which is a major road, not an urban street, and also impacts on open areas (SSSI, etc.).	No response required.
GBC.1.60	Gravesham Borough Council	Landscape and visual effects	Taking all this into account, the results presented in table 11.6 implying only the Botany Marshes LCA is subject to a moderate significant effect in landscape terms is not plausible.	The effects upon this receptor is summarised within ES Chapter 11 (Document Reference 6.1.11) with full detail of assessment at construction contained within Appendix 11.2 (Document Reference 6.2.11.2) and operation within Appendix 11.3 (Document Reference 6.2.11.3)
GBC.1.61	Gravesham Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The chapter illustrates that there is potentially significant nature conservation interest on the Peninsula and the linkage with the North Kent Marshes Ramsar/SPA which are of international importance. Other consultees are better placed to produce detailed technical comments on this matter.	No response required.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.62	Gravesham Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	It will be necessary for the Environmental Statement to show that the impacts can be mitigated by the enhancement of the undeveloped areas that are retained at Botany Marsh and Black Duck Marsh. These will be in the context of a dramatic change in the level of human disturbance in the area, both inside the resort complex but also from the other changes to access to the Peninsula.	The ecological mitigation strategies (including proposals to enhance the undeveloped areas of the Project Site) detailed within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3) have been prepared in parallel with the Landscape Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.7) and take account of the multifunctionality of the open spaces.
GBC.1.63	Gravesham Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The Ramsar / SPA is also under pressure from new development in Gravesend (and further east in Medway) so this factor needs to be taken into account. There is a tariff payable ⁵ by residential development within a 6km of Thames Estuary Marshes. This would include any residential development in Gravesham in the Ebbsfleet or at Pepper Hill, but not on Botany Marshes. As currently understood this proposal would not trigger such a payment directly but the principal may be applicable due to direct and indirect impacts on nature assets or from additional development pressures.	The potential effects of recreational disturbance on the coastal SPAs as a result of the new residents in the proposed residential accommodation has been addressed within Appendix 12.4: Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.4).
GBC.1.64	Gravesham Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	It is noted that Buglife are starting a petition that the marshes be designated an SSSI. This implies, at the very least, that there is significant ecological interest in the area. The remaining areas of fresh marsh may not be sufficient.	No response required.
GBC.1.65	Gravesham Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The implications for the Bakers Hole SSSI with its geological and archaeological significance need to be fully explored and how the issues that arise are going to be addressed. Crossing this area in an acceptable way poses significant challenges.	Baker's Hole SSSI is designated for its geological interest, as such impacts are addressed within the Cultural Heritage Chapter of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.14).
GBC.1.66	Gravesham Borough Council	Marine ecology and biodiversity	The proposed analysis that needs to be done and that the designating of the Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone has been taken on board. It is noted that a sensitive lighting strategy is under consideration for the marine as well as the land based environment. No further comment is offered as this stage.	Noted - a Lighting Statement is provided at document reference 7.9.
GBC.1.67	Gravesham Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	As was highlighted in the Councils response the Environmental Scoping the Ebbsfleet Valley is an area of great archaeological importance. Although much of the ground has been disturbed by quarrying and development, archaeological investigations to date have found everything from woolly elephants to Anglo-Saxon water mills. The area also has a rich industrial heritage from chalk extraction and cement manufacture.	This is noted
GBC.1.68	Gravesham Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	This both introduces potential constraints, but also provides opportunities for this heritage to be celebrated as part of the development.	LRCH welcomes this response and is developing a range of initiatives to capture and celebrate heritage

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.69	Gravesham Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	In the marsh area the chapter illustrates that there is potential for buried assets to be found even under the areas where tipping has occurred provided that the water table has remained high enough. The Council would defer to KCC Archaeology for their advice on this matter.	This is noted
GBC.1.70	Gravesham Borough Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Northfleet contains a conservation area and a number of listed buildings, as does Gravesend Town Centre, opposite the proposed facilities at Tilbury. There is also the Rosherville Conservation area on the river between Tilbury and the development. The impact of the proposals, direct and indirect, on the setting and appreciation of these assets needs to be robustly evaluated. Much will depend what the proposals are for the Tilbury Ferry terminal and what the implications are from additional river traffic.	This is noted
GBC.1.71	Gravesham Borough Council	Noise and vibration	As with Air Quality this is a topic area where a technical meeting has been requested by the applicant. Accordingly the comments here are general and limited since more detailed input will come through the more detailed technical engagement.	The Noise and Vibration Assessment was discussed with GBC on the 23rd October 2020. Further information about noise and vibration is available in chapter 15 of the ES. (document ref 6.1.15)
GBC.1.72	Gravesham Borough Council	Noise and vibration	The site will require a considerable amount of construction activity, which with Gate 2 will run along with the operation of Gate 1. A comprehensive code of construction practice hours of the operation of the resort, shielding of equipment etc. will be required to minimise the implications especially for any nearby residential properties. The applicant should investigate if there are any noise sensitive businesses in the vicinity.	The impact of construction noise and vibration from both Gate 1 and Gate 2 construction are considered. A map of noise sensitive receivers is included in the construction noise and vibration assessment (document ref 6.2.15.3)
GBC.1.73	Gravesham Borough Council	Noise and vibration	Appreciating the difficulties of doing this it is important that an illustrative construction programme is produced to understand how various operations may fit together. This has to include construction traffic routing which to start with at least can only use existing infrastructure until a route can be provided along the future access road alignment. Piling will be a particular concern in relation to vibration. Past experience has shown that vibration transmission through chalk can produce unpredictable impacts. On the Gravesham side at least it is known the underlying chalk dips steeply downwards towards the river in the vicinity of Stonebridge Road. Understanding the chalk/alluvium boundary across the entire site has implications for depth of piling and therefore the noise impacts.	The assessment of construction noise and vibration has been considered in stages mirroring the anticipated construction staged plan - see construction noise and vibration assessment (document ref 6.2.15.3). Flight auger piling is expected due to ground condition (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) thereby reducing vibration levels and impact
GBC.1.74	Gravesham Borough Council	Noise and vibration	The operation of the resort gives rise to traffic and related noise implications for which methodologies are well established. Traffic modelling results are needed before this traffic element can be analysed. The operation of the resort will however produce its own noise profile and it is noted that the chapter makes references to screams for example. It is proposed to use Europa Park as a comparator and it will be necessary to explain clearly factors such a setting, degree of containment of rides etc. may influence the results. It is not clear at this stage to what degree in the Resort noise making	The points raised have been included in the Noise and Vibration Assessment (document ref 6.2.15.4). The context and setting of the Europa Park measurements are given in the ES.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			activities will be inside buildings, though the latter will give rise to noise (plant and machinery) in their own right.	
GBC.1.75	Gravesham Borough Council	Noise and vibration	Fireworks and noise in the evening are potentially a matter of concern because the noise impacts could spread over a significant area relatively late in the evening when background noise levels are reduced. The long term management of the site, including replacing/upgrading rides, needs flexibility but also control to ensure that the environmental envelope that is assessed is not breached.	Fireworks will not be used.
GBC.1.76	Gravesham Borough Council	Air quality	As with Noise this is a topic area where a technical meeting has been requested by the applicant. Accordingly the comments here are general and limited since more detailed input will come through the more detailed technical engagement.	The assessment methodology was consulted upon during the Section 42 statutory consultation period in 2020.
GBC.1.77	Gravesham Borough Council	Air quality	Operation of construction machinery and dust is noted. This highlights the need for an illustrative construction timetable to understand how long operations, and at what scale, may potentially go on.	Noted
GBC.1.78	Gravesham Borough Council	Air quality	It is not clear what is involved in the Energy Centre which has multiple locations and a chimney that implies emissions. The Council would expect there to be one location in the submission DCO with the environmental impacts assessed.	The proposed energy centre has been assessed within the Air Quality assessment, detailed in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16), including its location and emissions.
GBC.1.79	Gravesham Borough Council	Air quality	The Borough has had a poor air quality base historically and has been working hard to improve this. The assessment is not simply about whether impacts are significant but also whether they help with the improvement to the air quality climate in a context where it is assumed that electrical vehicles etc. will bring benefits for pollution levels from the road network over time. The long term impact of increased air pollution on the health and welfare of Gravesham residents, particularly the young and the elderly, should be fully assessed and mitigated.	Noted, where significant effects are likely, mitigation has been proposed in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).
GBC.1.80	Gravesham Borough Council	Water resources and flood risk	The chapter sets out a comprehensive range of studies and data sources, etc. that will be used to address a range of hydrological issues.	N/A
GBC.1.81	Gravesham Borough Council	Water resources and flood risk	The floor defences will be raised to meet 1 in 1000 year flood from the Thames, which is impacted by rising sea levels. This will need to take into account the Environment Agency plans set out in Thames Estuary 2100. It is	The EA have been consulted with during the process and further details can be found in Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			also important that there is an agreed strategy to defend the whole of the flood cells since raising defence levels for the London Resort site on its own will be insufficient.	
GBC.1.82	Gravesham Borough Council	Water resources and flood risk	The resort is going to need a substantial supply of water and it is not clear how this will be provided in an area already under stress and subject to considerable development pressures. The development in itself, its water supply and its waste water has potential to have knock on impacts on other parts of the hydrological system. Convincing evidence will be needed that that this can be achieved without impacting on household and industrial water supplies, including future demand.	Discussions on procuring a water supply to the development is ongoing with Thames Water. Supply provided to the development must be considered within Thames Water strategic supply planning with any impacts to future supply for household and industrial users considered and mitigated. On-site wastewater facility is also currently being proposed. Reference is made to the Utilities Statement (Document Reference 7.6) for details.
GBC.1.83	Gravesham Borough Council	Water resources and flood risk	There are complex hydrological interactions in the area between the rivers, ground water and the impacts of pumping etc. For example the builders of HS1 found that the Blue Lake (correct title of what is called Sawyers Lake on some plans) fell unexpectedly in level due to dewatering operations during construction, which impacted to water supply to industrial premises. Development in Eastern Quarry is changing how the water table is managed in that area. These interactions have potential implications for river flow, flood risk and ecology. Saline intrusion into the aquifer is another potential risk.	Noted. No response needed.
GBC.1.84	Gravesham Borough Council	Water resources and flood risk	Northfleet Waste Water Treatment Works is at capacity and serves a large part of the urban area and down the A227 corridor in Gravesham. The Ebbsfleet Development Corporation has been looking at options with Southern Water Services to serve the Ebbsfleet development as part of their wider master planning process. A very clear strategy will be needed as to how waste water will be dealt with that is deliverable on the timescales suggested by the construction timetable. Unless major capital spend is already committed it is difficult to see how the Resort timescales can be accommodated.	The Design Team has engaged with Southern Water to understand options for foul (wastewater) servicing for the development from the Northfleet WWTW. The Southern Water response provided clarity on the lack of existing capacity within the catchment. To address this, an on-site wastewater treatment works is proposed. Reference is made to the Utilities Statement (Document Reference 7.6) for details.
GBC.1.85	Gravesham Borough Council	Water resources and flood risk	It may be noted that Gravesham Borough Council owns land in the vicinity of Northfleet WWTW.	Order limits no longer include Northfleet wastewater treatment works.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.86	Gravesham Borough Council	Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions	The chapter outlines the know information about ground conditions. It highlights that parts of the site are contaminated. In the case of the CKD out on the Peninsula this is highly alkaline and therefore poses a significant risk to anyone coming in contact with or the groundwater. The long industrial legacy therefore means that it is not always clear what has been used as fill. As a site proposed to host thousands of people every day it is essential that any pollutants are either removed or dealt with in such a way as to isolate them from the surrounding environment.	Mitigation measures to isolate site visitors from potential contamination are outlined in the 'Avoidance and mitigation measures' section Chapter 18 of the ES (document reference 6.1.18) - Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions - and described more fully in a Contaminated Land Management Strategy (Appendix 18.9).
GBC.1.87	Gravesham Borough Council	Materials, energy and waste	The Borough Council is not the waste authority (which is Kent CC) though it does collect both domestic and trade waste. The Resort has potentially significant implications during construction, with contaminated waste being a particular risk. Waste movement will have implications for the local highway network, especially before the direct link to the A2 is available in some form. The amount of waste when operational is a significant increase in the overall amount. For both construction and operation detailed plans will be needed of where waste is arising and where it is being disposed of (recycling/landfill/etc. as appropriate) and how it gets there.	N/A - no response needed
GBC.1.88	Gravesham Borough Council	Greenhouse gas and climate change	The Borough Council regards climate change as a very serious issue. On 25 June 2019 Council declared that there was a climate emergency and pledged to do what is possible within its powers and resources to make Gravesham carbon neutral by 2030. Table 20.4 should therefore be amended to reflect that decision, which is impacting on Borough Council policies and operations. It will be necessary for the applicant to show that the Resort is meeting that aim inside Gravesham Borough as well as across the development as a whole.	Table 20.4 in the final ES chapter has been updated to include reference to Gravesham Borough Council climate emergency commitments. Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES. (document ref 6.1.20)
GBC.1.89	Gravesham Borough Council	Greenhouse gas and climate change	The objective of the scheme should be to minimise in design, construction and operation outputs that are instrumental in climate change. The science and technology of this topic are constantly evolving, so new opportunities and technologies may come forward. Tables 20.22-23 provide a summary of the current options, but these need to be turned into deliverable plans and implemented.	The Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.20) provides a summary of GHG emissions associated with operational energy and net zero commitments. More detail is provided in the Energy Strategy (document ref 6.2.20.3)
GBC.1.90	Gravesham Borough Council	Greenhouse gas and climate change	Adapting to climate change involves at design taking into account such issues as handling flood risk, more intense rainfall and higher summer temperatures.	The assessment of the effects of climate change on the Proposed Development has now been completed and has been included in the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES. (document ref 6.1.20).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

GBC.1.91	Gravesham Borough Council	Greenhouse gas and climate change	An inherent problem with a large scale development of this type is that to operate it needs to attract a large number of people from a wider area. Although more sustainable travel modes can be encouraged by a range of means	GHG emissions associated with operational transport has been included in the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES. (document ref 6.1.20).
GBC.1.92	Gravesham Borough Council	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	The Resort by its very nature is not something that the Local Plans envisaged. The overall area has seen significant development, which is continuing, and it is essential that the development is seen in the overall context. The Local Authorities can supply schedules of significant planning permissions as well as allocations. It is however necessary to take into account the scales of development implied by the Governments Housing Objectively Assessed Need numbers that Local Planning Authorities are being asked to meet. Local Plans are at different stages of preparation so it is necessary to make allowance for what is yet to have formal allocation or planning permission. This is particularly relevant to transport modelling.	The Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES(document ref 6.1.20) provides a summary of GHG emissions associated with operational energy and net zero commitments. More detail is provided in the Energy Strategy (document ref 6.2.20.3)
GBC.1.93	Gravesham Borough Council	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	The most direct impact on the project will be emerging plans for development in the Ebbsfleet Central area, where advice should be obtained from the Development Corporation. Wider there are proposals like the Lower Thames Crossing which could have significant impacts but is not yet a consented scheme.	The assessment of the effects of climate change on the Proposed Development has now been completed and has been included in the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.20).
GBC.1.94	Gravesham Borough Council	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	The Resort is of sufficient scale as to seriously impact on the base assumptions that have been made in preparing Local Plans and transport strategies. A range of scenarios will be need to be tested to understand how robust the proposals are and what the potential implications might be.	GHG emissions associated with operational transport has been included in the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES. (document ref 6.1.20).
GTC 1.1	GTC		While we have no objections or comments to make on the consultation I would just like to take this opportunity to highlight that we do operate two 11kV cables which fall within land marked as for "temporary possession". These cables form part of our licensed distribution network in the area and therefore we would need to discuss how these cables could be protected throughout your works, or diverted away if required. At this stage I assume the cables as needed, however I would be grateful if you could confirm. I can provide location details for the cables if needed.	The draft DCO (document ref 3.1) contains provisions which will highlight how the cables will be protected during any works
HS1 1.1	High Speed 1	Project description	HS1's overarching concern is that there is currently insufficient information for it to properly assess the potential effects of the Proposal on HS1's operations. LRCH simply has not provided enough information in its consultation materials for HS1 to adequately understand what the impact of the Proposal will be on its business operations. As a result, and for the reasons detailed below, HS1 objects to the Proposal in its current form.	The 2020 PEIR reflected the information that was available at the time of consultation and was an accurate representation of information available at that time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail. Extensive dialogue has been held with HS1.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.2	High Speed 1	Land transport	<p>HS1 has some 5,513 surface car parking spaces serving Ebbsfleet International Station (“Station”), which are a vital part of its undertaking. Land for a further 3,487 is safeguarded to serve potential future need. Diagram 9.4 of the Transport chapter, however, fails to reflect the true extent of the car parking. No reference is made to carpark F, for example, which is labelled incorrectly as being for coaches. The consultation material makes reference to a “new HS1 multi storey carpark on Northfleet Rise” but is silent on quantitative or qualitative analysis. There is no indication of how many HS1 carparking spaces are affected, either temporarily (during construction) or permanently. In the absence of any such details, no meaningful engagement can be made with the material. HS1 is unable to adequately judge the impact of the Proposal on its operations. HS1 has no adequate means of knowing whether the proposed multi storey car park will be suitable for its needs.</p>	<p>LRCH have set out the required lift and shift requirements at Ebbsfleet Station which is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
HS1 1.3	High Speed 1	Land transport	<p>The Proposal appears to affect or seek temporary possession of nearly all of HS1’s car parking provision. It is not clear on what basis and for what purposes this land is required and insufficient information has been provided to enable HS1 to assess the likely impact on its operations – both temporarily or permanently including the anticipated duration of effects. Based on the cumbersome presentation of the information, HS1’s car parking provision appears to be substantively impacted by the Proposal and we require significantly more detail as to what is intended in order that we can understand how we will be affected. It is not clear, in fact, that LRCH has fully considered the impact of removing car parking on HS1 at all – paragraph 9.317 of the PEIR, for example, fails to identify the requirement to re-provide car parking displaced by the Proposal.</p>	<p>As above</p>
HS1 1.4	High Speed 1	Land transport	<p>While Ebbsfleet Development Corporation (“EDC”) is listed as a consultee, there does not appear to have been any attempt to co-ordinate the re-provision of carparking spaces with EDC’s emerging Ebbsfleet Central Masterplan. HS1 understands that the provision of multi storey car parking on Northfleet Rise is unlikely to be acceptable to EDC. As such, a solution as to the re-provision of these spaces in coordination with the emerging masterplan needs to be agreed urgently between LRCH, HS1 and EDC.</p>	<p>LRCH are working closely with the EDC.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.5	High Speed 1	Land transport	HS1 considers that the number of car parking spaces proposed by LRCH (10,000) is excessive and that a greater emphasis should be put on travel by train and other more sustainable means. LRCH itself notes in the PEIR that car use will decrease over time. It is unclear whether, and, if so, how, parking provision is to be phased based on demand. Suitable strategies for car parking, including charging models, are essential to ensure only customers visiting the Proposal are able to park in its car parks.	LRCH has undertaken a worst case highway impact assessment using mode shares based on full car parking occupancy. The Demand Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) outlines how LRCH will seek to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes. An off-site parking strategy has been written to outline the management of people parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
HS1 1.6	High Speed 1	Land transport	The coach drop off bays currently located on the Station forecourt will be removed by the proposed Transport Interchange, but there is no indication of how they are proposed to be re-provided.	An area of land is still provided within the car parking layout for coach drop off.
HS1 1.7	High Speed 1	Land transport	The proposed Transport Interchange as shown allows for no future expansion of the Station. HS1 requires more space to be safeguarded to allow for the possible future expansion of the Station to meet demand. The proposed Transport Interchange should be designed to allow for over site development in order to make best use of the valuable land around the Station. This needs to be factored in at the present stage, so that foundations can be designed around the access road which will sit under this potential structure.	The proposed transport interchange could incorporate expansion for HS1
HS1 1.8	High Speed 1	Land transport	It is stated at paragraph 4.50 of the PEIR Alternatives Chapter that “one of the routes under consideration for a future extension of the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) would terminate at Ebbsfleet International Station”. We do not believe this statement to be correct. Our understanding is that any future extension to the Elizabeth Line would be likely to terminate or pass through Northfleet Station as the line is at a different level to Ebbsfleet International.	Noted
HS1 1.9	High Speed 1	Land transport	The Transport chapter of the PEIR states that surveys carried out during the London 2012 Olympic Games identified no capacity or congestion issues. We would point out that the 2012 Olympic Games were a one off unique event with special event management put in place. Background passenger numbers have also increased significantly in this period. This should therefore not be considered evidence that the station is now in a position to accept this level of throughput without further analysis. Further work is required in this area.	Noted - further assessment work has been agreed with HS1, Network Road and Southeastern.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.10	High Speed 1	Land transport	Additionally, paragraph 9.332 of the PEIR states that “Initial discussions have taken place to discuss proposals for the rail system to accommodate the additional passenger capacity from the London Resort. The discussions and final rail strategy will be set out in detail in the TA and supporting documents.” HS1 has not been party to these discussions and other than some early studies on station capacity in 2015 no further discussions have been held with HS1 regarding a Rail Strategy. It is imperative that HS1 are included in such discussions going forward.	As noted, significant consultation was undertaken during 2015. As the proposals have adapted during 2020, HS1 has been party to discussions alongside the EDC. Furthermore, HS1 are party to the agreed assessment strategy contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
HS1 1.11	High Speed 1	Land transport	The Masterplan appears to show an area of landscaping on the site of the HS1 compound and Head House facility at the Thames Tunnel Portal. This is vital HS1 infrastructure, to which unrestricted access is required at all times. The currently proposed arrangement is not acceptable to HS1.	Access will be retained to this area.
HS1 1.12	High Speed 1	Project description	The draft Development Consent Order (the “Order”) has no Protective Provisions for the benefit of HS1. HS1 is a statutory undertaker for the purposes of the PA 2008. HS1 requires Protective Provisions in its favour, together with a Protective Provisions Agreement between HS1 and LRCH to regulate the otherwise wide and inappropriate exercise of articles of the Order in respect of its operational assets. The applicant for the proposed Lower Thames Crossing Development Consent Order, Highways England, has agreed to both of these requirements in similar circumstances and we consider that HS1’s assets as affected by the Proposal should be treated in the same way. A copy of HS1’s template Protection Provisions and Protective Provisions Agreement has already been provided to LRCH.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1. The level of information shared and issues captured has progressed significantly from the consultation material, which was locked down in late June / early July 2020. This has included the various protections which HS1 may require.
HS1 1.13	High Speed 1		The proposed list of Requirements are insufficient to address HS1’s concerns and do not afford HS1 sufficient opportunity to review and sign off detailed design of the Proposal to the extent that it has the potential to interfere with its business operations and/or interfaces with its assets. Additional and / or enhanced Requirements that address HS1’s concerns are needed. We enclose a set of planning conditions prepared by Network Rail (High Speed) Asset Protection on our behalf, which give an indication of the matters we would expect to see dealt with by way of Requirements. We are of course happy to engage directly with LRCH to discuss these further.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1. The level of information shared and issues captured has progressed significantly from the consultation material, which was locked down in late June / early July 2020. This has included the various protections which HS1 may require.
HS1 1.14	High Speed 1	Land transport	Work No.1 impinges on the access road to the HS1 compound and Head House facility at the Thames Tunnel Portal. This element of the Proposal should be amended.	Access will be retained to this area.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.15	High Speed 1	Land transport	It is unclear from the information provided in the consultation materials or the description in the draft DCO what Work No. 23 comprises. Since this affects HS1's Car Park D, we require full details of the proposed works in order that we can adequately assess their impact.	Since comments made, LRCH have engaged with HS1 to identify a suitable strategy for access into HS1 Car Park D.
HS1 1.16	High Speed 1	Project description	More generally, HS1 requires a greater level of input into the design of the proposal in order to ensure that its infrastructure is not unacceptably impacted. For example, there may be circumstances in which a stand-off zone is required to ensure the integrity of HS1 infrastructure. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with your technical team.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts.
HS1 1.17	High Speed 1	Land transport	HS1 objects to the extent of its land presently included in the draft Order: - No justification has been provided as to why parts of the Station and associated railway are included and these should be removed - Areas of HS1 car parking provision are included within the Land Plans with no adequate details of proposals for replacement car parking. No case is made for its inclusion and details of replacement car parking needs to be identified and agreed with HS1 and EDC - Rights are sought over the Thames Tunnel Portal Access Road, which is identified on Sheet 2 of the Land Plans. This area also contains a HS1 maintenance compound, which is important HS1 infrastructure and must remain easily accessible to HS1 at all times. The design must be amended to avoid any requirement to take access over the Access Road.	The Draft Order since consultation has been amended to include all necessary land.
HS1 1.18	High Speed 1	Land transport	More generally, there is no sufficient explanation from LRCH as to the justification for each plot of land currently identified for potential acquisition or temporary possession, or over which LRCH intends to seek the power to acquire rights. As already noted above, as a statutory undertaker for the purposes of PA 2008, the right to acquire HS1's land, or to acquire rights over that land, may only be granted if the Secretary of State is satisfied that the relevant tests in s127 PA 2008 are granted. No case has been made and no adequate information in respect of any compensation land is provided. In any event LRCH will be aware that the Station and railway are subject to a Crown (DfT) freehold, and the car parks are subject to a Crown (DfT) Headlease that cannot be acquired compulsorily. In reality, LRCH needs to reach agreement with the freeholder, EDC, the DfT and HS1 in respect of these matters.	Legal, technical and planning discussions have progressed with HS1. There is much greater clarity on the operational and land aspects with revised Order Limits (ES Figure 13.1) and provisions under discussion to accommodate operational matter (document ref 3.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.19	High Speed 1	Land transport	The Proposed development appears to take all Resort visitor traffic away from local roads and onto a designated dual carriageway. This is welcomed in principle. However, the impact of traffic generated by the Resort is of key interest to HS1 Limited (“HS1”) as daily commuters, in particular, will be keen to have a similar car drive journey time and train experience as they do now.	Noted - the relevant assessments are contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
HS1 1.20	High Speed 1	Land transport	Access to the Ebbsfleet International Station (the “Station”) during the construction of the Resort Access Road remains of particular concern. It is not clear from the submitted plans whether vehicular and pedestrian access between carpark D and the Station can be maintained or what the phasing of construction might be.	The access to Car Park D has been updated since these comments were raised and is included within the updated DCO plans.
HS1 1.21	High Speed 1	Land transport	It is not clear how the revised vehicular access to Carpark D is to be achieved. The plans appear to show the existing access being severed by the new Resort Access Road with no alternative provision made. The plans also appear to show a road spur off the Resort Access Road into Carpark D. HS1 objects to this proposal, as it would allow Resort Traffic to come onto local roads and vice versa.	as above
HS1 1.22	High Speed 1	Project description	HS1 has a compound and head house located in the centre of the proposed Resort adjacent to the Thames Tunnel portal. Access to this compound is critical to HS1 in terms of operating and maintaining the railway. An existing access road in HS1 ownership follows the northern side of the railway from the Northfleet Industrial Estate to the compound and tunnel portal. The plans appear to show this access road being permanently acquired by London Resort Company Holdings (“LRCH”) and therefore HS1’s access to the tunnel compound would be lost. HS1 objects to this and LRCH needs to ensure that HS1 can access the asset 24/7, without having to obtain consent from LRCH. Further, the compound, head house and tunnel portal are critical HS1 infrastructure and should all be explicitly referred to in Chapter 5 of the PEIR.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts - this has included the areas around the Tunnel.
HS1 1.23	High Speed 1	Land transport	In addition, HS1 has concerns about the time that it may take for passengers to clear the platforms, given that the Station currently only has one escalator each way between each platform and the concourse. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that the escalators are located at the London end of the platform. LRCH should assess whether additional vertical circulation may be required and what impact that may have on the station operation. Any requirements for new vertical circulation will need to be covered by LRCH. Earlier assessments of the station capacity and potential solutions urgently need to be reviewed in coordination with HS1, in order to adequately understand the full impact on the station in the opening year and beyond, and to assess what might be needed to mitigate this.	HS1 are party to the agreed assessment strategy contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1.)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.24	High Speed 1	Land transport	The lead in times for planning the design of any station alterations or an enlarged station; the resulting construction and commissioning of the same. In addition the cost to and impact on services whilst the station is redesigned. How the costs of a redesigned or enlarged station are met and by whom needs to be determined.	Noted - HS1 are party to the agreed assessment strategy contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1.)
HS1 1.25	High Speed 1	Land transport	HS1 continues to have concerns about the rail capacity and the ability to increase the HS1's rail modal (percentage) share– particularly in terms of the number of trains, frequency and numbers of carriages and general availability of rolling stock.	Noted - HS1 are party to the agreed assessment strategy contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1.)
HS1 1.26	High Speed 1	Land transport	The lead in times for any new rolling stock may not align with the planned resort opening and there may be a significant lag in achieving additional capacity. The underlying assessments and resulting proposals need to be shared as a matter of urgency, in order to allow requirements to be assessed.	Noted - HS1 are party to the agreed assessment strategy contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1.)
HS1 1.27	High Speed 1	Land transport	[Lack of assessment of] the increased maintenance costs due to a significant increase in rail traffic from running more evening and weekend services for resort visitors.	Noted - HS1 are party to the agreed assessment strategy contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1.)
HS1 1.28	High Speed 1	Land transport	[Lack of assessment of] the increased maintenance costs from more traffic on HS1 roads.	Noted - HS1 are party to the agreed assessment strategy contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1.)
HS1 1.29	High Speed 1	Land transport	[Lack of assessment of] How the different types of passenger (commuters, international and resort visitors) will be managed and separated so that the needs of both are met to the current high standards.	Noted - HS1 are party to the agreed assessment strategy contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1.)
HS1 1.30	High Speed 1	Land transport	There appears to be no assessment of the re-provided carparking against the "lift and shift" provisions as set out in the Station Car Park Lease ("Lease"), which requires that re-provided spaces must be no less "convenient and commodious" than existing spaces. HS1 would expect LRCH to fully demonstrate the impact on HS1 car parking through clear timelines, numbers of spaces affected and an assessment of the re-provided spaces against the car parking assessment matrix contained in the Lease. New car parking spaces and drop off areas will need to be put in place before the existing ones are lost. No adequate information has been provided in this regard in order to enable HS1 to assess whether planned car parking provision is sufficient to avoid serious detriment to HS1's undertaking arising from the Proposal.	Noted - HS1 are party to the agreed assessment strategy contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1.)
HS1 1.31	High Speed 1	Land transport	The proposals appear to remove the current bus, coach, and taxi drop off area to the West of the station to make way for the new four lane road connecting the A2 to the resort. HS1 needs to understand where the replacement bus, coach and taxi facility is to be located and ensure that it	The Lift and Shift plan has been shared with HS1 and is contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1.)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			complies with the requirements of the “lift and shift” provisions in the Lease, and cannot adequately do so from the information that has been provided. At present, paragraph 5.66 of the PEIR states that they will be relocated to a convenient location nearby. This is totally insufficient and more detail is urgently required. The same comment applies to plans for re-provision of car parking spaces.	
HS1 1.32	High Speed 1	Land transport	The availability of access to the remainder of the car spaces at Car Park D (HS1 Limited’s nomenclature) [needs to be addressed]	Car Park D plans have been shared with HS1 and are contained within the DCO plans
HS1 1.33	High Speed 1	Land transport	The availability of sufficient space that is safe to act as an evacuation area for the station and trains. And that LRCH ensures that the space needed for the “Land Train” does not compromise the evacuation process [needs to be addressed]. It should be noted that the reference to the “Land Train” incorporates both the “people mover” and the “Resort travel interchange”.	Noted
HS1 1.34	High Speed 1	Land transport	The continued provision of an electricity supply to the railway and station [needs to be addressed]. This will need to be ensured throughout both construction and operation.	Noted
HS1 1.35	High Speed 1	Land transport	The continued provision of gas and water supplies to the station [needs to be addressed]. This will need to be ensured throughout both construction and operation.	Noted
HS1 1.36	High Speed 1	Land transport	The continued provision of foul drainage/sewage and flood prevention measures. The station foul drainage is currently pumped off to Northfleet sewage treatment works. There is limited service in and around the station and therefore any increase in transport or an adjacent transport hub cannot rely on the station provision [needs to be addressed]. This will need to be ensured throughout both construction and operation.	Noted
HS1 1.37	High Speed 1	Land transport	During construction the ability of NR(HS) operatives to be able to access maintenance strips [needs to be addressed]. This will need to be ensured throughout both construction and operation.	Noted - Access will be maintained
HS1 1.38	High Speed 1	Land transport	The existing maintenance strips must be preserved / maintained, and reprovided on any “new” land owned by LRCH.	LRHC note and agree with this response
HS1 1.39	High Speed 1	Land transport	The continued provision of a depot should the current one, adjacent to the western area Car Park D, have to be moved [needs to be addressed]. Access to this depot should also be achieved via a right turn off the northbound Resort Access Road, otherwise NRHS operatives would need to drive all the way to the Resort before turning back to access the site.	Agreed and provided
HS1 1.40	High Speed 1	Land transport	How the increase in waste and additional station cleaning will be handled and paid for [needs to be addressed].	Operational implications at Ebbsfleet International Station are under discussion between LRCH and HS1 which may mean certain matters are captured in commercial agreements or via planning controls.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.41	High Speed 1	Land transport	The impact on the operations of British Transport Police based in portakabins at Car Park D [needs to be addressed].	Access to Car Park D will be maintained.
HS1 1.42	High Speed 1	Project description	Detailed review of LRCH's Code of Construction Practice required as the documents evolve in order to confirm that all HS1's requirements have been addressed.	The DCO suite of documents includes a Construction Method Statement (document ref 6.2.3.1), and various related strategies which will assist in dealing with this matter.
HS1 1.43	High Speed 1	Land transport	Develop agreed alternative car parking using the agreed 'Lift & Shift' metrics.	As noted above, Lift and Shift shared with HS1
HS1 1.44	High Speed 1	Water resource and flood risk	Complete a Flood Risk Assessment [needs to be addressed]	Noted. Further information is available in Appendix 17.1 Flood Risk Assessment. (document ref 6.2.17.1)
HS1 1.45	High Speed 1	Noise and vibration	Demonstrate that noise from the railway is not increased by the LRCH proposals.	Railway noise is included in the Noise and Vibration Assessment (document ref 6.2.15.4)
HS1 1.46	High Speed 1	Land transport	Demonstrate that the new adjacent roads do not adversely impact on the use of and environment on the platforms.	The environmental impact is included within the ES - notably the air quality and noise chapters. (document refs 6.1.16 and 6.1.15)
HS1 1.47	High Speed 1	Land transport	Develop an ongoing construction liaison process to fully inform HS1 and Network Rail High Speed of the works on and around the HS1 Ltd infrastructure [needs to be addressed]. A much greater level of engagement with HS1 is required moving forward in order to ensure that the Proposal does not cause serious detriment to HS1's undertaking.	Noted
HS1 1.48	High Speed 1	Land transport	Concerning both accidental and hostile vehicle incursion onto HS1 property, a full assessment and design submission will need to be submitted to ensure all mechanisms of EVI are designed for and mitigated against and compliant with current standards. This also includes all structures and furniture which, if hit by vehicles, could end up on HS1 property. This comment remains to be addressed.	Noted - this will be dealt with during the detailed design process
HS1 1.49	High Speed 1	Land transport	Vehicles travelling in the opposite direction to trains will have headlights which may be a risk to trains. Structures adjacent to the tracks will need to be lit without light being shed onto HS1 property. Structures adjacent to HS1 will need a solar glare assessment to ensure solar reflection is not a risk to oncoming trains. This comment remains to be addressed.	Noted - this will be dealt with during the detailed design process
HS1 1.50	High Speed 1	Land transport	Access to all HS1 assets will need to be maintained in all circumstances. All existing access points to HS1 signalling compounds and laydown areas to remain in place. The permanent solution will not add additional time or constraints on obtaining access to attend faults or emergencies. These areas will need to be publicly accessible and not located within the resort secure area. This comment remains to be addressed.	Agreed - access to all HS1 assets will be maintained
HS1 1.51	High Speed 1	Project description	Agreements and approvals to be made regarding the future ownership and maintenance of the Swanscombe Marsh pumping station and ongoing access. This compound is to fall within the resort's secure area. This comment remains to be addressed.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.52	High Speed 1	Land transport	The resort will be situated above HS1 tunnels with trains approaching the tunnels at high speed. The resort will be in the driver's line of sight on approach to the tunnel heading west. An assessment for solar glare should be made and appropriate measures taken to mitigate risks. Construction activities will need to consider this when illuminating sites and access roads. The Resort will need to mitigate against risk from lighting, lasers, fireworks, rides, or other entertainment. These comments remain to be addressed, in terms of both the construction and operational phases.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts.
HS1 1.53	High Speed 1	Land transport	The Thames Tunnel Kent portal is a key operational function of the HS1 railway and is also an emergency services forward incident control point. Access to this must be maintained at all times. This area will need to be accessible from the public areas and not located within the resort secure area. This comment remains to be addressed.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts.
HS1 1.54	High Speed 1	Project description	A full review and report is required to assess the changing security risk profile of all areas. Change of use of the land may require fencing upgrades or other security measures such as CCTV. The introduction of the resort adjacent to HS1 may import additional risks from terrorism. This comment remains to be addressed.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts.
HS1 1.55	High Speed 1	Project description	Restrictions will need to be in place reducing the likelihood of accidental or deliberate incursion onto HS1 of foreign objects such as kites, footballs, balloons, flags, litter or any other items where the public may gather adjacent to HS1 assets. Picnic areas and green spaces should be located away from HS1. Assessment of public safety with balloons or other items which could come into contact with live 25kV overheads when leaving the resort and entering HS1. This comment remains to be addressed.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts.
HS1 1.56	High Speed 1	Land transport	HS1 and NRHS will require ongoing and free access to the maintenance strip as set out on the 2010 Lease Plans (provided separately) and existing access rights should remain in place, or a suitable alternative provided which does not frustrate access. This comment remains to be addressed.	Noted - Access will be maintained.
HS1 1.57	High Speed 1	Soils, hydrogeology and ground conditions	An initial risk assessment should be completed for unexploded ordnance and, if found to be a potential issue, further site surveys should be undertaken. This comment remains to be addressed. While paragraph 18.86 of the PEIR refers to mitigation in respect of any unexploded ordnance, details as to any surveys are awaited.	A Preliminary UXO risk assessment for the Essex Project Site is presented in Appendix 18.5 and detailed UXO risk assessments in Appendix 18.1 and 18.2 The potential for encountering UXO during demolition and construction is assessed throughout Chapter 18 of the ES (document reference 6.1.18), and the mitigation measures include provision in case of encountering UXO.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.58	High Speed 1	Project description	Electromagnetic interference (EMI) from Paramount assets to be designed out. An EMI conformance report will need to be produced and approved by NRHS. This comment remains to be addressed. The references to the health impacts of electromagnetic field exposure in chapter 8 of the PEIR should be expanded to assess and design out electromagnetic interference.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts. These issues will be addressed at the detailed stage and can be captured as part of the requirements (document ref 3.1)
HS1 1.59	High Speed 1	Waste and materials	Unless impractical, hazardous or flammable materials should be stored at least 200m from HS1. Where this is not achievable a materials management plan will be required. This comment remains to be addressed.	All waste streams will be stored at the transfer station at the wharf, which is approximately 600m away from HS1. Storage for other materials which may be hazardous or flammable will be outlined in materials management plan at later design stages. Further information in the Outline Operational Waste Management Strategy (6.2.19.1)
HS1 1.60	High Speed 1	Project description	Consideration and approvals are required regarding information relating to fires and emergency evacuation of the Resort. Resort emergency procedures are to align with HS1 evacuation procedures for clash avoidance. This comment remains to be addressed.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts.
HS1 1.61	High Speed 1	Noise and vibration/ Air Quality	Construction activities and the permanent solution for resort and transport link should not create any noise, fumes or other air quality issues for travelling public or for safe operation of stations and railway assets.	The assessment for noise and vibration can be found in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15) and air quality in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).
HS1 1.62	High Speed 1	Project description	NRHS will need to procure additional dedicated resources to fulfil the requirements of providing asset protection for this scheme. This should be funded by the developer. A full cost proposal is being prepared. HS1 requires an undertaking from LRCH that LRCH will pay HS1's reasonable professional fees, including the cost of NRHS's services. HS1 will contact LRCH directly to discuss this further.	There has been extensive dialogue with HS1 regarding the designs and operational effects of the London Resort, including meetings between technical experts. LRCH has a funding arrangement in place with HS1 regarding its input into the project, as it does with Network Rail.
HS1 1.63	High Speed 1	Land transport	There are inaccuracies in description of HS1 and services at Ebbsfleet. Most significant is assertion that there is spare capacity at station and on railway.	HS1 have agreed to an assessment on capacity
HS1 1.64	High Speed 1	Land transport	TN4 and TN8 and TN10 not found. Access strategy anticipated to include outline improved station facilities at Ebbsfleet	The relevant information is contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Notwithstanding since these comments LRCH have engaged with HS1 over the level of demand on the network.
HS1 1.65	High Speed 1	Land transport	Para 9.236 of the PEIR - States that low level station only accessible via passport control but this is not correct	Noted
HS1 1.66	High Speed 1	Land transport	Para 9.235 of the PEIR - Refers to load carried during Olympics, but this was achieved with significant management provided.	Noted
HS1 1.67	High Speed 1	Land transport	Ebbsfleet Gateway Road not identified in assessment of effects.	It is not intended to utilise this access point

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HS1 1.68	High Speed 1	Land transport	Table 9.2 and 9.23 Link N and P1 and possibly others should be identified as high sensitivity to consider sensitivity of commuters aversion to delay and to protect overall quality of HS1 service	HS1 have agreed to an assessment on capacity and mitigation that will mitigate any impact upon the delay for users
HS1 1.69	High Speed 1	Land transport	9.54 consideration of impacts should make specific reference to impacts on Ebbsfleet and St Pancras stations as result of changed passenger loads and characteristics	HS1 have agreed to an assessment on capacity and mitigation that will mitigate any impact upon the delay for users
HS1 1.70	High Speed 1	Land transport	9.179 Cumulative effects of EUDC on the road network should also be considered.	Noted - included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
HS1 1.71	High Speed 1	Land transport	9.52 appears to be saying that there will need to be a mechanism to secure action in future should cumulative effects emerge. Please confirm the intention.	Agreed, the mechanism is contained within the Rail Strategy located within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
HS1 1.72	High Speed 1	Land transport	9.120 refers to impacts where passenger demand increase by +5% but we consider impact on station of changed passenger characteristics	HS1 have agreed to an assessment on capacity and mitigation that will mitigate any impact upon the delay for users
HS1 1.73	High Speed 1	Land transport	9.164 how to prevent people arriving early ?	The arrival / departure profiles are based upon industry experts assessments
HS1 1.74	High Speed 1	Land transport	Table 9.6 Stanstead Airport traffic to be considered	It is expected that movements from Stanstead Airport will be minimal.
HS1 1.75	High Speed 1	Land transport	Rail 9.360 See general comments on forecasting on HS1 and utilisation. Details of full assessments/ assumptions are required.	Noted
HEng 1.1	Highways England	Land transport	Transport Impacts: associated with the proposed site, cannot yet be determined at either a quantitative or qualitative level until further work in modelling has been completed. As yet, this work has not been agreed and Highways England cannot yet accept the proposals indicated within the PEIR.	Noted - modelling methodology now agreed with resultant impacts included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
HEng 1.2	Highways England	Land transport	Transport modelling: there is no current agreement regarding the use of Lower Thames Area Model (LTAM) and A2BE modelling data by LRCH. Discussions between LRCH and LTC continue	As above
HEng 1.3	Highways England	Land transport	Lower Thames Crossing: currently the evidence does not assess whether the proposals will need to rely on in whole or in part the Lower Thames Crossing. This must be clarified prior to DCO submission. At present, given that the modelling information is not available, it is difficult to provide any detailed comments on the proposed travel demand impacts or travel plan implications which could further reduce the amount of traffic associated with the development.	Highways England have assessed within the A2B&E approved scheme with LTC as a baseline. This is still considered that this is the most appropriate approach, however for robustness the assessment includes sensitivity tests without the LTC.
HEng 1.4	Highways England	Land transport	Mitigation: in the absence of agreed modelling, it is not possible to comment on any proposed mitigation. Any mitigation, especially any schemes affecting the SRN directly (such as the connection of the main access spine road to the A2 Ebbsfleet junction) will need to demonstrate full	Noted - modelling methodology now agreed with resultant impacts included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			Design Manual for Roads and Bridges compliance, including degree of progress prior to DCO submission.	
HEng 1.5	Highways England	Land transport	Heritage/Culture and Archaeology: the identification of the Swanscombe Cutting Footbridge Crossing of A2 East of A296 Junction, which forms part of the Kent Project Site has been identified as a Grade II Listed Building may need to be monitored throughout the process and will likely need HE involvement.	Noted
HEng 1.6	Highways England	Land transport	Ecology: it appears the A2 corridor has been inadequately assessed within the PEIR and clarification from the developer in terms of future responsibilities in relation to ecology is required. In designing and assessing work in the A2 corridor and linked areas, the London Resort designers and ecologists should take account of Highways England's existing works, including any environmental designated funds associated with the A2BE scheme, and legal commitments.	Noted
HEng 1.7	Highways England	Air Quality	Air Quality: will require further work outside of the CTMP, in order to assess further impacts beyond dust mitigation measures. It is likely that this work will be informed by modelling and feed not only into air quality, but also noise and the overall Environment Statement.	The air quality assessment which includes dust emissions, is located within Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).
HEng 1.8	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 9.12 - Daily visitor demand varies between 7000 – 53,000 with an average of 26,000. While an 85% assessment day is indicated to form the basis of the assessment (c38,000) a sensitivity test should be considered for maximum capacity (of those 54 days per year when 35K is exceeded). Event days at the site are likely to reach a higher number of visitors, and the resultant traffic impacts associated to these events would need to be assessed within modelling. A traffic management plan will be needed to assess the daily management, but also those worst-case scenario days. ACTION 1: Daily visitor demand should be separated out into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor numbers that are pre-purchased tickets (i.e. known visitors) • Visitors expected to turn up and pay – but may be turned away if the site is full. • Visitors expected to turn up and use facilities in the central area outside the Gates (i.e. uncontrolled visitors to the site) 	Noted - A Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) has been produced and included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
HEng 1.9	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 9.55 - Highways England notes the inclusion of Best Practice Guidance from IEMA, DMRB and WebTAG, and the inclusion of DfT Circular 02/13 within the National Policy section the following Highways England documents may be of assistance when considering development in relation to the SRN: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England Guidance: The strategic road network Planning for the future 	Noted - A Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) has been produced and included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department for Transport Highways England License: Secretary of State for Transport statutory directions and guidance to the strategic highways company. <p>Additionally, please note that IEMA Guidelines for Assessment of Road Traffic uses very high percentages and in busy areas negates the effect of a small percentage increase.</p>	
HEng 1.10	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.63 & Para 9.112 - It is yet to be agreed to what extent LRCH is able to make use of any LTC derived information, other than what is already in the public arena. Discussions are taking place at the highest levels in HE seeking to strike the right balance between the need to follow normal practice and procedure to safeguard HE projects while assisting 3rd parties as best we are able with their information needs.</p> <p>ACTION 2: As such, it would be preferable to use modelling guidance found within WebTAG, but also highlighting any differences between a WebTAG led assessment and an NPPF led assessment. For TAs, Highways England requires specific numbers, queue lengths etc, not simple percentages.</p>	Noted - modelling methodology now agreed with resultant impacts included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
HEng 1.11	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.98, 9.101 & 9.109 - The PEIR notes that discussions are ongoing with HE, KCC and other highway authorities and at this point and are likely to be continuing for a while. There is a need for robust supporting evidence for visitor forecasts, suitable parking management scheme and the support of road and rail-based travel modes to the London Resort.</p> <p>While 85th Percentile is of interest, Highways England must have “worst case scenario” assessment and mitigation. and understand how this number has been arrived at given the distribution of visitors across the year.</p> <p>Outstanding items that are following on from the response provided for the Scoping Note, include the details for the Construction Management and also the Operational Servicing, along with a Transport Management Plan for this aspect.</p> <p>It is considered that the operational hub for construction is likely to involve at least some quantity of material via HGV through the A1089, A282 and A13 Roads, and not just via ferry.</p> <p>In addition, it is considered that the timing of the construction phase is also likely to be coincidental with works on the Lower Thames Crossing. As such, further details will be required in order to understand how the proposed London Resort works will not impede or have an impact upon the LTC works and construction movement.</p> <p>CAVEAT A: There may be a further DCO in progress at any time during the initial phase of LR. It is the Thurrock Flexible Generation Plant (TFGP) which will be constructed in East Tilbury. Construction materials likely to be delivered to PofT and taken to site from there. The DCO is currently with PINs. Awaiting preliminary meeting date.</p>	The Transport Assessments assumes full car park occupancy which is considered a worst case assessment on the peak hours. The TFGP has been considered, however construction will be complete before the Resort is in operation. Both a CTMP and TDM is contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>ACTION 3: Provide the worst-case scenario assessment and mitigation in order for Highways England to understand how the 85th Percentile has been arrived at.</p> <p>ACTION 4: Provide the Construction Management and Transport Management Plan as well as Operation Servicing.</p> <p>ACTION 5: Provide evidence demonstrating that the construction of LRCH will not unacceptably impact on the construction of Highways England projects including A2B&E and LTC. Include matters as necessary in the required CMT</p>	
HEng 1.12	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.114 - Traffic surveys undertaken in 2014 and 2017 will be utilised by the applicant for the upcoming Transport assessment. These may be out of data and more recent information should be sought or the use of 2014/2017 data further justified. While new survey data is difficult to obtain under COVID conditions, there has been no mention whether WebTRIS data has been sought from Highways England, or from Local Authorities who may have traffic surveys on file. This information should be sought and used where appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted - the use of the A2B&E model has been the primary source of traffic flows, however suitable alternatives have been used where needed, including WebTRIS.</p>
HEng 1.13	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.126 - A spreadsheet model has been proposed to provide a base modelling assessment. This is insufficient for a project of this scale. Highways England requires a mix of strategic, local network and individual junction assessments in order to assess the full impact and what mitigation is required. A VISSIM model is available for the area (south of the river) and can be utilised. The various assessments need to also describe how they relate and support each other. Any discrepancies or deliberate adaptations to achieve a 'better fit' will need to be described and justified.</p> <p>ACTION 6: Applicant should seek to obtain WebTRIS data and more recent traffic surveys on file from the appropriate Local Authorities.</p> <p>ACTION 7: A mix of strategic, local network and junction assessments are required with supporting evidence and narrative to justify any discrepancies or deliberate adaptations.</p> <p>ACTION 8: Update Figure 9.4 to identify mode links on the A1089, towards the port of Tilbury.</p>	<p>Noted, the use of a VISSIM model and local junction models have also been utilised to determine the impact of the Resort. In addition, suitable WebTRIS data has been used to identify the impacts on a wider network outside of the A2B&E model area. The use of a strategic spreadsheet model has been agreed with Highways England as set out within the modelling methodology.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HEng 1.14	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.133, 9.350 & 9.135 - Assessment scenarios have been indicated as follows: 2025 – Gate 1 (first full year after opening) 2029 – Gate 2 opening year (full development) 2038 – Maturity of proposed development Assessment time periods indicated: Weekday AM/PM Peak Weekday Interpeak</p> <p>Timings are indicated as follows: Gated theme parks: 10:00 – 23:00 VIP and Hotel Guests: 09:00 – 23:00 Staff Arrivals: not mentioned, but presumably between 07:00 – 23:00 on various shifts. Further information on shift patterns is required. Highways England notes that the PEIR indicates that ‘Highways England has a micro-simulation model of the local highway network that is available and could be used to provide a localised sensitivity test of the local road network on the weekend’. Weekend assessment is likely to be requested given the higher volume of visitors during this period; discussion with Highways England is underway and would need to be agreed with all stakeholders. Permission to utilise the model will need to be sought from Highways England through the proper requests. ACTION 9: Highways England also requires Weekend, Bank Holiday and other ‘high visitor day’ assessments. Additionally, further information should be provided to identify key periods when a large number of visitors are likely to be leaving the site (e.g. at the end of the day, after a special event such as a firework display). ACTION 10: Further information on shift patterns is required for all staff both within and outside of the main gates. Some staff may be on a 24/7 rota for hotels or maintenance. ACTION 11: Use of the Micro-Simulation model needs to be sought from Highways England through the proper channels.</p>	<p>The assessments undertaken are considered to be worst case, assuming full car park occupation and includes the highway network peak hours (morning and evening peaks). Other assessment periods are being tested for sensitivity purposes. Full staff shift patterns are included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Lastly, the VISSIM model has been utilised for the local network.</p>
HEng 1.15	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.157 - Highways England notes that the use of the River Thames, from the Port of Tilbury, will be used for construction materials and staff. More detail is needed as to the quantum and accessibility of the construction workers accommodation in terms of their impact on the SRN. Again, consideration of inclement weather upon the use of the river for delivery of construction materials between the hub and the proposed development will need to be included. The ES and TA would also need to include information about associated likely movement of construction</p>	<p>The construction worker profiles are contained within the Construction Traffic Management Plan contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			workers who live off-site; if they are local what percentage are likely to be employed and how would they be likely to arrive at the site for work ACTION 12: Further information regarding quantum, accessibility and movement patterns of construction workers and construction materials is required to confirm level of movement on the River Thames and living arrangements for construction workers and the respective impacts on the SRN.	
HEng 1.16	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 9.162 - HE notes that previous work did not include the Essex Project site; however, the proposed ES will cover both Essex and Kent. The PEIR proposes that information from the Tilbury 2 DCO will be used for an assessment. This should be approached with extreme caution as post DCO, the Port of Tilbury have acknowledged that their numbers were underestimated. The clear impacts of the proposed parking facility at Port of Tilbury (PoTL) should be assessed along the A1089 and the A13 and M25 J30 and agreed in modelling. ACTION 13: Revised Information from PoTL Tilbury 2 DCO to be included in any TA, and modelling for the A1089, A13 and M25 J30 and assessed for underestimation. ACTION 14: Clear proposals for any mitigation works at the ASDA roundabout to be provided.	The Tilbury2 DCO has been included within localised junction modelling to determine the impacts which includes mitigation at the ASDA roundabout
HEng 1.17	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 9.163 - Highways England notes the inclusion of the new car parking for visitors at the Port of Tilbury; the highways impacts are still unknown on the North Side of the River and will be needed to be assessed in full within the TA. The UKs EU Exit will occur on 1/1/21. The government is seeking to create a series of Border Facility sites in Kent to process outbound and inbound freight. This may include the use of land at Ebbsfleet International Station. Traffic Management of freight flows will be via the Kent Resilience Forum's Operation Fennel and may include Operation Brock on the M20. The impact upon the M20 would need to be considered also for flows of traffic and further impacts. ACTION 15: The DCO transport evidence base must demonstrate how it has taken account of the implications of EU Exit site use and traffic management.	The resultant impact of Brexit is yet to be determined until a trade deal has been reached its not possible to test the impacts.
HEng 1.18	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 9.166 - The PEIR does not adequately consider the impact the Lower Thames Crossing is likely to have upon traffic flow in the area, in combination with the London Resort traffic. The formation of the new River Thames Crossing to the east of the site will impact traffic upon the A2 and M20. This will need to be assessed accordingly as it will impact upon traffic distribution. As noted, modelling is yet to be completed. Highways England are unlikely to be able to provide a robust response until this information becomes	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) assumes both with and without LTC

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>available.</p> <p>ACTION 16: The DCO transport evidence base must demonstrate the extent, if any, to which the site could be constructed and/or operated prior to any opening to traffic of LTC. If the degree of construction and/or operation would be limited, the DCO must specify how the site will be managed so as to not exceed pre-LTC network capacity.</p>	
HEng 1.19	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.178 - In light of Covid-19, new traffic flow surveys for vehicles are considered to be difficult to obtain and Covid-19 has had the most impact upon vehicle usage; however pedestrian/cyclist movement has not overtly been impacted as a result of this situation and could be obtained safely. Discussion of this topic should be signed off with the modelling assessment.</p> <p>Highways England notes that visitors are expected to arrive from all over the country, but the PEIR does not quantify what proportion would be expected and from where. The TA and ES will need to distinguish between those who are visiting just for the day and returning home and those visiting for longer and staying on site or in other tourist accommodation; since their likely modes and timing of travel and hence ES/TA impacts will be different. For example, while train/boat numbers could be aspirational a more practical assessment of visitors travelling from within the greater UK by various modes should be provided. Is it likely that this would be by train or by vehicle? Visitors from as close as Kent may choose to come by vehicle in order to explore the countryside.</p> <p>ACTION 17: Visitor (group/individual) profiles will need to be provided indicating why timings of trips and choice of mode of travel are utilised.</p>	Full details of visitor profiles produced by ProFun are included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
HEng 1.20	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.178 - If London resort are stating that a large number of vehicular visits are expected, particularly from the Kent/Sussex region – then a larger consideration of the A2 needs to be provided within a transport assessment as this road indicates higher levels of capacity during peak hours, in the London Bound direction. At present, the A2 is operating at near capacity, any additional large volume of traffic is likely to cause severe delays and congestion.</p> <p>ACTION 18: Detailed assessment of the A2 will be required in order to ascertain whether the London Resort can mitigate its traffic impact or will be dependent upon the opening of the LTC.</p>	Noted - As previously stated, the A2B&E scheme assumed LTC in a committed scheme, however the assessment has been undertaken with and without the LTC

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HEng 1.21	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.178 - The parking provision to the north of the site would then need to consider the impacts on the M25 J30, A282, A13 and A1089 (as identified previously). The applicant would also be expected to quantify what proportion of vehicles would be likely to arrive vs other modes, and potentially a monitoring situation for visitors to the site to determine where they are arriving from and by what mode (in the future). There is no clear breakdown of what other available routes are accessible from the site, which could then be utilised for local travel or staff to/from the site. ACTION 19: Sensitivity testing will be required to assess likely impact of inclement weather on access from PofT and likelihood of rerouting to access via the A2.</p>	<p>The information from TC is that this would only happen on a small number of times (3 days per year). These will generally occur poorer weather days and therefore less visitors. Where appropriate visitors will be directed to the main Kent site, however if required on this infrequent events buses will be provided to transfer people to the Resort.</p>
HEng 1.22	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.294 - There is a notable lack of mention regarding the Lower Thames Crossing within the PEIR. Further consultation with Lower Thames Crossing is advised given their comments provided to Highways England. Highways England notes that agreement upon these junctions will be considered within the Highways England modelling team assessment, separate to the PEIR.</p>	<p>LRCH has continued to liaise with the Lower Thames Crossing team at Highways England and have obtained output data from the LTC model.</p>
HEng 1.23	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.200-9.287 - The PEIR does not explicitly state what quantum of visitors would use a specific mode; this is likely to be considered in the TA once modelling has been agreed. The Scoping Note had indicated that the site expects 25% of car borne resort traffic to arrive via Tilbury but makes no mention of Construction Traffic arrival at either site (presumably 100% at Tilbury but should be confirmed). As the LTC notes, no mention has been made of inclement weather preventing Ferry operation (or deterring visitor use) – and the uplift in vehicle traffic with would then proceed directly to the London Resort via the SRN, rather than that car park on the north. ACTION 20: Further information is required not only for diverted visitor traffic, but also for diverted Construction traffic for inclement weather. Additionally, information would be required for the proposed consolidation centre at PoTL and how materials are proposed to arrive there – including quantum, routing, vehicle type, trip number. ACTION 22: Evidence will need to be provided regarding how people will be prevented from driving to nearby parking and undertaking a ‘last-mile’ walk/bus methodology. The SRN would be impacted in terms of volume and the LRN would be subject to increased fly parking.</p>	<p>Information on visitors by mode, construction and operational traffic and prevention of off-site parking is contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and accompanying Technical Notes.</p>
HEng 1.24	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.305 - The PEIR notes that modelling required to assess the London Resort is yet to be completed; as such it would be difficult to determine what potential significant environmental effects of the proposals would be had upon the proposed site and surrounding neighbourhoods, particularly in relation to the SRN.</p>	<p>Weekday AM and PM peak hour modelling assessments are contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Noise and air quality assessments are contained within the Environment Statement. Further data from LDP and ProFun</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			CAVEAT B: Visitor forecasts, contained within TN1, TN2 and TN3 (Mode Share) are still yet to be agreed; as is any mitigation measures.	supporting the visitor and staff numbers has been submitted to Highways England.
HEng 1.25	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.316 - The PEIR states that the London Resort will 'maximise the use of the SRN to ensure the flow of traffic can be maintained through busier periods while minimising the impact of visitor and staff travel on the LRN'.</p> <p>Highways England would be concerned that the priority for travel should be on sustainable transport modes over personal vehicle, and that the 'maximised use of the SRN' should be a 'last-resort' consideration. However, HE does recognise that there will be travel to the Resort by personal vehicle and appropriate mitigation measures and incentives will need to be put in place in order to keep this volume reasonable and preferably on the SRN, rather than the LRN.</p>	The traffic impact assessment contained in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) is based on a what is considered to be a worst case car mode share (when the car parks are full). The Travel Demand Management plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) and Technical Note 4 (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-P) set out how a reduced car mode share will be achieved by encouraging use of sustainable modes.
HEng 1.26	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Para 9.317 - No mention of the A2 Bean/Ebbsfleet proposed mitigation measures has been made, however the proposed design of the dual carriageway from the A2(T) into the site is predicted to accommodate the level of traffic estimated in order to avoid queuing back onto the SRN. This also takes into account future growth for Ebbsfleet Garden City. The proposed design would need to be effectively tested within modelling and to DMRB standards in order to make a full assessment.</p> <p>ACTION 23: LRCH will need to demonstrate that it has taken full account of all committed development and non-committed sites within Local Plan allocations in the vicinity of the site. It will also need to conduct sensitivity tests re all other "likely" development. In this way it will comply with both WebTAG style assessment and NPPF required assessment</p> <p>ACTION 24: Several constraints have been identified which would require consideration and it is indicated that the junction proximity may require the relaxation or departures from Standard.</p> <p>CAVEAT C: HE would need to agree to any further changes taking place prior to the draft DCO is submitted to PINS and there can be no assumption can be made that a Departure from Standards would be granted.</p>	Highways England's proposals for improving the A2 Ebbsfleet junction have been upgraded to accommodate London Resort traffic and traffic generated by the consented scheme for Ebbsfleet Garden City. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) details the committed and non-committed sites included within the transport modelling.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HEng 1.27	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 9.324 - ACTION 25: Sustainable modes of transport are assessed; but again, numbers are not included at this point. While these services, including Bus Rapid Transit, are welcomed – further information will need to be provided within the ES.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) contains proposals for promoting the use of sustainable modes, including rail and bus strategies.
HEng 1.28	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 9.369 - Mitigation measures also include Construction Logistics Plan (CLP), Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP), Public Transport Strategy (PTS), Travel Plan (TP) and new/improved NMU routes. These are expected to be enforced through DCO regulations and/or S278 agreements. As yet, these documents have not been provided. ACTION 26: Provision of identified documents: Construction Logistics Plan (CLP), Delivery Servicing Plan (DSP), Public Transport Strategy(PTS), Travel Plan (TP) and new/improved NMU routes.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and accompanying Appendices contain all relevant documents dealing with rail and bus strategies, construction, delivery and service vehicles and travel demand management measures. Appendices TA-AC Travel Demand Management Plan, TA-AD Construction Traffic Management Plan, TA-AE Delivery and Servicing Plan
HEng 1.29	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 9.377 - CAVEAT D: Modelling work for the LRCH has not yet been agreed and is subject to ongoing discussions with the Highways England Modelling team. ACTION 27: A presumption about the level of overseas visitors has been included based upon Disneyland Paris; however, no evidence of this has been included and would need to be provided in order to fully assess.	The modelling methodology was agreed with Highways England on 15th June 2020 - <i>We are content that the overall modelling approach is acceptable</i>
HEng 1.30	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 9.412 - The extent of the PEIR is reliant upon several documents that have not yet been produced but will form part of the ES/TA. While the assessment is based on current policy, and supports sustainable transport, there is a clear lack of evidence as to the quantum of traffic likely to be present upon the SRN and what impact this might have upon the area. For example, the LRCH does not appear to have completely considered the LTC or the availability of the modelling to which the applicant considers they have access. There is a lack of reference to information regarding the current A2B/E junction improvements undertaken by Highways England which may assist with any modelling queries that the applicant has. Further discussions with all Highway Authorities are needed prior to the production of the Environmental Statement and the TA.	This is set out in detail in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). HE have now agreed in principle to the modelling methodology being used for the London Resort
HEng 1.31	Highways England	Land transport	Chapter 9 Para 4.417 - The PEIR concludes that 'It is concluded that several mitigation measures that are either inherently provided by the proposals or will be developed based on the detailed assessment results will satisfactorily counterbalance the potential environmental impacts associated with the	This is set out in detail in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>London Resort so that the increased travel demand can be safely accommodated by the local transport networks.'</p> <p>CAVEAT E: As yet, there is insufficient information provided in the way of robust traffic evidence to support the statement that the proposed mitigation measures are sufficient. Even if this statement were correct, the ES needs to be compatible with the TA which in turn must fully mitigate all the transport related impacts of the LRCH.</p>	
HEng 1.32	Highways England	Land transport	<p>Chapter 9 Access Road - A2 Bean/ Ebbsfleet Junction - 3.6. The proposed design has not been checked for DMRB compliance as it has no modelling agreement to support the design.</p> <p>Action 28</p> <p>Any design must be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported by robust, agreed modelling • Completed to the end of preliminary design stage in full accordance with DMRB before submission of the DCO. • Fully funded by the development and able to be delivered, operated and maintained in all respects without unacceptable impacts on the safety, reliability and operation of the SRN or cost to the taxpayer. <p>CAVEAT E: Clarification around the trip generation and trip distribution is required prior to any full assessment being provided. As this has not yet been agreed, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the mitigation measures proposed would sufficiently counterbalance the environmental effects of the London Resort.</p>	The proposed access is based on an upgrade of Highways England's improvement for the A2 Ebbsfleet junction. The upgrade will be fully funded by the development. Further details and clarification on trip generation and distribution has been provided to Highways England.
HEng 1.33	Highways England	River Transport	<p>Chapter 10 Para 10.10 - Reference is made to the use of the EIA regulations in the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. It is expected that National Policy Statements for Ports as established by the Secretary of State will be utilised where appropriate, under which air quality and noise assessments will be made for both terrestrial and marine aspects.</p> <p>It is considered that any further policy requirements will be addressed by the relevant marine authorities.</p>	Agreed
HEng 1.34	Highways England	River Transport	<p>Chapter 10 Para 10.25 - A consultation meeting in 2017 established that the assessment area for the River Thames and the LRCH should cover a 6 mile stretch between Tilbury Landing Stage and QE Bridge.</p> <p>Highways England considers that the assessment area should cover that area likely to be used by vessels used in direct support of LRCH e.g.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Clippers extended runs from last current stop off in London b) Clippers using Tilbury c) All construction and supplies vessels 	Details are included in the River Transport Chapter (document ref 6.1.10) in the Environment Statement

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HEng 1.35	Highways England	River Transport	Chapter 10 Para 10.46 - From publicly available information on vessel traffic density it can be ascertained that the annual number of commercial vessel movements currently occurring in the vicinity of the proposal is in the order of 20,000. CAVEAT F: A baseline vessel density will be agreed with the PLA and other stakeholders during the preparation of the NRA	A Navigation Risk Assessment (document ref 6.2.10.1) has been prepared and is included in the Environment Statement
HEng 1.36	Highways England	River Transport	Chapter 10 Para 10.53 - ACTION 29: Confirmation of more exact number of movements per day between the PoTL and London Resort, and Central London and the London Resort, including a predicted schedule should be provided. And evidence regarding likely alternative means of transport visitors will use if the Clipper is not available or user levels of the service are not as expected.	Details are included in the River Transport Chapter in the Environment Statement (document ref 6.1.10). Further details on the river service into London are contained within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
HEng 1.37	Highways England	River Transport	Chapter 10 Para 10.39 - CAVEAT G: Any dredging required will be assessed during the preparation of the full ES, assessments will be conducted to satisfy the requirements of both the PLA and the Marine Management Organisations' (MMO) dredging and disposal licencing regimes. ACTION 30: An assessment of the impact of dredging upon the SRN may be required.	Details are included in the River Transport Chapter in the Environment Statement (document ref 6.1.10) and any traffic flows associated with the construction of the Resort are contained within the Construction Traffic Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AD).
HEng 1.38	Highways England	River Transport	Chapter 10 Residual and in-combination effects - At present there is a lack of navigation data, at this stage, it is not possible to determine the residual or in-combination effects of the London Resort. However, the PEIR states that mitigation strategies will be developed as part of the NRA where required, and the post-mitigation residual effects are predicted to be 'not significant' in EIA terms. At present it is not possible to determine the residual or in-combination effects from the current lack of information.	A Navigation Risk Assessment (document ref 6.2.10.1) has been prepared and is included in the Environment Statement
HEng 1.39	Highways England	River Transport	Chapter 10 Conclusion - Further work is required to be carried out prior to any conclusions drawn from the River Transport chapter, which will likely inform the ES and the TA. Where Highways England would need clarity is around the number of proposed river transport trips and the likely number of passengers on those trips which would arrive via the SRN in Essex; this would apply to both the construction phases (for materials and staff) and operational aspects.	Details are included in the River Transport Chapter in the Environment Statement (document ref 6.1.10)
HEng 1.40	Highways England	River Transport	Chapter 10 ACTION 31: Clarification around the trip generation expected on the River Thames for both construction and operational phases is required as this will impact traffic levels on the SRN.	Details are included in the River Transport Chapter (document ref 6.1.10) in the Environment Statement and in the Construction Method Statement (document ref 6.2.3.1) and their impacts upon the SRN
HEng 1.41	Highways England	Landscape	Chapter 11 Landscape - The SES team notes that this report does not appear to have accounted for Highways England's Environmental policy and strategy. As HE's Environmental Strategy is not listed in Section 2 of the	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			report it cannot be claimed that this has been accounted for in the Assessment.	
HEng 1.42	Highways England	Landscape	Chapter 11 A1089/ Tilbury Ferry Road Peninsula - The area of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction indicates that there are several TPOs, Ancient Woodland and areas of moderate to poor qualities species which are likely to be impacted. HE trees could be replaced without difficulty, however if any works need to be undertaken beyond the highway margin then LRCH will need to assess and mitigate tree loss/impacts in greater detail with regards to TPO/Ancient Woodlands areas.	An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) is included as Appendix 12.9 (Document Reference 6.2.12.9).
HEng 1.43	Highways England	Landscape	Chapter 11 - HE land will be affected, and it would be considered that the LRCH will need to tie in the impacts on trees with the wider ecological assessment (bat roosts/routes, survey/breeding periods for birds) when works are to be undertaken. The A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction will need to provide the LRCH with the next level of detail regarding their own impact upon trees/mitigation as the project progresses in order for the LRCH to draw up their own plans/mitigation measures. The DBFO Contract for the A1089 and Asda Roundabout will need to be considered within any DCO and Protective Provisions (PPs) of the LR; to ensure that any mitigation measures proposed are adequately protected and fit within the DBFO landscape management forward programme.	An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) is included as Appendix 12.9 (Document Reference 6.2.12.9).
HEng 1.44	Highways England	Landscape	Chapter 11 ACTION 32: It is advised that the A2B/E and LRCH liaise with each other to provide an up-date information exchange and that further detailed plans are provided in order to assess the impact and replacement planting. Consideration of the implications of the DBFO on any DCO works to the A1089 and Asda Roundabout will all need to be addressed.	No response required.
HEng 1.45	Highways England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Chapter 13 para 9.12 - Chapter Twelve summarises the relevant wildlife legislation and planning policy relevant to the project and information on legislation and policy is also included in Chapters Two Relevant Law and Regulations and Chapter Three National and Local Planning Policy. The PEIR is a high-level preliminary assessment of likely significant effects and the completion of further surveys, assessment, consultation and design changes will influence the development of suitable mitigation measures required for the project. It is therefore not possible at this stage to determine if relevant legislation and policy has been fully adhered to by the project. It is however noted that the PEIR does not identify the protection provided to irreplaceable habitats. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Comments noted and addressed in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>states that ‘development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists’.</p> <p>CAVEAT I: It is recognised in Chapter Twelve that within the current draft of the Environment Bill, as submitted to Parliament, Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) are exempt from the requirement to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain. The Applicant has, however, included within the PEIR the biodiversity metric on a voluntary basis to support a stated commitment to delivering net gain in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>ACTION 33: The PEIR does not identify the protection provided to irreplaceable habitats.</p>	
HEng 1.46	Highways England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>Chapter 13 para 12.66-68 - Overall, the survey methodologies appear thorough and consistent with best practice guidance, which is referenced in the PEIR, Chapter Twelve, paragraphs 12.66-12.68. Some assumptions and minor limitations are identified in paragraphs 12.47 to 12.54 inclusive but do not cause significant concerns for the assessment.</p> <p>The methodology does not mention surveying for non-native invasive plant species. Historical baseline condition reports do mention the presence of giant hogweed and Japanese knotweed and therefore a survey for non-native invasive plant species should be undertaken.</p> <p>ACTION 34: Mitigation should be included to prevent the spread of non-native invasive plant (Japanese knotweed) and animal (including marsh frog) species.</p>	Noted
HEng 1.47	Highways England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>Chapter 13 para 12.92 - ACTION 35: Due to loss of habitats proposed, the project is currently recording a biodiversity net loss and further off-site compensation is required. This is discussed further below.</p>	<p>A number of land holdings are being considered for delivery of off-site mitigation. Potentially suitable land will be subject to an initial Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey followed by an assessment of the potential impacts of any proposals for habitat creation/ enhancement on the existing habitats and species of conservation value. The impact assessment, and design of ecological mitigation measures will be informed by detailed 'Phase 2' ecological surveys as considered necessary following completion of the initial Phase 1 survey. NE will be consulted on the survey proposals.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HEng 1.48	Highways England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>Chapter 13 - The red line boundary overlaps with the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet Junction Improvements (A2BE) scheme although there is no reference to this scheme in the ecology information. Given the overlap in survey area collaboration between the projects would be beneficial. Consultation with Highways England is required to minimise adverse cumulative impacts and maximise ecological benefits by ensuring a joined-up approach to ecological mitigation and compensation in the local area.</p> <p>ACTION 36: The A2BE Environmental Statement is available online (https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/south-east/a2-bean-and-ebbsfleet-junction-improvements/) and should be reviewed as part of the desk study for the London Resorts Project.</p>	<p>The A2BE works are to be undertaken by Highways England and are not included in the Chapter 12 assessment (document reference 6.1.12). Indirect impacts relating to traffic generated by the project and alterations to the Ebbsfleet junction are included in the assessment.</p>
HEng 1.49	Highways England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>Chapter 13 - It appears the A2 corridor has been inadequately assessed within the PEIR and clarification from the developer in terms of future responsibilities in relation to ecology is required. For example, the A2BE scheme has avoided losses of ancient woodland and the London Resort scheme should also aim to do so. Work on the A2BE involved provision of compensation for general habitat losses, and unavoidable losses relating to veteran trees, and work under licence affecting dormice. ACTION 37: In designing and assessing work in the A2 corridor and linked areas, the London Resort designers and ecologists should take account of Highways England's existing works and legal commitments, to avoid losses for both trees and wildlife.</p>	<p>The A2BE works are to be undertaken by Highways England and are not included in the Chapter 12 assessment (document reference 6.1.12). Indirect impacts relating to traffic generated by the project and alterations to the Ebbsfleet junction are included in the assessment.</p>
HEng 1.50	Highways England	Soil, hydrogeology, and ground conditions	<p>Chapter 18 - Information produced within the Phase 1 Geo-environmental Risk Assessment (December 2014), erroneously refers to the Highways Agency, which is now Highways England. In addition, the document refers to out of date DMRB Standards and accordingly the document will need to be updated to reflect the current DMRB standards namely CD 622 Revision 1 'Managing geotechnical risk' (formerly HD 22/08, BD 10/97, HA 120/08). This DMRB document defines the technical approval and certification procedures to be used to ensure that the risks associated with geotechnical activities are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>The referenced document (Appendix 18.1) was produced in 2014. The document has been updated (Appendix 18.6), however much of the information related to ground conditions remains pertinent and so both documents are included as technical appendices to Chapter 18 of the ES (document reference 6.1.18). The relevant DMRB standards will be adopted / referred to during geotechnical design of relevant aspects of the Proposed Development (but are not relevant to Chapter 18).</p>
HEng 1.51	Highways England	Soil, hydrogeology, and ground conditions	<p>Chapter 18 - ACTION 38: A number of the procedures concerned with regards to ground conditions should be completed as part of the preliminary design of any mitigation works to the SRN, and therefore before the draft DCO is submitted.</p>	<p>Noted. Mitigation works anticipated for the SRN are provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HEng 1.52	Highways England	Soil, hydrogeology, and ground conditions	<p>Chapter 18 - In reviewing the area covered by the report it appears that the areas within the full DCO red line boundary have not been covered. This is of concern as Zone 5A does not cover the full extent of the A2 trunk road where highway improvements may be required. Accordingly, the missed areas will need to be fully investigated before the report can be considered acceptable. It is likely that this will be addressed in the Environmental Statement to be released later by LRCH and will be reviewed by Highways England at that time.</p> <p>ACTION 39: A review of the areas within the full DCO red line areas where highway improvements may be required, as areas which have been missed will need to be fully investigated.</p>	The DCO Order Limits have been refined / amended since the PEIR report was published. This chapter assesses the full area covered by the final DCO Order Limits plus a 1km buffer about this area.
HEng 1.53	Highways England	Project description	<p>Chapter 1 - CAVEAT J: Highways England agrees that some flexibility regarding the design of the internal operations of the site is required; however, this would be only if the attractions of the site remain similar. If new/different attractions are offered (i.e. golf course or racing track) a new ES/TA may be required. New attractions may lead to intensification and impact trip rates.</p>	If additional uses are proposed then additional approvals may be needed.
HEng 1.54	Highways England	Relevant law and policy	<p>Chapter 2 - ACTION 40: No mention has been made of the 1980 Highways Act. The DCO will need to echo its provisions and requirements, therefore this must be included.</p>	This has been captured in the draft DCO (document reference 3.1).
HEng 1.55	Highways England	Relevant law and policy	<p>Chapter 3 - NEW: ACTION: Reference should be made to Highways England guidance documents and license:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highways England: The Strategic Road Network – Planning for the Future (2015) - DfT Circular 02/2013: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development - Department for Transport Highways England License: Secretary of State for Transport statutory directions and guidance to the strategic highways company. 	The relevant guidance is addressed in ES Chapter 9 (document reference 6.1.9) Land Transport and accompanying Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) .
HEng 1.56	Highways England	Socio-economic effects	<p>Chapter 7 - The documents reviewed do not refer to any Strategic Road Network (SRN) mitigation measures and therefore no view on the viability measurement can be undertaken.</p> <p>ACTION 41: The London Resort will need to provide details of the SRN mitigation measures to be delivered and the planned approach to delivering them.</p>	Details of impact on the SRN is included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Mitigation is proposed at the ASDA roundabout and the Ebbsfleet Junction.
HEng 1.57	Highways England	Socio-economic effects	<p>Chapter 7 Policy - Policies which may discourage the development of London Resort should be identified. For example there is no mention of Policy DP3 of the Dartford Development Policy Plan 2017, which suggests that development will not be permitted if they generate significant localised residual impacts on the highway network and result in severe impact on road</p>	A comprehensive Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been prepared identifying relevant policies and how the Resort complies with and supports those policies

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>traffic, congestion, air quality and safety of road users (including pedestrians/cyclists) and excessive pressure for on street parking. Societal changes are likely to have shifted regional priorities and induced councils or other authorities to review their policy documents. For example, the focus on increasing provision of walking and cycling infrastructure has increased markedly as a result of the pandemic. It is important to check that the most recent policy documents have been reviewed and any anticipated changes are considered</p> <p>ACTION 42: Given the scale of the London Resort Development and in line with the Dartford Development Policy Plan 2017, an assessment of the impact on the highway network must be undertaken.</p> <p>ACTION 43: Provide consideration of the impacts of the recent pandemic on local/regional policies and alignment of the project. The London Resort has not effectively considered the impact the recent pandemic may have had on local/regional policies.</p> <p>ACTION 44: Clarity is required on how the London Resort supports the identified policies and strategies and how it will assist in achieving the identified targets. The London Resort should consider how the development relates to the other developments in the Core Study Area, also contributing to the targets.</p>	
HEng 1.58	Highways England	Socio-economic effects	<p>Chapter 7 Baseline - No data has been presented which assesses other routes, and the effect of the development on the highway network in the surrounding area in either the baseline state, during construction or at the operational stage. The Detailed Baseline does not sufficiently review current traffic conditions within and beyond the Project Site Boundary and this is seen as a major gap in the baseline assessment, given the scale of the development, the expected number of visitors, and its potential impact on the regional economy.</p> <p>Currently, reference is made to the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation (EDP) initial PROW and route assessment which identified nine affected PROWs and routes. However, no substantial information is provided, including the extent which the identified PROW and routes are affected.</p> <p>ACTION 45: It is recommended that the Detailed Baseline is revised with further analysis and information regarding the baseline and future baseline state of PROWs and routes.</p> <p>In some sections, data up to and including 2019 has been used to inform the findings in order to remove the impacts of the pandemic (for example Section 7.2.16). While this has been done so as to ensure data and outputs are representative of the pre-pandemic state of the baseline, this methodology omits the impact of the recent pandemic and may prove to be overly simplistic and not a true reflection of the future baseline state.</p>	<p>A full assessment of baseline traffic conditions, construction and operational traffic impact is included in the Land Transport chapter of the ES and in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and the associated Construction Traffic Management Plan and Delivery and Servicing Plan.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) identifies each of the affected PROWs and routes, presenting a description of the baseline of each as well as the likely impact of the London Resort. More detail is provided in the Landscape Strategy (part of the DAS, document ref 7.1) and the Public Rights of Way Assessment (document ref 6.2.11.9).</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the ES acknowledges that COVID-19 has the potential to impact a variety of health, social, economic and demographic indicators. It notes that whilst many forecasts conclude that the impact of the pandemic is not expected to be persistent, with the recovery to pre-pandemic levels expected by 2024 (the</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>It is important to consider the medium to long-term impacts the pandemic may have on baseline metrics presented. For instance, social distancing measures and visitor’s weariness of exposures to the virus may likely limit the number of visitors admitted to the Resort. There is no evidence or justification presented within the PEIR to support the expectation that London Resort will be a global top amusement/theme park and would attract between 4.7m and 21m per year.</p> <p>Uncertainty around visitor patronage of the facilities must be considered as this underpins the viability of the investment. Any assessment without consideration of the impact of the virus is likely to underestimate the viability and hence risk of successfully delivering the required SRN mitigation.</p> <p>ACTION 46: Consideration should be provided of the impacts of the recent pandemic upon the baseline and future baseline.</p>	<p>opening year of Gate One), COVID-19 could be relevant for short-term effects and some operational effects (where relevant). The impact of COVID-19 on the future baseline is therefore considered for all construction effects and operational effects where there is more relevant evidence of a longer term impact.</p>
HEng 1.59	Highways England	Socio-economic effects	<p>Chapter 7 Baseline - There is lack of clarity on the role of Thurrock in the Detailed Baseline. Thurrock is a constituent of both the CSA (presents data for authorities in the Core Study Area to assess significance) and SRCA (presented in the baseline for context only) geographical study areas. Clarity is required regarding why, in some instances, data and metrics relating to Thurrock are being presented for context only as part of the SRCA even through the project site falls within the boundaries of Thurrock.</p> <p>ACTION 47: Clarity is required regarding the boundaries of each geographical study area and the extent to which the baseline data relates to Thurrock.</p>	<p>Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) and the detailed baseline appendix present data at different geographical levels depending on the effect. The Core Study Area (which is made up of Dartford, Gravesham and Thurrock) is the study area for many effects. As identified by this comment, the SRCA is used for baseline context only - to understand how areas are performing compared to the wider sub-regional area. As described in the spatial scope section of Chapter 7, the SRCA includes Kent and Medway and Essex so it includes Thurrock but also Dartford and Gravesham.</p>
HEng 1.60	Highways England	Socio-economic effects	<p>Chapter 7 Baseline - It is not always clear what developments are considered in the baseline and the assumptions behind any exclusion or inclusion which need to be fully understood throughout the assessment. For example, clarity should be sought on the on the exact future baseline assumptions around the new primary healthcare facility within Ebbsfleet Garden City and Darent Valley Hospital (including any assumed opening years and the status of any planning/consent application), as access to alternative facilities identified in Essex (Tilbury Health Centre and Sai Medical Centre) would require the use of the nearby tolled river crossing.</p> <p>ACTION 48: Outline what developments have been considered in the baseline and the level of certainty to ensure it is compliant with WebTAG and the NPPF.</p>	<p>The detailed baseline appendix for Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) provides more information on the developments which are considered in the future baseline. It lists the other developments where relevant, outlining the contribution of each to the future baseline.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HEng 1.61	Highways England	Socio-economic effects	Chapter 7 Baseline - In line with TAG A2.2, only changes at the national level should be considered and the extent of the additionality should be dependent on the level of displacement and deadweight. There is no mention of how any deadweight (the level of investment which would occur in the absence of the investment) is to be factored into the net additional employment effects mentioned or other baseline metrics. ACTION 49: The methodology for accessing additionality should account for the displacement, deadweight, leakage and substitutions. At present, it is not clear how this has been done.	Deadweight is considered in Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) through the consideration of the existing employment across the Project Site. This is subtracted from the total direct employment of the London Resort to provide estimates of gross additional employment (employment supported on top of the existing site). Leakage and displacement is then applied to gross additional employment to estimate additionality.
HEng 1.62	Highways England	Socio-economic effects	Chapter 7 - ACTION 50: There are several socio-economic issues which require further work and justification to comply with WebTAG guidance. It is expected that the ES and, in particular, the TA, will provide further information to sufficiently address these issues.	Issues discussed above in the context of Chapter 7 (document ref 6.1.7). These issues are addressed in the Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).
HEng 1.63	Highways England	Socio-economic effects	Chapter 8 - DMRB guidance LA 112: Population and human health is not referenced in the Human health chapter, however LA 112 has been applied in Chapter 9: Transport.	The guidance is referenced in Chapter 8 (document ref 6.1.8) and Chapter 9 (document reference 6.1.9) of the ES.
HEng 1.64	Highways England	Marine ecology and biodiversity	Chapter 13 - No reference has been made to DMRB guidance LA 108: Biodiversity in the assessment methodology.	N/A
HEng 1.65	Highways England	Marine ecology and biodiversity	Chapter 13 - There could be a very small increase in load and traffic using the SRN linked to the proposed coastal alteration and terracing works to provide additional saltmarsh habitat and new intertidal mud areas, as well as the extra plant and equipment needed to construct the new jetty in Swanscombe given that this is a designated site (Marine Conservation Zone) and could require specialised equipment/ additional journeys on the SRN. The potential increase in the use of the SRN arising from these works, would, however, be almost negligible in the context of the scheme.	Noted
HEng 1.66	Highways England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Chapter 14 - 4.36. With regards to the Highways England strategic road network, the failure to address the contributions of setting, particularly of the Scheduled Monuments, presents a risk for being able to fully consider cumulative effects of works that may be proposed along the A2 (and specifically in the vicinity of Darenth Park). In addition, the Swanscombe Cutting Footbridge Crossing of A2 East of A296 Junction, which forms part of the Kent Project Site has been identified as a Grade II Listed Building. This will need to be considered further within the Environmental Statement. ACTION 51: Identification of the Swanscombe Cutting Footbridge Crossing of A2 East of A296 Junction, which forms part of the Kent Project Site has been	This is noted and LRCH looks forward to continued dialogue with Highways England as the application progresses

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			identified as a Grade II Listed Building may need to be monitored throughout the process.	
HEng 1.67	Highways England	Air Quality	Chapter 16 - CAVEAT L: Areas of poor air quality are the most sensitive to changes in pollutant concentrations, so even minor changes as result of a proposed development may lead to significant impacts. Receptors within the nearby air quality management areas will be most likely to be affected by operational emissions. This is of concern when we think about potential cumulative effects.	The Air Quality assessment is presented within Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16) and details the mitigation required for the proposed development.
HEng 1.68	Highways England	Air Quality/Traffic and Transport	<p>Chapter 16 - With regards to dust, the construction methodology only refers to assessing the risks of dust impacts. As such this is woefully inadequate for determining the impacts of construction activities on the operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), (A2, M25 and A282) in the vicinity of the proposals. Whilst it is expected that the highways work to the A2 trunk road will be accompanied by their own Construction Management Plan and Method Statements the overall development proposals could have an adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. Accordingly, a construction Traffic Management Plan will be required which amongst other matters should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the anticipated number, frequency, types and timing of vehicles used during construction (construction vehicles should avoid the network peak hours of 0800-0900 and 1700-1800; protective shoulder times of 7:30 – 9:30 and 14:30 – 18:30 should be considered instead); • the parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors; • the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste, including abnormal loads; • the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development; • the erection and maintenance of security hoarding or other appropriate security barriers; and • the provision of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders); <p>The PEIR can be seen as a public information document, with some overview of proposed assessment methodologies, however, it will only be when we get sight of the ES that Highways England can get a full understanding of the proposals. The PEIR states an intention to submit the DCO application by the</p>	<p>These points are covered in the Construction Traffic Management Plan included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>Additionally, the impact of construction dust and construction traffic has been considered in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>end of 2020, which is likely to necessitate a further response.</p> <p>ACTION 52: Production of further information regarding the Construction Traffic Management Plan will need to be provided.</p> <p>ACTION 53: The consideration of protecting peak ‘shoulder’ times on the SRN to avoid construction traffic congestion would be welcomed. Utilising 07:30 – 09:30 and 14:30 – 18:30, would assist to protect journey times from the SRN to the site and vice versa</p>	
HEng 1.69	Highways England	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	<p>Chapter 21 - In reviewing Appendix 21.1; Highways England noted that Tilbury Port Expansion has been considered within the London List, but that the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) has not. While the Lower Thames Crossing has not yet received DCO; the proposed routing is close enough to the site along the A2 and M2 in Kent and the A2/ A1089 in Essex, that it would significantly impact the flow of traffic and routing in the area both to/from the Resort. As such, Highways England would recommend that a ‘sensitivity test’ is provided to include the LTC within any modelling or cumulative effect analysis. Further information on this would be required.</p> <p>ACTION 54: Exclusion of the Lower Thames Crossing from assessment of cumulative impacts and modelling may be considered environmentally relevant to Highways England.</p> <p>CAVEAT M: Cumulative impacts of the LTC would not be required if the LRCH was subject to a delay in opening until the LTC was operational.</p>	Full details of the traffic modelling and the status of the Lower Thames Crossing is considered in ES Chapter 9 on Land Transport (document ref 6.1.9) and the accompanying Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). This includes the up to date dialogue with Highways England.
HE 1.1	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>We note the need however, for the ES to demonstrate stated impacts through the use of appropriate photomontages and rendered images. We would be pleased to provide advice on specific views in relation to heritage assets from which the impact of the development should be assessed.</p>	This is welcomed and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HE 1.2	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The PEIR (14.192) assesses the magnitude of impact (MoI) as 'Medium', that the proposed four-storey car park would have on the significance of the grade II* listed Tilbury Cruise Terminal and Riverside Station, and the expected residual significance (RS) of effect as 'Moderate Adverse'. We consider the MoI would actually be Major and the RS would be High Adverse. This is due to the scale and close proximity of the car park to the Terminal building. We would therefore expect appropriate recognition of harm in the ES, and an approach to design that reduces this harm.	This is noted and further clarification on rationale is explored in
HE 1.3	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	With regard to views from, and towards, the scheduled Tilbury Fort and grade II* listed Barracks block (which faces onto the parade ground and towards the proposed car park), we agree with the assessment level of 'Medium' MoI and 'Moderate Adverse' effect on significance (14.155). We would expect harm to be minimised here, firstly through detailed architectural design, and secondly through landscape screening.	This is noted and welcomed
HE 1.4	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Table 14.4 summarises designated heritage assets; it should be stated clearly if the information in the table relates to the whole project site (both Kent and Essex).	This is noted and further explored in ES Figure 14.1 - 14.12 (Document references 6.3.14.1 - 6.3.14.12)
HE 1.5	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	In addition to new baseline surveys providing information about the Essex development area and intertidal areas, we need more baseline information about; the deposit sequences and archaeological potential of the Swanscombe Peninsula, the Ebbsfleet Valley and Palaeolithic sites around Bakers Hole. Some of this work has already been completed or is proposed, but it needs to be finished before we can agree the content of the ES, mitigation strategies or the proposed Heritage Statement.	This is welcomed and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
HE 1.6	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The PEIR also acknowledges that further information in general is required, in order to better characterise the site's archaeological resource and its impact by the development, and that there is therefore a requirement for both further desk-based assessment and fieldwork (PEIR, 14.3, 14.11 & 14.58). We are in agreement with this approach, although the scope of the proposed surveys as outlined in the PEIR lack detail.	This is welcomed and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
HE 1.7	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The Appendices supporting Chapter 14 report on some of the investigations and surveys already undertaken for the project. However, the reports and their contents are not all complete.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
HE 1.8	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	A report for the evaluation work undertaken in the area to the north of Springhead and encompassing the Neolithic scheduled monuments is not included. However, this work, which involved geoarchaeological, archaeological and Palaeolithic investigation, is included in the list of previous investigations for the project (14.59). Sight of the report would help guide the need for further evaluation, and facilitate further discussion on	This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			construction design, especially given the sensitivity of the archaeology here and the likely impacts from the access road (14.97).	
HE 1.9	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The ‘deposit model and archaeological characterisation’ report (Appendix 14.3) is incomplete and does not include a deposit model. Appendix 14.7, which sets out the results of deep geophysical survey on the Swanscombe Peninsula also lacks the geoarchaeological information needed for ground-truthing (for both please see the Geoarchaeology section below).	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
HE 1.10	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Considering the amount of fieldwork that is likely to be required to inform the ES, and the need for some elements to take an iterative staged approach, we think it is important that discussions about this fieldwork commence at the earliest opportunity. It is also important that where consents are required (e.g. for works within scheduled monuments, SSSIs, etc.) these are applied for and obtained early. Please note that applications for Scheduled Monument Consent (which are required for any works within a scheduled monument) can take 2-3 months to process.	This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses
HE 1.11	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The PEIR notes that further fieldwork will initially include evaluation at the Baker’s Hole scheduled monument (PEIR, 14.11); and geophysical survey and boreholes to further characterise geo-archaeological deposits (PEIR, 14.109). Whilst we are supportive of these plans, we would also stress the importance of early/further field evaluation for other aspects of the development. This includes, but is not limited to, anticipated impacts to the Neolithic sites near Ebbsfleet (a scheduled monument); and areas with potential for undesignated archaeology (including nationally important and waterlogged, as well as deeply buried remains).	This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses
HE 1.12	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Within our recent Scoping response we highlighted in particular the need to understand in detail the alterations and additions to the existing A2 Ebbsfleet junction. This is because the junction sits within a highly significant and sensitive archaeological area. We are therefore encouraged to note that the submitted PEIR Consultation Brochure includes confirmation that “Highways England has agreed to provide forecast model data from their traffic models for the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet improvements project,” and that this information will be fed into for the London Resort assessment. This information should be used to determine what additional capacity may be required at this junction, and how this will be achieved within the development design. Early identification of additional need at this junction, and early and on-going consultation with Highways England about this matter, is strongly recommended in order to avoid double-handling and any	This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>intrusive works that may later become superfluous. Highways England has made a considerable effort to avoid new disturbance to sensitive archaeological remains when designing their recent improvements to the Ebbsfleet Junction. Every effort should be made to continue this approach for the London Resort. This should include provision for the continued preservation in-situ of the temple beneath the slip road.</p>	
HE 1.13	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>The separate impact assessment, which looked at the impacts of the ‘people mover route’ on Bakers Hole monument (Appendix 14.5, 6.1.1), explores different options and gives clear recommendations on which are least harmful to heritage. We are therefore concerned that the PEIR now selects only one (and the most harmful) route (14.95). We want to see consideration of all routes, and if the least harmful cannot be chosen, then we need clear and convincing justification for why. The choice of route and its justification must be completed as soon as possible, as no evaluation should take place until the impact locations are agreed, to avoid potentially unnecessary intrusion into the monument and SSSI. Impact should consider not only direct damage to the monument, but also the lack of access for further study development might cause; as noted in Appendix 14.5, 4.1.3: “impact is construed as including lack of future access”. Impacts of the access road might also effect the Neolithic scheduled sites in the Ebbsfleet Valley, and in accordance with NPPF less harmful alternatives should be considered and the chosen route justified (Appendix 14.5, 6.1.1; Chapter 14,14.94 and 14.97).</p>	<p>This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)</p>
HE 1.14	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>We have previously recommended that the ES should include the establishment of character areas/zones for the archaeological resource in general, i.e. for Holocene archaeology as well as Palaeolithic deposits. We therefore welcome the in-depth and thorough characterisation of the site’s Holocene archaeology produced thus far as set out in Appendix 14.3 (Archaeological deposit model and characterisation). We understand that this characterisation may require updating since it was originally produced, and in light of new information that has since been revealed. We also feel it does not adequately reflect the differences in deposit sequence and deposit characteristics for each zone identified, which would be derived from geoarchaeological input and deposit modelling. We would also point out that although some areas have indeed already been excavated during HS1 works (as shown in the characterisation), some of these features are nevertheless still preserved beneath the current road system and should continue to be preserved as such.</p>	<p>This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HE 1.15	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>The PEIR has not drawn on any of the (Holocene) geoarchaeological work undertaken for the project so far. Appendix 14.3 is not yet acceptable as a deposit model – draft or otherwise. A deposit model maps below ground deposits. Although this Appendix zones the site into areas of archaeological potential (as would be an output of a deposit model) the Appendix is based on HER distributions alone. We think a document is required in the ‘Archaeological Deposit Model and Characterisation’ (Appendix 14.3), that is written by (or closely with) a geoarchaeologist. This should present what is known about the distribution, depth, and potential of the buried deposit sequence of the study area, in the form of text, schematic sections, and maps (such as the zones already produced). It should be based on geotechnical, archaeological and other datasets, which provide information on geology, geomorphology, and sediment character across the study area. This will provide a context for buried archaeology, from which archaeological potential can be assessed. The HER data currently utilised should feed into the deposit model, but the Appendix should be deposit-led, rather than led by the HER data as it is currently.</p>	<p>This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses</p>
HE 1.16	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>The lack of borehole information to ground-truth the deep geophysical surveys reported on in Appendix 14.7 is also noted. The 2015 geotechnical boreholes (Appendix 18.4 / Chapter 18) were monitored by geoarchaeologists. This should have informed the deposit model (Appendix 14.3) and helped to ground-truth the geophysical survey. The geoarchaeological deposit modelling, and input to the geophysical survey, is needed to inform the ES.</p>	<p>This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)</p>
HE 1.17	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>There is little information in the PEIR about the scope of the further surveys mentioned in the baseline section (14.212). We would welcome input to the scope of geoarchaeological and geophysical surveys proposed for the Essex side (14.119). These should be the same as for the Swanscombe Peninsula and the Ebbsfleet Valley in terms of deep geophysics, geoarchaeological boreholes, and a deposit model. We would expect to discuss the scope of this work as soon as possible to make sure this essential work is adequate, and completed in time to inform both the ES, and decision making for design and mitigation going forward.</p>	<p>This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses</p>
HE 1.18	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>There is no mention in the ‘Baseline Conditions’ section of geology or topography. This would be where the geoarchaeological information obtained from the deposit model should be summarised, to provide the context for the subsequent archaeological evidence. We recommend this this is undertaken in the ES, building on the surveys and work outlined in 14.109.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HE 1.19	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Contamination because of CKD previously prevented geoarchaeological boreholes being drilled on the peninsula. It would be helpful to understand whether this will still be the case.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
HE 1.20	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Section 14.213 summarises the additional work that may be employed to inform the mitigation strategy, which for the most part seem sensible and appropriate. However, it may be useful to include provision for the collection and assessment of additional boreholes where necessary.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
HE 1.21	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>We agree that the development has the potential to have a physical impact to archaeological remains outside the development footprint by indirect means (e.g. impacting the local hydrological regime). We note however that the PEIR only recognises this potential with regard to the marine environment and remains within the marine zone (PEIR, 14.25). It is important to recognise that such indirect archaeological impact can also occur in the terrestrial zone, particularly in relation to organic or waterlogged remains. These are particularly sensitive to changes to the local hydrological regime. The potential for indirect archaeological impact should thus be fully and properly assessed within the ES wherever it is applicable, both within the marine and the terrestrial zone. Likely impacts on the local hydrology are confirmed in Chapter 12 (Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity), which explains that the proposed development could potentially change the local hydrology as well as well the quality and quantity of the water (PEIR 12.31 and 12.144). This may impact on archaeological remains located within the development area, particularly organic remains that have been preserved in waterlogged environments, and organic rich deposits such as peat.</p> <p>Changes to water levels or water chemistry can result in the damage and/or loss of vulnerable archaeological remains. We recommend that the impact and mitigation strategies discussed in this chapter are incorporated into the discussions of the historic environment, and that a reference is made to the Historic England document: 'Preserving Archaeological Remains' (2016): https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/preserving-archaeological-remains/ Chapter 17 (Water Resources and Flood Risk) should also be examined for potential impacts on the historic environment.</p>	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14). Further consideration is given in Chapters 17 & 18 of the Environmental Statement - Water Resources and Flood risk and Soils Hydrology and Ground Conditions (Document References 6.1.17 & 6.1.18)
HE 1.22	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	We understand from this chapter that the baseline presented is a desk-based assessment only, and currently does not include data from the NRHE and UKHO, so is therefore incomplete. However, we note that a considerable number of heritage features were identified within the study area from the	As above

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>available HER and other data, on which to base the assessment of potential impacts. These demonstrate the clear potential for marine vessels and structures that could be impacted by construction works. In this regard, we also recommend the use of further data sets such as that provided by CITIZAN, which details a number of findspots within the project area. Furthermore, we note that none of these assets are considered more than moderately significant. Further detail should be provided on how the significance determination was reached, especially for features that could be impacted, to inform the assessment of significance and mitigation measures proposed. In this regard, we welcome the reference in paragraph 14.124 to marine geophysical and geotechnical surveys, which would inform the assessment of effects within the Environmental Statement. We highlight however, that such surveys should be interpreted following standard guidance, and be conducted by an experienced and qualified marine archaeologist.</p>	
HE 1.23	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>With regards to the sections (14.122-125, 14.145-6 and 14.164) detailing the potential direct and indirect impacts on marine heritage assets (from the construction and operation phases), we are content that the main potential impacts set out within these sections are appropriate. However, we wish to see further consideration and discussion regarding during which phases of the development these impacts could occur. Primarily, we would consider the effects of scour and sediment changes to be an indirect impact that would also be applicable within the operational phases of the development, due to the influence of structures within the water column of sediment transport patterns over time. Moreover, due to the shallow nature of the areas to be impacted, it would be applicable for consideration of how boat wash from construction vessels and transport vessels could impact the burial of marine heritage assets.</p>	<p>This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HE 1.24	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	We are pleased to see the detail provided regarding the proposed mitigation measures set out in this chapter, in relation to the construction and operational phases of the project. However, Table 14.9 appears to have a preference for preservation by record for intertidal and subtidal features that may be impacted by construction activities. Whilst we do not contradict this approach, we would like to see greater emphasis on the primary mitigation strategy of avoidance of heritage assets, in line with the marine plan policy SE-HER-1.	This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses
HE 1.25	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	We additionally note that the proposed works associated with the piles and jetty construction, could result in increased erosion. This could expose and potentially damage any archaeological remains in the area (see Section 14.146). However, we note that additional work will be carried out to assess the physical processes, which will provide information about the potential for archaeological remains to be damaged by the proposed works.	This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses
HE 1.26	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	We note that there is no specific mention to the securement of mitigation measures for potential impacts to marine heritage assets with the Deemed Marine Licence. We request that appropriate consideration is given to the securement of such measures within the DCO, whether this is in conjunction with any onshore Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) produced or as a separate marine WSI. We note that as the Governments Advisor on all aspects of the historic environment in England, Historic England would be the key advisor to the Marine Management Organisation on heritage matters, in relation to any work that would require an MMO licence. We therefore anticipate providing further specialist advice on marine matters in due course.	This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

HE 1.27	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	By following planning policy and guidance we would also additionally expect the project to be creative in how it might offer opportunities for the enhancement of assets, and how the project might deliver public (heritage) benefit.	We share this aspiration and consideration is given to ways in which this might be achieved in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14).
HE 1.28	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Given the size and nature of the scheme the ES should aim to make clear public heritage benefits and outreach as part of planned mitigation. Mitigation should include a proposal to remove Baker’s Hole from Historic England’s Heritage at Risk Register. Other opportunities could include contribution to/provision of a centre, for understanding the rich heritage of the area, which would also be a benefit of the proposed scheme. We would welcome the opportunity to continue previous discussions between HE, KCC, NE and the project team to build on the opportunities created by the scheme in this regard.	We share this aspiration and consideration is given to ways in which this might be achieved in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and look forward to working closely with Historic England, KCC, ECC and other bodies.
HE 1.29	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	This is a significant body of work to be completed, and we have some concerns regarding the current proposed timeline for determination of the application, and amount of additional work required ahead of submission. We therefore encourage discussion with relevant consultees on the above matters as soon as possible.	This is noted and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses
HE 1.30	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The scheme has the potential to cause harm to both designated and undesignated heritage assets of national importance. There is also an opportunity to provide enhancement to assets and secure heritage benefits as part of the scheme. Sufficiently identifying the significance of assets at an early stage, and using this to evolve a Historic Environment Framework, deposit model, baseline assessment and subsequent heritage and Environmental Statements, will therefore be critical in providing a strong basis for design decisions.	This is noted, we take our responsibilities towards cultural heritage and the SSSI incredibly seriously and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses
HE 1.31	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	We think there must be a particular focus on using landscape and geoarchaeological approaches to analysis, and expect to see the development plans actively respond to historic environment concerns. This is because it is an objective of sustainable development to protect and enhance the historic environment as outlined in the NPPF (paras. 8 and 200).	This is noted, we take our responsibilities towards cultural heritage and the SSSI incredibly seriously and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			It is vital that impacts to the historic environment are also sufficiently identified. Where there is harm to the significance of heritage assets we note the requirement to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage assets conservation and any aspect of the proposal (NPPF para. 190), and to have clear and convincing justification for any harm (para. 194). This is particularly essential in regard to designated heritage assets or those of equal significance.	
HE 1.32	Historic England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Given the importance of the heritage assets within the area, we encourage you to seek improvements and enhancements to the supporting documentation, and the overall approach taken.	This is noted, we take our responsibilities towards cultural heritage and the SSSI incredibly seriously and we look forward to working closely with Historic England as the application progresses
KEP 1.1	Kent and Essex Police	Land transport	Consultation with the Police Designing out Crime Team: Predominately when designing the measures that will be in place to manage the access and egress and isolating those areas where vehicles or staff are not permitted.	Noted
KEP 1.2	Kent and Essex Police	Land transport	Further detail and strategic overview: To coordinate the anticipated demand on policing, further detail is required on the proposed capacity on roads and proposals to embed designing out crime concepts.	Noted. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) sets out in some detail the impacts of the scheme on the local road network. As was set out within the PEIR, the majority of trips are outside of the peak hours having less of an impact upon key routes within the area.
KEP 1.3	Kent and Essex Police	Land transport	Blue Light Service provision and access: Information regarding areas for blue light service emergency access/egress across the whole breadth of the site. Ideally with a dedicated emergency service provision throughout.	Included in the Environment Statement
KEP 1.4	Kent and Essex Police	Land transport	Park Mark Accreditation: The high volume of vehicles in one location (i.e. the 'Park and Ride' facilities) could be a potential crime generator. A proposed option to counteract this is consideration of adopting the British Parking Association – Park Mark Scheme throughout the development.	Noted - Since comments were provided LRCH have been consulted with the blue light services over the masterplan layout, including the new security area on the access road.
KEP 1.5	Kent and Essex Police	Land transport	Safer Bus Station Scheme: We would similarly welcome the opportunity to discuss potential Bus Terminus and strongly recommend engaging with the British Parking Association and applying for the Safer Bus Station Scheme.	Noted
KEP 1.6	Kent and Essex Police	Land transport	Cycle storage: It is recommended to address secure external storage facilities and bicycle security, be this within the footprint of the plans or within communal bicycle stores.	Secure cycle parking is included within the Resort

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KEP 1.7	Kent and Essex Police	Land transport	Adoption of SBD for any commercial / amenity facilities: If there's provisions for the public within the 'Park and Ride' area (such as commercial), we would recommend complying with the relevant SBD Commercial guide.	Noted
KEP 1.8	Kent and Essex Police	Land transport	Adoption of Essex Design Guide for designing the road network and infrastructure in Essex: We would welcome discussion around the implication of the road network on the Blue Light Service.	Noted
KEP 1.9	Kent and Essex Police	Project development and alternatives	<p>The Kent development area and design guide: We have discussed the initial proposed layouts of both road access/egress, entry to the park, turnaround area and the impact of Pilgrims Way footpath. As it stands, the following areas cause concern for security of the site, visitors and workers:</p> <p>Interchange Plaza area:</p> <p>A) Numbers waiting for entry/opening (crowded place), relationship with any alcohol licensed area (I would recommend separate licensable activity areas).</p> <p>B) The space required for searching/screening of visitors would need to be designed in at an early stage and modelled, cognisant of MTA/IED.</p> <p>C) Bottleneck due to access/egress points in relation to a major incident/MTA et. al.</p> <p>D) Area merges with a range of other activities such as the 'Pedestrian Collector', footpath, deliveries, drop offs/parking and relationship with the turnaround area/location for suspect vehicles.</p> <p>E) It would appear there is limited distance from vehicular traffic.</p> <p>F) Concern re the structure at this 'pinch point' from impact of an IED.</p> <p>G) Ideally, the Pilgrims Way footpath would be rerouted as it is unrestricted through the site with easy access to the 'pinch points' highlighted.</p>	LRCH and specialists are liaising with the Police and other emergency services organisations regarding these matters. The Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1) identifies various measures, along with the Security Planning Report (document reference 7.8).
KEP 1.10	Kent and Essex Police	Project description	Lockdown: In terms of lockdown of the site, we would need to understand how this would operate in a live incident, areas that visitors would disperse to (secondary vulnerable locations), cognisant of the above issues raised.	LRCH and specialists are liaising with the Police and other emergency services organisations regarding these matters. The Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1) identifies various measures, along with the Security Planning Report (document reference 7.8).
KEP 1.11	Kent and Essex Police	Project description	Security / Crisis Management Centre: We discussed this during our recent meeting on possible locations and working practices. Provision of Police representation and possible IT/access would need to be considered at design stage. The physical location would need to be in a secure area to ensure that it's away from any incident should the site be evacuated, thus ensuring it	LRCH and specialists are liaising with the Police and other emergency services organisations regarding these matters. The Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1) identifies various measures, along with the Security Planning Report (document reference 7.8).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			remains in a safe and secure working environment and not vulnerable to a secondary attack.	
KEP 1.12	Kent and Essex Police	Project description	CCTV: Provision of CCTV throughout and surrounding the development with access by both the CMC and central emergency service command centres in Maidstone.	LRCH and specialists are liaising with the Police and other emergency services organisations regarding these matters. The Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1) identifies various measures, along with the Security Planning Report (document reference 7.8).
KEP 1.13	Kent and Essex Police	Project development and alternatives	<p>When contemplating ‘Lighting Design’ within the facility, we would recommend that incorporated within any plans are detailed lighting design, detailing the current relevant standard and or relevant industry standard (i.e. incorporation of the newest standard for street lighting BS5489-1 2020). Lighting plays a pivotal role in deterring criminal activity, but also promotes a feeling of safety within that space. When designing both public and private space, and when applied and designed correctly, lighting can reduce the potential for crime.</p> <p>When contemplating lighting within the footprint and surrounding areas, we would recommend consideration be given to incorporating a Central Management System (CMS). CMS provides remote dynamic street lighting control, allowing a monitoring functionality, for instance the council are aware when lighting has failed and is proven to be more sustainable. From a Police perspective, CMS can prove beneficial in emergency situations where greater visibility is required.</p>	LRCH and specialists are liaising with the Police and other emergency services organisations regarding these matters. The Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1) identifies various measures, along with the Security Planning Report (document reference 7.8).
KEP 1.14	Kent and Essex Police	Project development and alternatives	It is imperative that any proposed public realm space within this area is designed where safety and security is subliminal to the user of that space. It is important to ensure that the design is such, that any community spaces and broader public realm, do not become a central point for Anti-Social Behaviour, thus having an adverse effect on those communities	LRCH and specialists are liaising with the Police and other emergency services organisations regarding these matters. The Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1) identifies various measures, along with the Security Planning Report (document reference 7.8).
KCC 1.1	Kent County Council	Land transport/ River transport	An updated masterplan illustrating the proposed resort and the access points for each mode of transport is needed as this information is relevant to assumptions around trip generation and mode share.	The access points are shown in detail within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.2	Kent County Council	Land transport	The County Council also needs to know if there is any update of the design of the proposed upgrade to the A2 Ebbsfleet Junction. Reference is made to discussions with Highways England regarding options covered by a technical note which has not been submitted to the County Council for review. This junction is the key location where resort traffic would meet traffic on the local highway network and has already been identified as a significant hotspot for congestion during PM peak periods.	Highways England have recently begun their improvement scheme for the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction. The improvement design for the London Resort will see upgrades to the HE proposal.
KCC 1.3	Kent County Council	Land transport	It is stated that a Construction Management Plan, Events Management Plan and Travel Plan are all being prepared. These will need to be submitted for review in due course prior to the submission of the DCO allowing the County Council and other partners sufficient time to provide constructive input. Travel Plans for both staff (covering both the construction and operational stages) and visitors are required. There will need to be close working with Highways England, who are in the process of improving the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junctions, to avoid abortive work and reduce delays on the highway network.	The development of these plans are subject to the relevant traffic modelling. The final reports are provided within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) that has been submitted as part of the DCO. It should be noted that there is now no Travel Plan, instead incorporated within the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC).
KCC 1.4	Kent County Council	Land transport	It is noted that the development now proposes a 2,500 space car park (approximately a quarter of the total visitor parking provision) at the Port of Tilbury but further details of its location and how this would operate in conjunction with ferry services across the Thames would help to understand its contribution. This proposal is supported in principal since it has the potential to reduce the distance travelled on the highway network for journeys originating north of the Thames. The County Council is mindful of the potential impact this could have on the highway network leading to the Port of Tilbury and local parking provision.	The provision of 25% visitor car parking at Tilbury seeks to reduce impacts to Dartford Crossing by reducing the need to travel across it, with car parks provided on both sides of the river. The highway impact assessment that has been undertaken includes the road network around Tilbury. This is available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic. The Transport Assessment, alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel. This strategy was explained during the transport workshops held during 2020.
KCC 1.5	Kent County Council	Land transport	There would appear to be no indication that London Resort is proposing any parking for staff at the Port of Tilbury. Further explanation of this decision would be welcomed.	Correct - staff will be expected to utilise public transport
KCC 1.6	Kent County Council	Land transport	The development contains separate elements that are likely to have different trip patterns and further information and discussion is required to fully understand these. A key aspect will be the development that is within the “pay-line” and that which is outside and likely to attract trips independently of the theme parks. The conference/convention centre and the eSports venue could have very different trip profiles and limited linked trips. There are concerns regarding visitors to these attractions coinciding	The Transport Assessment covers a range of factors, including the attractions people are visiting – for example Gate 1, or the Water Park, or the entertainment facilities – and how this influences arrival and departure times, and the likely number staying in our hotels, and thus not impacting the transport network. The traffic flows associated with the London

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>with peak periods for the theme parks and further information is needed on how such an occurrence will be managed or avoided. There is also a significant “back of house” area supporting the resort (314,000m²) and further information is needed regarding the staff associated with what will be mainly B1 Office/B8 Storage & Distribution use as this has specific access arrangements.</p>	<p>Resort are generally outside of the conventional network peak hours, however there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) assumes full occupation of the car park provision, however this is not LRCH’s aim as we are seeking to promote public transport as the main travel option to The London Resort. A breakdown on the numbers of vehicles expected into the London Resort on the Kent side is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix). The forecasts include staff on site that would be working from the Back of House area and are assessed.</p>
KCC 1.7	Kent County Council	Land transport/ River transport	<p>Peak days have been identified as occurring in March, April, June, July, and August when the number of visits could increase up to 75,590. It is vital that demand management measures are in place to ensure that vehicles using the access road on these peak days does not impact on the flow of traffic on the A2 and the adjacent local highway network. Reference is made to cruise ships docking at the Port of Tilbury allowing cruise passengers to visit the resort. The County Council would welcome further information on how these visits have been taken into account.</p>	<p>A Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) has been produced and will be a live document.</p>
KCC 1.8	Kent County Council	Land transport	<p>It is noted that whilst visitor and staff numbers for the theme parks have been determined based on the experience of its consultants, benchmarked against similar resorts, the transport consultants have validated the “back of house”, RDE and hotel elements using trip rates from the TRICS database. This exercise was undertaken in 2017 and should be updated with the most recent version of TRICS. From the review of the transport technical notes</p>	<p>It is noted that an assessment was undertaken using TRICS, however this was to show that TRICS is not a suitable database to assess the impacts of the scheme. The staff numbers are based upon industry experts assessment of the needs for a Resort of this scale, and not based upon development quantum. This</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			there are a number of inconsistencies relating to the information provided on visitor numbers that need to be resolved.	information has been used to assess the impacts of the Resort.
KCC 1.9	Kent County Council	Land transport	It is understood the Highways England has agreed to share its transport modelling outputs from both the A2 Bean & Ebbsfleet traffic model and the Lower Thames Crossing Area Model. In the case of the latter of these, further information is required on how London Resort proposes to allow for development that has not been included, e.g. Medway, which could have significant implications for the A2. It is further understood that the outputs from these transport models will be used to create a spreadsheet traffic model that would provide the input for a micro-simulation model. This approach needs further explanation and detailed discussions of this methodology will be required to ensure the highway impacts are correctly assessed. The network will need to include those local junctions where there is a significant impact and the County Council recommends testing scenarios with and without the Lower Thames Crossing in the event that the resort reaches maturity in advance of the opening of the Lower Thames Crossing. It is worth noting that the County Council is developing a strategic countywide transport model for Kent and a public transport model. Elements of these may be useful for the ongoing validation of the London Resort transport modelling.	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and will include assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models. Traffic modelling has been undertaken in forecast scenarios with and without the LTC and LTC is included in the model coverage. LRCH have continued to engage to discuss these points with KCC, including a meeting held of the 07 October 2020.
KCC 1.10	Kent County Council	Land transport	Further clarification and justification are required regarding the hourly peak periods that are to be used for the transport assessment. It is also noted that no weekend assessment period is proposed which the County Council would have expected considering the nature of the proposed development and taking into consideration its proximity to Bluewater. The County Council needs assurance that the transport assessment provides a reasonable worst case of the impact on the local highway network for both weekdays and weekends.	During the initial modelling of the London Resort in 2015 it was noted with the stakeholders that the PM peak hour was considered to be the worst case on the highway network. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) includes the relevant AM and PM peak modelling for the 85%percentile periods. The Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) has been developed in order to manage those time periods where impacts could be seen, including when Bluewater operates.
KCC 1.11	Kent County Council	Land transport	The trip generation for the resort identifies the proportion of private vehicles and coaches but does not provide any information on service vehicles. There is also ambiguity over how service vehicles would access the resort with some being allowed access from London Road rather than the Resort Access Road. Further details of how service access would be managed and controlled to ensure that the number of additional HGV's allowed on the local road network is kept to a minimum.	The level of servicing for the London Resort is considered to be negligible given arrivals will be throughout the day and use of Tilbury. However, a full delivery and servicing plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-P) has been produced and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.12	Kent County Council	Land transport	Further clarification is required regarding the change in trip distribution over the assessment years to explain the increase in the proportion of international visitors, decrease in the proportion of domestic visitors and increase in the proportion of overnight stays at the resort. The methodology used for the distribution of employment across the local authorities is accepted in principle but where it has been recognised that journey times by car are generally quicker than public transport this should be borne in mind in assessing likely staff car trips and the provisions needed to minimise these.	This is set out in detail within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), notably Technical Notes 1 and 2 (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendices TA-M and TA-N)
KCC 1.13	Kent County Council	Land transport	It is acknowledged that for a development of this scale and nature there is uncertainty in accurately predicting the modal split for transport. The approach of comparing other significant trip generators in the UK and Europe along with consideration of local factors is broadly supported. However, the choice of using 2025 and 2029 as the primary assessment years for mitigation of the resorts transport impacts does not match the expected maturity date of 2038. Consideration should be given to 2038 as an assessment year for mitigation.	Modal Split is dealt with in detail Technical Note 3 and 4 (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendices TA-O and TA-P) Furthermore, 2038 has been assessed.
KCC 1.14	Kent County Council	Land transport	The transport assessment has considered two scenarios for determining how people may travel to the resort. The first of these assumes full occupation of both the visitor and staff car parks whilst the second is more public transport focused. The assumption that the lack of capacity at the resort car parks would deter visitors' risks undercounting those visitors that may choose to park elsewhere with impacts on local residential parking provision. The limited number of staff car parking spaces and ambitious staff car share mode will need to be supported by a range of sustainable travel incentives and car management measures that should be set out in a Staff Travel Plan. Further evidence is also needed to demonstrate that there will be sufficient capacity across the other modes of transport to accommodate all of the staff trips that cannot be made by private car, e.g. how will a 10% mode share by coach for staff trips be achieved.	An Off-Site Parking Management plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-Y) has been produced that KCC have commented upon. Coach provision will be based upon demand and will primarily be delivered by offsite operators. LRCH are currently liaising with National Express.
KCC 1.15	Kent County Council	Land transport	It is stated that up to a 5% mode share could be achieved for visitors accessing the resort by walking or cycling. These would be predominantly local visitors within a 5-10km distance, but it is not clear how this 5% has been derived and what infrastructure would need to be in place for it to be delivered.	Technical Note 4 (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-P) set out the likely mode share for walking and cycling. The proposed improvements looks at the ability for 5% to access the site, however the impact assessment assumes a lower figure.
KCC 1.16	Kent County Council	Land transport	Up to a 13% mode share for bus travel has been suggested based on a 60-minute travel journey catchment from Ebbsfleet International Station. A journey time by private car is likely to be faster decreasing the attractiveness of this as an option but the local area benefits from the Fastrack service and a dedicated route to the resort could prove attractive. Any proposal would need to be carefully designed to provide segregated access for Fastrack to	The Transport Assessment includes a Bus Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-V) which sets out how access by bus will be achieved.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			provide reliable journey times and adequate enforcement to ensure that visitors from further afield did not park at inappropriate locations to take advantage of the Fastrack service. Further comments on bus provision for the resort are given below.	
KCC 1.17	Kent County Council	River transport	Subject to an extension of the Thames Clipper services providing a direct river service between London and the resort it is estimated that up to 15% of visitors could use this mode of transport. This appears optimistic but is supported by a separate analysis carried out by Thames Clipper. The County Council would welcome further information including details of pick-up points, distances, journey times and the analysis carried out by Thames Clipper to understand the potential of this mode of transport.	The assessment assumed a lower mode share by river for robustness, however TC have confirmed that a 15% mode share should be a target and can be accommodated.
KCC 1.18	Kent County Council	Land transport	Whilst Greenhithe Station is promoted as the station of choice on the North Kent line, visitors and staff are likely to use Swanscombe Station as this is considerably closer to the resort and this station should be given further consideration.	Initially, visitors will be encouraged not to use Swanscombe, however LRCH are continuing engagement with Network Rail regarding potential improvements.
KCC 1.19	Kent County Council	Land transport	It is further stated that as rail has the largest catchment of non-car modes (and includes coverage of the active travel, bus, and ferry services areas) up to 64% of visitors could reasonably access the site by non-private vehicle. Firstly, this acknowledges that the upper range mode share for each non-car mode would not be achieved, since this would total 94%, and secondly, this analysis suggests that sufficient car parking/drop-off infrastructure should be provided to accommodate at least 36% of all visitors.	Noted
KCC 1.20	Kent County Council	Land transport/ River transport	Going forward, it would be helpful to tabulate the multi-modal trip attraction for visitors and staff during the agreed assessment hours and showing the total daily trips. Separately, tabulated data showing the number of vehicle trips by vehicle type (private car parking, drop-off/pick-up, coach, taxi, bike, HGV's, etc.) for the assessment hours should be provided.	Full details of the visitor and staff profiles are included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
KCC 1.21	Kent County Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	In considering employment opportunities, LRCH should have regard to the requirements of its supply chain and supporting infrastructure as well as the leisure and entertainment facilities it will provide itself. Training will need to be put in place at an early stage of the project to ensure that when the resort is operational there is a suitably skilled workforce available locally to take advantage of the opportunities. The County Council would advise that LRCH engages with schools and FE/HE colleges at the earliest opportunity so that the curriculum can be shaped to match the potential demand. The	These elements are considered in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7). This is an evolving document, aimed to be a starting point from which a detailed implementation plan can be developed, to ensure that the pledged benefits are achieved. It considers how the supply chain benefits would be maximised and outlines the engagement that has been undertaken, including with education

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			County Council also notes that LRCH is proposing to develop an Employment & Skills Strategy and to provide training facilities on site and requests further engagement on both matters over the period leading up to the submission of the DCO.	providers so that the curriculum can be shaped to match potential demand. Engagement has already been undertaken with schools, FE and HE colleges as well as KCC, and through the setting up the Employment and Skills taskforce, this will continue.
KCC 1.22	Kent County Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	In relation to the proposed level of employment that is likely to be generated by London Resort there are concerns regarding the level of off-site workers forecast during construction and the number of seasonal workers expected forecast in the operational stage. The County Council would welcome further discussions to understand the derivation of these figures and the implications this may have for local employment opportunities. In terms of the indirect and induced levels employment that the resort could generate the County Council is broadly in agreement with the methodology used but again would welcome further discussions on the implications this would have across Kent.	The Applicant is aiming to maximise the local job opportunities provided by the London Resort (as described in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) but acknowledges that due to the specialist nature of the construction, a significant proportion of the Resort will need to be constructed off-site or using modular construction, reducing the opportunities for local employment. The Applicant has engaged with KCC on these matters, and is committed to ongoing engagement through the Employment and Skills taskforce.
KCC 1.23	Kent County Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	It is noted that the proposals for London Resort include 500 dwellings that could potentially accommodate up to 2,000 employees. It is the County Councils opinion that these would essentially be homes of multiple occupation more suited to seasonal workers than permanent employees. The PEIR acknowledges that there is insufficient temporary accommodation to cater for the forecast on-site construction workers and visitors potentially staying overnight. There are concerns, particularly regarding the overnight visitors, that if demand is not met then this could have an adverse impact on visitors to other attractions within Kent. The County Council understands that LRCH is exploring options and would welcome further discussion on these matters.	Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) considers the impact of the London Resort on accommodation and the housing market, both during construction and operational. The operational impact on visitors to other attractions in the area is also considered. The Applicant has engaged with KCC on these matters.
KCC 1.24	Kent County Council	Land transport	It is proposed that a staff shuttle would be provided between the resort and Greenhithe station on the North Kent Line and suggested that this might be fulfilled by Fastrack. This would need further discussion to explore the options available. Depending on the number of resort staff likely to use Fastrack additional services may be required on peak days with use of the scheduled services on the quieter days.	A Bus Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-V) has been prepared that identifies the requirements to support use of the North Kent Line, however LRCH are continuing discussions with Fastrack.
KCC 1.25	Kent County Council	Land transport	High speed trains arrive at Ebbsfleet every 15 minutes from both London and the coast many operating with 12 carriages resulting in over 700 seats per journey. Whilst there will be other users of these services there remains the potential for large numbers arriving and departing during peak periods. The critical need to deal with this highly peaked demand works against any idea of through Fastrack services being used to form part or all of the core people mover function. It is more appropriate for the Fastrack services to	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			concentrate on moving visitors and staff from the wider local area. It would, however, be important for Fastrack services to use the public transport route between Ebbsfleet station and the resort to maximise through travel without the need to change buses.													
KCC 1.26	Kent County Council	Land transport	<p>Frequent core routes 480/490 and Fastrack B already serve London Road passing the site of the resort and can provide direct links with:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Temple Hill</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Dartford Town Centre</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fleet Estate</td> <td>Stone</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greenhithe</td> <td>Ingress Park</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Valley Drive</td> <td>Denton</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gravesend Town Centre</td> <td>Northfleet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bluewater</td> <td>Greenhithe Station</td> </tr> </table> <p>It may be possible that frequencies of these services could be further enhanced for peak arrival and departure times associated with the resort. A new Fastrack C service is planned operating between Dartford town centre and Ebbsfleet station via Princes Road, Bluewater, and Eastern Quarry. An extension of this service to the resort and proposed ferry terminal using the public transport route between Ebbsfleet station and the resort would be the most effective way of linking the new developments in Eastern Quarry and Ebbsfleet to the resort.</p>	Temple Hill	Dartford Town Centre	Fleet Estate	Stone	Greenhithe	Ingress Park	Valley Drive	Denton	Gravesend Town Centre	Northfleet	Bluewater	Greenhithe Station	The consideration of these routes is included within the Bus Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-V), which identifies where improvements are required.
Temple Hill	Dartford Town Centre															
Fleet Estate	Stone															
Greenhithe	Ingress Park															
Valley Drive	Denton															
Gravesend Town Centre	Northfleet															
Bluewater	Greenhithe Station															
KCC 1.27	Kent County Council	Land transport	The traffic flows and traffic management on Galley Hill and London Road will be important to ensure that bus services have reliable journey times. Opportunities should be explored, and where appropriate implemented, for bus priority measures and traffic management measures to both reduce the impact of the resort and improve public transport access to it.	The London Resort access strategy looks to limit Resort traffic flows along London Road which will be less than the traffic generated by the current use on the site.												
KCC 1.28	Kent County Council	Land transport	To encourage resort staff from the local area to use the enhanced bus services the County Council would expect an attractive staff travel discount scheme to be put in place.	The level of mitigation for staff is yet to be determined, however will form part of the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC).												
KCC 1.29	Kent County Council	Project description and alternatives	LRCH should also be aware of the English Coast Path that will pass through the boundary of the proposed development site. This new National trail was approved in 2020 and is currently being established on the ground. The alignment of the route is highlighted on the accompanying map and is expected to be open to the public in 2021. The PRoW network is a valuable resource that provides significant opportunities for outdoor recreation and active travel. Considering these paths are expected to see an increase in use as a result of the proposed development, it should be expected that the surface and environment of the PRoW passing through the application site will be enhanced by LRCH. These improvements would also help compensate for any PRoW network disruption caused by the development of the London	Further dialogue on the detailing of any works to the Coastal Path will be discussed with the relevant authorities. This is a matter being captured in current workshops.												

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			Resort site. The PRoW & Access Service would welcome further engagement to discuss these improvements and clarify the works in due course.	
KCC 1.30	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	Further clarification is required on the status of the PRoW routes across the site (as identified on PRoW Strategy Plan, Figure 11.8) and consideration should be given to providing new access rights for cyclists where possible. Walking and cycling provision will need to be carefully considered, to encourage sustainable travel patterns and increase the opportunities available for outdoor recreation. For example, the project provides an excellent opportunity to improve cycling access along the River Thames and support a 'City to Sea' cycle track.	Further clarification to be provided in terms of cycle routes. It is intended that the proposed PROW routes will all be cycle routes. Further information is available in the ES Appendix 11.9 Public Rights of Way Assessment and Strategy
KCC 1.31	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	The PRoW Strategy Plan highlights new Permissible Paths across the Peninsula. These paths would be a valuable addition to the network, providing new access for the public, but the status and ongoing maintenance of these new routes needs to be clarified. It will be expected that they will not become the responsibility of the County Council's PRoW & Access Service. It is requested that the status of each route is clarified, with consideration given to the creation of new cycling access rights. If the routes are to be permissive, it is advised that LRCH enters into a licensed permissive path agreement with the County Council where appropriate. This agreement would clarify the public access rights, confirm future maintenance responsibilities, and enable the paths to be shown on ordnance survey mapping.	The primary pathway in the Broadness Marsh area is routed from the Kent Pylon to Botany Marsh and also forms the proposed route of the National Coast Path. This will be a hard surfaced track with both pedestrian and cycle access. A further hard surfaced track links off this route to the Broadness Harbour area and provides for vehicular access for residents. The network of pathways within the northern area of Broadness Marsh are designed as nature trails, with a mown grass surface proposed. Due to the sensitivity of the existing and proposed habitats present in the Broadness area (predominantly open mosaic habitat and salt marsh around the rivers edge), a balance has been struck between the benefits of providing public access and protection of the ecology due to recreational impacts. Therefore the pathway network has been designed to be low-key in order to avoid bikes and other wheeled pushchairs etc from entering and maintaining a more secluded and tranquil character. The management and maintenance responsibility for the ecological/landscape areas will be taken by LRCH, as set out in the Ecology Mitigation and Maintenance Framework (EMMF). LRCH would be willing to enter into discussions in relation to licensing the permissible routes. Further information is available in the ES Appendix 11.9 Public Rights of Way Assessment and Strategy
KCC 1.32	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	It is recognised that temporary path closures may be required during the construction phase of the resort. Considering the popularity of the PRoW network and England Coast Path, temporary closures would be an	We will provide options for temporary diversions of public rights of way, based on the construction schedule, for discussion and agreement.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			inconvenience for path users and cause disruption. LRCH should, therefore, discuss temporary path closures in advance with KCC PRow officers to minimise their impact on path users.	
KCC 1.33	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	<p>To reduce the impact on the PRow network, a ‘hierarchy of intervention’ is requested, which seeks the minimum impact in the first instance during construction and comprises the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – signage regarding keeping routes open; – using local management to hold PRow users for a short period (e.g. to allow vehicles to pass); – temporary closures with very short diversions immediately around works where there is no other option. <p>With reference to the “last resort”, it is requested that any temporary path closures are kept to a minimum distance and duration, to minimise disruption for path users. Alternative access routes (temporary diversions) should also be provided, to avoid fragmentation of the PRow network. It is assumed that details of the PRow to be temporarily and permanently stopped-up will be provided as the plans for the resort are refined.</p>	We will provide these details as plans for the phasing and construction of the resort are refined. Options for route diversions will be made available for discussion and agreement.
KCC 1.34	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	The County Council will require the monitoring of path use before, during and after the construction phase of the project. People counters should be installed on PRow at key gateway locations. Data obtained from these counters can then be used to assess the impact of the proposed development. It is recommended that electronic people counter sensors are installed, instead of manual surveys, as these counters will be able to operate 24 hours a day and capture sporadic path users. Furthermore, the electronic counters can be left in-situ once the development is complete and monitor long term use of the paths.	Noted
KCC 1.35	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Records of brown hare, hedgehog, pygmy shrew, and weasel were identified during the data search, but it is stated that these will not be taken forward into the Environmental Statement as an Important Ecological Feature. However, no specific surveys have been carried out for these species and they may be present within the site and, therefore, impacted by the proposed development. It is the County Council’s view that they should be considered within the submission. In addition, the brown hare and hedgehog are priority species (under S41 NERC Act) and impacts to species of principal importance/BAP priority species are: “Capable of being a material consideration in the...making of planning decisions.” (paragraph 84, Government Circular (ODPM 06/2005)).	The potential presence of these species within the Project Site is considered within Appendix 12.1: Ecology Baseline Report (Document Reference 6.2.12.1). Their presence could not be ruled out but none were recorded during other survey work. None of these species was deemed to be an Important Ecological Feature for the purposes of identifying potentially significant effects, however the proposed mitigation and enhancement strategy (both on-site and off-site) would very likely benefit all of these mammal species.
KCC 1.36	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater	In relation to bat surveys, internal examination of buildings could not be carried out as a result of the current Covid-19 restrictions. However, due to the size and nature of the proposed development the County Council would	Upon completion of the external preliminary roost assessment, three buildings were considered to have high potential for roosting bats, ten to have moderate

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		ecology and biodiversity	have expected emergence surveys to have been scheduled to ensure it was understood if, and to what extent, bats were roosting within the buildings to ensure the impact on roosting bats was fully understood.	potential and ten to have low potential within the DCO order limits. An additional 26 buildings are 'requiring further assessment' as access limitations prevented a full visual inspection. Any buildings requiring demolition will be fully assessed for its potential to support roosting bats in advance of works commencing.
KCC 1.37	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>There are concerns with the conclusions of the PEIR regarding the classification of the importance of the species within the site and in the County Council's opinion that, for many of the species groups, the conclusions are underrated. The following examples demonstrate this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reptiles have been assessed as District Level importance even though the presence of three species of reptile make the site suitable to be considered as a Local Wildlife Site. Therefore, the County Council would have been expected for the reptile population to have been assessed as County importance. • Otters have been assessed as Local importance, but these are not common within Kent and, therefore, the presence is of note and the County Council would have expect them to have been assessed as at least of County importance. <p>As all the surveys have not been completed the importance classification cannot be fully considered and it is advised that those conclusions must only be made once the surveys have been completed.</p>	The valuation of the species populations has been undertaken using professional judgement, taking into account a variety of factors including local conservation status, abundance and distribution and usage of the habitats within the Project Site. A lower valuation does not alter the requirement to avoid harm and mitigate impacts on these species nor does it affect the requirement to protect biodiversity as whole.
KCC 1.38	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Until all the ecological surveys have been completed and it is fully understood what is present on site it is impossible to fully understand what the impact will be, what mitigation is required and if such mitigation is achievable. It is advised that this is information is required prior to identifying what mechanisms could be used to implement any mitigation. Also, when the County Council refers to impacts it is referring to both direct and indirect impacts. This includes (but is not limited to) habitat loss, changes to habitat management, increase in noise, increase in lighting, and increase in disturbance.	A full assessment supported by the completed surveys and detailed mitigation strategies is now contained within the ES.
KCC 1.39	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The proposed development will result in the direct loss of habitat as a result of the implementation of the proposed development and the remaining areas will be required to be multi-functional, providing open space for recreation and SuDS, in addition to the ecological mitigation. Due to the loss of habitat, impacts from the proposed development (including noise and lighting) and the other requirements on the retained habitat (in particular recreation) there are concerns that, due to the ecological interest of the site, there will be a limit to the amount of ecological mitigation which can be implemented successfully on-site and there will be a significant loss of biodiversity. It is understood that, due to the limited amount of space within	The ES acknowledges that off-site land/biodiversity offsetting will be required to fully address all negative impacts on ecological features. Whilst the final details of the off-site mitigation land and associated biodiversity offsetting schemes are not yet available, a number of guiding principles regarding the nature, scale and location of such offsets have now been clearly set out within Appendix 12.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.2) and within Appendix 12.10: General Principles for Offsite Ecological

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			development sites, that open spaces must be multifunctional. However, in this situation it would be fully expected that information would be submitted clearly demonstrating what the constraints on site are and that those requirements would not negatively impact the ecological mitigation.	Mitigation (Document Reference 6.2.12.10). These provide a greater level of certainty that relevant effects on important ecological features can be avoided or mitigated, and that a net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.
KCC 1.40	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>The Swanscombe Peninsula currently has limited recreational access, so the site is largely undisturbed. The creation of walking trails within the site would encourage people to use the site and result in an increase in disturbance within site and as such may result in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in breeding bird species/numbers due to an increase in noise/light; • Reduction in bat species/numbers due to increase in light (lighting may be required within the opens space area due to health and safety); • Loss of habitat due to increase in trampling. <p>The County Council would expect any submitted information to fully assess the impact the proposal would have from an increase in recreational pressure.</p>	The ecological mitigation strategies detailed within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3) have been prepared in parallel with the Landscape Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.7) and take account of the multifunctionality of the open spaces.
KCC 1.41	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Surface Water Drainage features are required to prevent surface water flooding and any SuDS features will have to be managed in a way that means that they will remain operational. It is agreed that SuDS features can benefit biodiversity but there will be restrictions on the types of habitats that can establish within these areas and the management priority will be for surface water drainage not biodiversity. Therefore, there will be limits on the mitigation that can be incorporated into any SuDS scheme. Due to the proposed recreational usage of the site there may also be requirements to avoid deep water bodies for health and safety reasons and it may not be possible to retain existing habitat types or species present within the site.	The ecological and landscape strategies have been prepared in parallel with the surface water drainage strategy to ensure that the assumed biodiversity benefits of any SuDS are realistic and achievable.
KCC 1.42	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The PEIR has detailed that there will be a direct impact on Botany Marshes LWS designated sites due to alteration of the hydrological regime through destruction of adjoining wetland but advised that the proposed mitigation is certain subject to design and implementation of suitable drainage and hydrological strategy. The implementation of appropriate mitigation is not certain until it has been clearly demonstrated that an appropriate drainage and hydrological strategy can be implemented and until that point the proposed mitigation is, at best, uncertain.	The final assessment of impacts upon Botany Marshes LWS has been informed by the baseline information and proposed mitigation set out in within Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.43	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The submitted information highlights that, due to the use of the site by wintering birds, the proposed development will have a negative impact on the South Thames Estuary & Marshes SSSI, the Inner Thames Marshes SSSI, the Medway Estuary & Marshes SPA/Ramsar/SSSI and the Thames Estuary & Marshes SPA/Ramsar site and that mitigation is uncertain due to the requirement for off-site mitigation. To fully understand if the impact can be mitigated details of an off-site mitigation area must be provided and it must demonstrate that the mitigation is achievable and that it can provide suitable habitat in perpetuity. As the proposals will result in a likely significant effect on the designated sites further information will need to be submitted to enable the determining authority to undertake an Appropriate Assessment.	The need for a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) is acknowledged and information to assist the competent authority in making such an assessment is provided in Appendix 12.4: Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.4).
KCC 1.44	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The submitted information has highlighted that there will be a need for off-site species mitigation and the County Council would expect information to be submitted demonstrating that suitable mitigation areas can be created within Kent and ideally within the immediate surrounding area. Due to the size of any off-site mitigation areas and the habitat creation requirements, it may not be possible for the proposed designated sites and the species mitigation to be located within the same area. It must be clearly demonstrated that the mitigation can be implemented and retained in perpetuity.	General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation are provided within Appendix 12.10 (Document Reference 6.2.12.10), which include providing off-site land within the Greater Thames Nature Improvement Area.
KCC 1.45	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The County Council would expect ecological surveys to have been carried out on the proposed off-site mitigation areas. This will enable consideration of whether the proposed off-site mitigation is appropriate and any requirements for habitat creation would not negatively impact any species currently present within the site.	A number of land holdings are being considered for delivery of off-site mitigation. Potentially suitable land will be subject to an initial Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey followed by an assessment of the potential impacts of any proposals for habitat creation/ enhancement on the existing habitats and species of conservation value. The impact assessment, and design of ecological mitigation measures will be informed by detailed 'Phase 2' ecological surveys as considered necessary following completion of the initial Phase 1 survey. Further detail with regard to off-site mitigation is presented in General Principles for Off-site Mitigation (Document reference 6.2.12.10)
KCC 1.46	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	There is a need for any future submissions on ecology to clearly demonstrate that LRCH has worked collaboratively with other specialists to ensure it is fully understood what the direct and indirect impacts from the proposal are and if the mitigation proposed is achievable.	No response required.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.47	Kent County Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The submitted information has stated the proposed development is aiming to implement Net Gain but would result in the loss on-site of 355 units. However, the information provided on Net Gain is in a format (pdf document as opposed to excel) that makes it difficult to interrogate the data and reach a conclusion on the validity of this statement. To enable full consideration of this issue the County Council request information of the Net Gain metric in an accessible format along with corresponding maps showing the locations of the habitats detailed within the metric. The loss of habitat (in Net Gain terms) may be higher than 15% and in situations where Net Gain is proposed information needs to be submitted demonstrating that it can be implemented and retained in perpetuity.	This information is provided in Appendix 12.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.2).
KCC 1.48	Kent County Council	Water resources and flood risk	The PEIR assesses the impacts to the water environment and operation. Although it lists flood risk associated with basement excavations it does not consider flood risk associated with earth movement and ground works during construction. Though temporary, construction will be over a considerable length of time during which flood risk may have a significant impact. The Construction Environmental Management Plan must consider requirements for the notification of events and appropriate management in the likelihood of a large storm event as well as ongoing day-to-day operations for surface water drainage and water quality.	The wording has been updated in the Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resource and Flood Risk to reflect the impacts consider the various works.
KCC 1.49	Kent County Council	Water resources and flood risk	In relation to further assessment, a Flood Risk Assessment is proposed but this must contain, or have as an annexe, a detailed Surface Water Drainage Strategy. The County Council would expect this Strategy to be detailed with a full assessment of pre and post development; be clear about the level of service provided by the drainage system and comply with the Government and the County Council's requirements for sustainable drainage provision.	Information on the proposed surface water drainage strategy are included in the Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) Water Resource and Flood Risk and the Surface Water Drainage Strategy Appendix 17.2.
KCC 1.50	Kent County Council	Water resources and flood risk	It is suggested (paragraph 17.202 of the PEIR) that tide locked scenarios will consider the combined probability of storm events. The County Council also seeks confirmation of more usual daily operation such as 1-in-30 year rainfall event occurring with Mean High Water Spring tidal level to ensure that no flooding occurs within the site area from the designed drainage system for normal operation.	The 1 in 30 year rainfall event combined with the MHWS is also considered as part of the design. Information added in Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) Water Resource and Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Strategy Appendix 17.2.
KCC 1.51	Kent County Council	Water resources and flood risk	Sustainable drainage systems are to be incorporated into the design and it has been suggested within the consultation that these will be integrated into the marsh areas. Any future assessment must consider how these systems are designed to ensure no adverse impacts on the water movement within the marsh; similarly any constraints from the marshes, e.g. water levels, must be considered in the design of any adjacent drainage system. All	The water levels within the marshes will be managed to ensure no deterioration of habitat due to the proposals. Further information can be found in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy Appendix 17.2. An access road is proposed parallel to the swales. Further information

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			drainage measures must have adequate access arrangements for maintenance, particularly any swale provided adjacent to the marsh system.	can be found in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy Appendix 17.2.
KCC 1.52	Kent County Council	Water resources and flood risk	It is recognised in the PEIR that “The Swanscombe Peninsula supports extensive areas of marshland” though “these marshes are not subject to protective environmental designations.”. The PEIR states that “the drainage strategy will aim to ensure that the Botany Marsh East and Black Duck Marsh retain their existing hydrological flow regime and are not adversely affected.”. However, the development will result in a significant loss of marshland area and the County Council would recommend a more detailed assessment of marsh hydrology and secondary impacts on the supported ecology, particularly pertaining to cumulative loss of specific water environments.	This is covered in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12) Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity, and Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework.
KCC 1.53	Kent County Council	Water resources and flood risk	Though there are other strategic infrastructure plans shown for the development there does not appear to be a specific plan showing proposed strategic drainage provision. Very limited detail on drainage is shown within the Green Infrastructure Strategy (Figure 11.9) but this is not sufficient to provide any greater comment. The County Council would, therefore, expect a greater level of detail to be presented within an overall drainage strategy (to include the resort access road) to be presented during the next stages of the development of the proposals following this consultation and prior to the submission of the DCO.	Further detail and information on the drainage proposals (including the access road) is added to Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) Water Resource and Flood Risk, the Surface Water Drainage Strategy Appendix 17.2 and drawings LR-KP-BUR-DCP-2.17.0 – 2.17.9.
KCC 1.54	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Chapter 14 is supported by a draft Archaeological desk-based assessment 2015, a draft Archaeological deposit model and characterisation 2015, a Historic Landscape assessment 2015, a fluxgate gradiometer survey 2016, an Earth resistance and EI survey 2017 and a Palaeolithic desk-based assessment 2017. As stated in both of the 2015 reports these will need to be updated to take account of the later reports noted above and the updated Historic Environment Record search which was obtained in 2020. As up to date reports have not been shared as part of the statutory consultation, draft updated reports should be sent to statutory consultees and local authorities for comment prior to DCO submission.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
KCC 1.55	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The updated Archaeological desk-based assessment should include a detailed historic map regression (see KCC standard specification current version sent separately), a specialist assessment of industrial archaeology (including the cement industry, Bell Wharf and the super pylon), which seems to have been underestimated in the reports so far, and a detailed archaeological impact assessment, which should include temporary construction impacts and landscape and biodiversity mitigation alongside the development proposals.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14). Biodiversity mitigation is addressed in Appendix 12 - Ecological Management and Mitigation Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.56	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>In addition, archaeological field evaluation will be required in several areas of the site prior to submission of the DCO. In particular, the areas which require evaluation to be undertaken and reported on before submission of the DCO include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bakers Hole SSSI, Scheduled Monument and adjacent non-designated archaeological remains (for the access route, people mover and interchange area); • non-designated archaeological remains in the area of Springhead Roman town and religious focus; • designated and non-designated archaeological remains of earlier prehistoric date along the flood plain and adjacent areas of the river Ebbsfleet; and • borehole assessment of alluvial areas relating to the river Thames. <p>Natural England and Historic England are the main advisers in relation to the designated sites but important archaeological remains are known to be present outside the designated areas so KCC Heritage Conservation would need to agree the Written Schemes of Investigation for the evaluation work prior to it being undertaken and the draft reports prior to DCO submission.</p>	<p>This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)</p>
KCC 1.57	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>Information in the PEIR is unclear about the proposed location of the people mover. The Illustrative Masterplan seems to show Option 1 of the routes considered in the Palaeolithic DBA, whereas the Masterplan in Figure 4.2e (described in 4.27 as the current proposal) seems to show Option 3 of the routes assessed in the Palaeolithic DBA. Paragraph 4.45 states: 'The solution now proposed involves a people mover route comprising a lightweight road laid on the surface of Baker's Hole, with minimal ground penetration to avoid disturbance to the geological and Palaeolithic features that justify the protection of the site. From the proposed travel interchange the route would cross the designated area and then follow a course along the eastern edge of Baker's Hole. To facilitate its future removal or realignment, the people mover route would not be adopted as public highway.'</p> <p>Option 2 of the people mover routes causes least harm to cultural heritage (see Palaeolithic DBA) and this route should, therefore, be chosen or a full explanation provided within Chapter 4 of why it has not and clarity as to which of the other routes is proposed. As noted above archaeological field evaluation should be undertaken prior to submission of the DCO. In addition, all the proposed routes for the people mover, transit route and interchange will have an impact on non-designated archaeological remains of expected national importance. Field evaluation will be required prior to submission of the DCO, as noted above.</p>	<p>This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.58	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The production of a Historic Environment Framework and strategy for submission with the DCO, noted in Chapter 14, is welcomed. Draft documents should be sent to local authorities and statutory consultees for comment prior to submission of the DCO. The document should include agreements for management and enhancement of heritage assets within London Resort’s land ownership which should include Bakers Hole SSSI, SM and adjacent archaeological remains.	Noted
KCC 1.59	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The statement in paragraph 14.215 that ‘Opportunities will be sought to mitigate effects on the historic environment through improving public understanding and engagement with, and protection of, the historic environment. The nature of the use, display and interpretation of the archaeological and built heritage evidence is currently under discussion and will be more fully addressed in the ES and supporting appendices but options include: ...’is also welcomed. Again, draft proposals should be sent to local authorities and statutory consultees for comment prior to submission of the DCO. There are opportunities to improve the condition, management, display, and interpretation of the important archaeological remains within and adjacent to the site. This should be explained in detail in the DCO following further discussion with local authorities and statutory consultees, and developer contributions should be agreed to allow these ambitions to be achieved. Understanding of the historic environment of the area will help in understanding the context of the development and through careful design can help develop a sense of place and sense of identity of the development within the local area.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14)
KCC 1.60	Kent County Council	Waste and materials	Chapter 19 of the PEIR acknowledges that the London Resort proposals have the potential to generate a significant quantity of waste during its construction and operation which could place significant demands on the existing infrastructure. The PEIR also acknowledges that there is growing pressure to reduce material consumption and maximise opportunities to reuse and recycle waste. There has been initial engagement with the County Council on this matter and it is noted that for the construction period a Site Waste Management Plan is proposed that would include material management and waste segregation on site. Similarly, an Operational Waste Management Plan is proposed for when the resort is built. Both plans will need to set out an approach that is in accordance with the Kent Waste & Minerals Local Plan 2013-30 (as amended by the Early Plan Review 2020). Concerns have previously been raised regarding the disposal or treatment of deposits left from previous use of the peninsula by the cement industry and dredged materials from the river Thames. Further discussions would be welcome on these matters and engagement in relation to the proposed waste management plans.	Both the Outline Site Waste Management Plan and Outline Operational Waste Management Strategy (Appendix 19.1 and 19.2) have an approach in line with the Kent Waste and Minerals Local Plan. These strategies both promote waste minimisation, segregation for recycling, and diversion from landfill where possible.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.61	Kent County Council	Greenhouse gases and climate change	The County Council is very concerned that no commitments have been made at this stage to reduce construction stage and lifecycle embodied carbon, and agree that without such commitments, the greenhouse gas impact will be Major Adverse.	The ES includes mitigation measures for construction stage embodied carbon and lifecycle embodied carbon that reduce significance to Moderate Adverse.
KCC 1.62	Kent County Council	Greenhouse gases and climate change	The County Council supports the outline target for achieving net-zero carbon emissions from operational energy consumption but would also expect this to be expanded to include all on-site operational transport and water consumption once the necessary assessments have been undertaken. It is requested that emissions relating to operational waste and recycling are also assessed. There should also be full consideration of the carbon sequestration impact from land use change, in particularly the loss of marshland.	The net zero commitment relates to operational energy emissions, as per the UKGBC definition. The commitment does not cover electric vehicle charging and other commercial process loads, nor does cover operational water emissions. GHG emissions associated with operational waste have not been scoped into the assessment as these are likely to be slight in comparison to the overall lifecycle GHG emissions. GHG emissions associated with land use change have been considered within the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES. (document ref 6.1.20)
KCC 1.63	Kent County Council	Greenhouse gases and climate change	It is noted that an evaluation of climate change risks has yet to be finalised. The County Council suggests that the Climate Change Risk & Impact Assessment for Kent and Medway is fully utilised to support this work. The County Council would welcome an opportunity to discuss matters relating to greenhouse gas emissions, energy generation and climate change risk and resilience further, to ensure the proposed development supports the County Council's aims.	The assessment of the effects of climate change on the Proposed Development has now been completed and has been included in the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES. (document ref 6.1.20)
KCC 1.64	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	PRoW DS30 - There is some ambiguity regarding the intentions for this route. Table 7.27 of the PEIR describes a minor diversion of this right of way, but the PRoW Strategy Plan (Figure 11.8) shows this route being retained along its existing alignment. It is assumed that the public footpath would be diverted, as the plans show the existing alignment being obstructed by Gate 2 of the development and the back of house facilities. Further clarification on this matter is sought.	It is intended to retain DS30 within its current alignment as closely as possible, although it has been rerouted slightly to avoid the back-of-house area and instead join the Ingress Park Gateway node which forms a key gateway into the site. Due to the level dropping steeply to the edge of Black Duck marsh, the DS30 route has been designed as a secondary route to DS1, and it will have a mown grass trail surface treatment.
KCC 1.65	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	PRoW DS1 - The alignment of this footpath has been incorrectly drawn on both the PRoW Strategy Plan (Figure 11.8) and illustrative masterplan. The route shown on these plans does not reflect the Definitive Alignment of this right of way. For clarity, it is requested that a revised PRoW Strategy Plan showing the recorded alignment of this footpath is produced and other plans also reflect the correct alignment. Concerns are raised regarding the impact of the development on the western section of this footpath, where the route passes along Tiltman	The route of DS1 through Black Duck Marsh has been corrected on the plans as per the definitive map. See the Existing Public Rights of Way figures (document reference 6.3.11.16). The primary pathway (DS1) in the Broadness Marsh area is routed from the Kent Pylon to Botany Marsh and also forms the proposed route of the National Coast Path. This will be a hard surfaced track with both pedestrian and cycle access. The network of

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>Avenue. It is stated that this right of way would be retained, but the drawings show this footpath would be directly affected by the Gate 2 area. The applicant must clarify their intention by amending the site layout to accommodate the existing alignment of this footpath or providing details of a diversion for the route.</p> <p>The plans describe the northern section of this footpath being diverted along the top of a bund, overlooking the creation of a new saltmarsh and the River Thames (PEIR Chapter 7 - Table 7.2). This proposal would appear to enhance the character of the existing route and is welcomed.</p> <p>The plans show the remainder of this footpath, located between Bell Wharf and Manor Way, being diverted north to accommodate the development. While it is pleasing to see that consideration has been given to this footpath and a diversion proposed, it should be diverted further north along the edge of the peninsula.</p> <p>It is requested that the diversion route passes along the northern perimeter of the Broadness Salt Marsh, following the alignment of the Permissible Path that has been illustrated on the PRow Strategy Plan. This alignment would provide expansive views across the River Thames and a quieter atmosphere for path users. The proposed diversion route that has been indicated with a green line on the PRow Strategy Plan should be retained as a Permissible Path.</p>	<p>pathways within the northern area of Broadness Marsh are designed as nature trails, with a mown grass surface proposed. Due to the sensitivity of the existing and proposed habitats present in the Broadness area (predominantly open mosaic habitat and salt marsh around the rivers edge), a balance has been struck between the benefits of providing public access and protection of the ecology due to recreational impacts, and this is the reason why the main National Cost Path has not been diverted through this area. Therefore the pathway network has been designed to be low-key in order to avoid bikes and other wheeled pushchairs etc from entering and maintaining a more secluded and tranquil character.</p>
KCC 1.66	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	<p>PRow DS2 - Table 7.27 in the PEIR describes this right of way being 'diverted alongside the proposed resort access road', but the PRow Strategy Plan indicates that this route will be extinguished. Based on the illustrative masterplans, it is assumed that the footpath would be extinguished to enable the development to proceed. Further clarification on this matter is sought.</p> <p>The loss of this footpath would be disappointing. If the intention is to extinguish this footpath then compensation should be provided in the form of new or enhanced public access elsewhere across the site. A north-south access route for the public must be retained through the site to maintain connectivity between the River Thames and the residential communities located inland.</p>	<p>DS2 will be diverted to make way for the gate 1 area. The new route will link the northern end of Pilgrim's Way to the new ferry terminal. It will follow the resort road, and connect via the new boardwalk along the eastern edge of Black Duck Marsh to provide a high quality route. These can be seen in the Public Rights of Way and Public Access Strategy (document reference 6.3.11.18).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.67	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	<p>PRoW DS12 - There is some ambiguity surrounding the future of this route. Table 7.27 of the PEIR describes this right of way being 'diverted alongside the proposed resort access road', while the PRoW Strategy Plan indicates that this route will be extinguished. Based on the illustrative masterplans, it is assumed that the footpath would be diverted along the new resort access road, but clarification is required on this matter. Table 7.27 also describes the route being diverted alongside the proposed resort access road, with a shared cycleway/footpath of 2m minimum width being provided. The creation of new cycle access is welcomed, but a 2m path width for a new shared user path is unacceptable. The County Council would expect to see a minimum path width of 3m for this type of multi-user route. Consideration would also need to be given to the legal status of the route. For example, the footpath could be converted into a cycle track. The proposals describe the footpath being 'separated from the resort road by a landscaped verge, which will become the boardwalk going through Black Duck Marsh (this is aiming to reduce incursion into the marsh). Cyclists will use the resort road, which will be lightly trafficked.' The County Council would object to the prospect of the footpath being aligned along a boardwalk, due to the future maintenance implications. In accordance with good design principles, the cycle track should also be segregated from the resort access road, even if this is predicted to be lightly trafficked. To address these matters, it is requested that the intended status and design of this route are confirmed.</p>	<p>As per diversion proposed for DS2. The boardwalk will be of a robust design that will form 24hr usability. See Public Rights of Way Assessment and Strategy (document reference 6.2.11.9) for more details.</p>
KCC 1.68	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	<p>PRoW DS31 - The plans indicate this right of way would be retained along its existing alignment, with 'localised widening to create a hard-surfaced path of 3m width where possible'. The improvements to this footpath would be essential, as the right of way provides a direct connection to Swanscombe and the local train station. As a direct route for local employees this route must be promoted and created within an attractive, safe, and secure environment. Consideration should also be given to the conversion of this footpath into a cycle track, as this would increase opportunities for active travel and support the sustainable travel objectives of the London Resort.</p>	<p>Due to the steep gradient and existing vegetation along DS31 (Pilgrim's Way) it may not be possible to widen to 3m along the entire route without regrading and/or losing some of the existing trees. Further detailed work will be provided for this route to understand the levels and implications of creating a wider route. It is currently envisaged that Pilgrim's Way will be re-routed to connect with the upper level of The London Resort Plaza, whilst another route will be provided to connect to ground level and on towards the ferry terminal.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.69	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	PRoW NU1 - There is a discrepancy between the alignment of this footpath recorded on the Definitive Map and the route being walked on the ground. Given this right of way appears to be located within the boundary of the Development Consent Order, consideration should be given to addressing this long term alignment issue, by diverting the right of way onto the existing walked route that passes through the Botany Marshes Nature Reserve. Diverting Public Footpath NU1 along this walked path, away from Manor Road, would significantly improve the safety and character of this route, in addition to providing a public access legacy benefit for the London Resort.	Agree that a diversion to within Botany Marsh would be sensible for safety reasons and for improved quality of the route.
KCC 1.70	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	PRoW NDS17/ NU2 - This PRoW passes directly through the application boundary, providing a valuable east-west link between Swanscombe and Northfleet. Concerns are raised with the potential impacts of the new 'people mover route' and access road between the A2 Ebbsfleet junction and the London Resort, as these would dissect this PRoW. This is a vital walking and cycling connection to Ebbsfleet station, which must be retained. A newly provided accessible bridge must, therefore, be included to maintain connectivity.	An extension of the bridge over the HS1 rail line will accommodate the people mover route.
KCC 1.71	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	PRoW NU14, DS20, NU47, DR18, DR20, DR19 and Restricted Byway DR129 - These PRoW pass through the application site but do not appear to be directly affected by the development plans.	Correct
KCC 1.72	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	England Coast Path - The Botany Marshes to Dartford Marshes section of the England Coast Path was approved by the Secretary of State on the 23 April 2020. While LRCH has acknowledged the existence of this National Trail passing through the development site (PEIR Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.77), the plans do not clearly show how it will be incorporated within the site. For the avoidance of doubt, it is requested that the proposals clearly illustrate the intended alignment of the England Coast Path on a revised plan. It is further requested that this route is aligned as close as possible to the River Thames. Ideally, the Coast Path should be aligned along the preferred riverside diversion route of Public Footpath DS1 (described earlier in this response). Consolidating the two routes along the same alignment would help to manage public access across the peninsula and minimise future maintenance costs. If the alignment of this National Trail needs to be amended, then LRCH they will need to apply for a 'Variation Report' to divert the legal alignment of the England Coast Path. LRCH will need to engage with Natural England to complete this process. LRCH should also be aware that Natural England is intending to extend the existing Thames Path National Trail along the England Coast Path. This would fulfil a long-term aspiration to establish a source to sea walking route along the Thames Path. It is expected that this	The national coast path current alignment and proposed alignment are shown on the updated drawings. Due to the sensitivity of the existing and proposed habitats present in the Broadness area (predominantly open mosaic habitat and salt marsh around the rivers edge), a balance has been struck between the benefits of providing public access and protection of the ecology due to recreational impacts, and this is the reason why the main National Cost Path has not been diverted through this area. Therefore the pathway network has been designed to be low-key in order to avoid bikes and other wheeled pushchairs etc from entering and maintaining a more secluded and tranquil character. The proposed route of the NCP will be of a very high quality, adjacent to the constructed reedbeds and linking to the Kent Pylon where panoramic views across the Thames are available.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			Thames Path extension will be formally confirmed once the England Coast Path has been opened to the public.	
KCC 1.73	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	PEIR 4.46 - The Bakers Hole SSSI should be considered in the Cultural Heritage section in terms of its Palaeolithic archaeology and the need to consider geological evidence to understand Palaeolithic archaeology.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)
KCC 1.74	Kent County Council	Project description and alternatives	Kent Project Site - From 5.23 onwards should include description of cultural heritage.	Noted. The ES Chapter 14 (document ref 6.1.14) on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology addresses this point.
KCC 1.75	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	PEIR 5.32 - Recognition of 1965 'super pylon' as a local landmark is welcomed but it also needs to be considered as an industrial heritage asset, in terms of views and setting etc.	Noted
KCC 1.76	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	PEIR 5.45 and 5.57 - Land remediation proposals and landscaping should be assessed for their archaeological impacts.	Noted
KCC 1.77	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	PEIR 5.63 and 5.68 - The impact of the people mover and transit interchange and resort access route on archaeological remains should be noted.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)
KCC 1.78	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	PEIR 5.66 - The need for archaeological investigations during construction activities has been noted but there is also a need for archaeological evaluation, impact assessment and mitigation through design first. Written schemes of investigation and Construction Practice Codes should also be agreed before consent is granted. The Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Transport Management Plan also need to take full account of archaeological impact assessment and mitigation requirements.	Noted. This is addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 3.2 Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Document Reference 6.2.3.2)
KCC 1.79	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	PEIR 5.75 - A heritage assessment of the proposals at Bell Wharf is needed and appropriate mitigation identified.	Noted. The ES Chapter 14 (document ref 6.1.14) on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology addresses this point.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.80	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	PEIR 5.76 and 5.77 - Flood defence and habitat improvement should have an archaeological impact assessment and appropriate mitigation is needed.	This is noted
KCC 1.81	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Table 6.1 - Should be amended to include non-World Heritage Site internationally important heritage assets – the latter is based on political decisions not significance thresholds. Expert professional judgement should be used. It should also be amended for all levels of sensitivity to include non-designated heritage assets as possible sensitive sites, see NPPF para 194 footnote 63. Again, professional judgement should be used.	This is noted
KCC 1.82	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	PEIR 9.390 - Mitigation measures should be agreed with the Local Planning Authorities and statutory consultees before submission of the DCO.	This is noted
KCC 1.83	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	Chapter 11 - The Landscape Strategy, including planting proposals, should take account of heritage assets. The landscape character assessment should take account of historic landscape character which does not seem to be included at the moment. The site is referred to as brownfield or having previous industrial use, but the industrial heritage character needs to be assessed further.	The historic landscape dimension is included in the assessment. Chapter 14 (document reference 6.1.14) provides a more comprehensive assessment of heritage features and assets.
KCC 1.84	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	Table 11.4 - This should include Springhead Roman Town, St Botolph's Church, All Saints Church, Northfleet Historic Town, and Swanscombe Peninsula Super Pylon.	The historic landscape dimension is included in the assessment. Chapter 14 (document reference 6.1.14) provides a more comprehensive assessment of heritage features and assets.
KCC 1.85	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Chapter 14 - It is not possible to comment on most of Chapter 14 until the baseline assessment has been updated and the field evaluations carried out. In the absence of up to date information in the statutory consultation, a draft of Chapter 14 should be provided to the local authorities and statutory consultees for comment before it is finalised. The draft archaeological desk-based assessment and the draft deposit model will need to be updated as noted above and stated in 14.3. The potential for survival of important industrial heritage remains should be considered in more detail rather than just assuming that recent industrial use will mean their wholesale removal. Further assessment by an appropriately qualified specialist will be required. Draft reports should be provided prior to submission of the DCO. It is disappointing that archaeological field evaluation has not yet been completed and reported on. Draft reports should be provided prior to submission of the DCO. Palaeolithic desk-based assessment requires a more detailed assessment of impacts including sections, at the southern end of the people mover, transport access and transit interchange is required.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)
KCC 1.86	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	14.57 - KCC standard specifications for archaeological work should be added to the relevant guidance section. Copies of these are to be sent separately to this letter.	This is noted and welcomed and LRCH looks forward to working with KCC as the application progresses

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KCC 1.87	Kent County Council	Soils, hydrology and ground conditions	Chapter 18 - The impact of the proposals on the geological significance of Bakers Hole SSSI does not seem to have been assessed in this chapter or elsewhere in the PEIR. When it is assessed LRCH should be aware that geological character and value contributes to Palaeolithic significance also.	Noted and assessed within Chapter 14 of the ES, Cultural heritage and archaeology (document reference 6.1.14).
KCC 1.88	Kent County Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	Figure 5.4 - On the Land Use Plan the whole of Bakers Hole SSSI/SM and adjacent nationally important non-designated Palaeolithic archaeology is shown as resort access. This introduces too much flexibility and uncertainty into the proposals and should be amended to show the agreed route.	The People Mover route is described in the ES (document ref 6.1.3) and the effects on parts of Baker's Hole are captured in the Chapter 14 of the ES (document ref 6.1.14) and Chapter 12 (document ref 6.1.12).
KCC 1.89	Kent County Council	Land transport	Figure 9.5 - Should include other important heritage assets	Noted
KCC 1.90	Kent County Council	Landscape and visual	Figure 11.2 - Should include nationally important, non-designated archaeological assets.	This is covered in Chapter 14 of the ES, Cultural heritage and archaeology (document reference 6.1.14).
KCC 1.91	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Figures 14.1 and 14.3 - Swanscombe Skull SSSI and NNR should be included on the plan of Kent heritage assets.	Noted
KCC 1.92	Kent County Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Figures 14.3 and 14.7 - All need to be updated	Noted
KCC 1.93	Kent County Council	River transport	<i>Feedback provided separate to main response:</i> The Council is keen to ensure that any extra water based transport provision for the resort, such as the proposed Park and Glide service, compliments and does not complete with The Gravesend to Tilbury Ferry service, operated by Jestream Tours. Specifically, the Council notes the intention to develop the current facility at the Port of Tilbury Landing stage. The landing stage is used by JetStream who make use of a V Birth on the inside edge of landing stage. In summary, KCC welcome the invitation extended by LRCH to ensure greater and ongoing dialogue involving the Councils and Jet Stream to ensure that the ferry is a central consideration to the development.	Consultation has been undertaken with the Gravesend to Tilbury ferry operator (currently Jetstream), the Port of Tilbury and Kent County Council to ensure that the proposals for Tilbury to resort ferry do not compromise the continued operation of the Gravesend to Tilbury ferry.
KAONB.1.1	Kent Downs AONB	Landscape and Visual	The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 also sets out a requirement for a Management Plan to be prepared and published for AONBs. The Kent Downs AONB Management Plan 2014 -2019 sets out the aims, policies and actions for the conservation, enhancement and management of the AONB. The following policies of the Management Plan are considered particularly relevant to the London Resort proposals: SD1, SD3, SD7, SD8, SD10, SD11. The Kent Downs AONB Management Plan can be downloaded following the link below: http://www.kentdowns.org.uk/guidance-management-and-advice/management-plan	The ES Chapter 11 on Landscape and Visual Effects (document reference 6.1.11) deals with the longer distance views.
KAONB.1.2	Kent Downs AONB	Landscape and Visual	Potential Impacts on the Kent Downs AONB	n/a

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

KAONB.1.3	Kent Downs AONB	Landscape and Visual	While lying some 5.1km from the boundary of the Kent Downs AONB, the scale of the proposal is such that there is potential for the development to impact on the Kent Downs AONB. These impacts could be as a result of inter-visibility, light pollution and increased use of the highways network in the AONB.	An 8km study area was agreed as sufficient to understand potential views from the AONB. (Meeting held on 22/09/2020 with Sean Hanna, Natural England and Katie Miller, Kent Downs AONB Unit.
KAONB.1.4	Kent Downs AONB	Landscape and visual effects	We welcome the inclusion of an LVIA within the Environment Statement and we are generally in agreement with the proposed methodology set out within this. We are concerned that only one viewpoint is proposed from within the Kent Downs AONB however, given that the Zone of Theoretical Visibility indicates a relatively wide area within the AONB from where the proposals could potentially be visible. We would have liked to have seen, as a minimum, addition viewpoints included from Pedham Place Golf Centre and Camer Country Park vicinities.	Photo viewpoints from the suggested locations have been added as Photo viewpoint 73 and 74 in Figure 11.12 (Document Reference 6.3.11.12) and photomontages produced in Figure 11.14 (Document Reference 6.3.11.14)
KAONB.1.5	Kent Downs AONB	Landscape and visual effects	We would also raise concerns that the photo viewpoint 41 from Footpath NS177 is taken on a day of poor visibility. Further concerns are raised regarding the fact that the parameters used for the ZTV do not appear to tie in with those specified on the Parameter Plans (for example the car parks are specified at 34 -38 m on the ZTV, but are up to 48m on the Parameter Plans and the Plaza is 19m on the ZTV but 26m on the Parameter Plans, etc.)	Photo viewpoint 41 was retaken in good visibility. The ZTV illustrated in Figure 11.9 (Document Reference 6.3.11.9) has been subsequently updated in accordance with the Proposed Parameter Plan (Document Reference 2.19)
KAONB.1.6	Kent Downs AONB	Landscape and visual effects	To enable the visual impacts of the scheme to be properly understood, the AONB Unit considers the inclusion of photomontages in the LVIA to be essential.	All three photo viewpoints taken within the Kent Downs AONB (Photo viewpoint 41, 73 and 74) have had photomontages produced based on the Proposed Parameter Plan (Document Reference 2.19), which are contained in Figure 11.14 (Document Reference 6.3.11.14) and are coloured in line with the coloured parameters in Section 4.1 of the Design and Access Statement (Document Reference 7.9)
KAONB.1.7	Kent Downs AONB	Light pollution	With regards to light pollution, we would welcome consideration of any night time effects on the Kent Downs within the ES.	A Lighting Strategy (Document Reference 7.9) with assessment contained in Appendix 11.2, (Document Reference 6.2.11.2) and Appendix 11.3, (Document Reference 6.2.11.3), summarised in Chapter 11 (Document Reference 6.1.11)
KAONB.1.8	Kent Downs AONB		The proposal has the potential to increase use of vehicular traffic using the highway network in the AONB, as a result of visitors accessing the site from the south, such as the A20 Shoreham Road. A significant increase in traffic would impact on tranquillity, which is one of the identified special characteristics of the Kent Downs. Increased use of lower grade roads could also impact on their character, for example as a result of degradation of sunken lanes. We would therefore like to see potential impacts on the highways network within the AONB assessed within the ES.	Impacts on the wider road network are assessed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

L&SE 1.1	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		<p>Support for sustainable transport proposals. A major attraction such as The London Resort (LRCH) will create a significant demand source, much of which will be travelling at different times and in different directions to traditional patterns which is clearly a positive and welcomed by Southeastern.</p> <p>However, there are some specific concerns detailed below which we would like to explore and consult on further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * It is well documented that the HS1 service has been a success in terms of opening up the route to and from London to East Kent, Medway towns and the coast, as a result of its own success has high passenger demand for services. Pre COVID 19 the service often operates to capacity at peak hours and during summer weekends. The % given by LRCH as those travelling by rail seems low, given how convenient and easy it will be. We notice that in Chapter 9 - Transport and Accessibility the data appears to be on High Speed use from 2011, which shows capacity half utilised and is no longer the case. * We are also aware that Ebbsfleet Garden City will add a significant number of new passengers to an already busy route. Therefore, we would want to work closely with LRCH to understand their thinking on the split of those travelling to the site by rail from the relevant directions (from London/from Kent) to be able to assure capacity provision on weekdays and weekends. * Additionally, the relatively late departures for large volumes of people will need to be reflected in planning future capacity provision. Southeastern would need to ensure ongoing consultation and discussion with LRCH, working to undertake sensitivity analyses to assess alterations against lower and higher demand scenarios. * Southeastern would also wish to maximise the experience of visiting London Resort by making the journey by rail as safe and secure by ensuring close collaboration with industry and statutory partners, the voluntary sector and the public. 	LRCH are currently working closely with Southeastern regarding rail access to the Resort. Some of the comments raised are noted and the strategies therefore where possible have taken them into account, including the developments yet to occur at the Garden City (of which were approved over 10 years ago). Southeastern have been provided with the predicted volumes of passengers for some time and these discussions will continue.
L&SE 1.2	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		<p>Other points for consideration;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * If a shuttle bus is required at Ebbsfleet International, it will require its own designated picking up/dropping off point. * There is a single lift at St Pancras International which is already at capacity if LRCH brings in more families, (children and buggies) via the station this would require discussion. 	This is noted, APT have designed a suitable pick up drop off area at Ebbsfleet International Station.
L&SE 1.2	London & South Eastern Railway Limited,		Neutral regarding road access proposal	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

	trading as Southeastern.			
L&SE 1.3	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		Strongly support environment, biodiversity and sustainability proposals.	LRCH notes this response
L&SE 1.4	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		<p>Southeastern greatly endorse the vision to make The London Resort a sustainable theme park and its ambitions to have a net zero operational carbon target. We believe public transport, and particularly rail, has a vital role to play in creating a more sustainable society.</p> <p>Operating in a socially and environmentally responsible way is important to us. Where possible Southeastern works together with partners, industry contractors and suppliers to find ways to reduce environmental impact. We are always looking for ways to improve how we work and go beyond simple compliance with regulation and would welcome discussion on ways that we could work together.</p>	LRCH is currently working closely with Southeastern regarding rail access to the Resort
L&SE 1.4	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		<p>Support pedestrian and cycle proposals. The opportunity to use a sustainable transport mode to get to and from stations is very important to Southeastern and our passengers. They not only want to be reassured that their bike has a space available, but that it will be safe and secure while they undertake their journeys.</p> <p>We have made significant investment to improve cycle facilities at a number of our stations. We would value the opportunity to work with LRCH to better understand visitor and residents needs and requirements.</p>	As above
L&SE 1.5	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		Support cultural heritage proposals.	LRCH notes this response.
L&SE 1.6	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		<p>Believe that benefits will outweigh problems. The development is an real opportunity to develop the Swanscombe Peninsula region, we appreciate that it will be a significant driver for employment, business growth, regeneration and tourism in Kent.</p> <p>On reading the consultation we have identified a number of opportunities</p>	LRCH welcomes this response. LRCH is working closely with Southeastern.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			where we can work together to the benefit of the local area and region. We believe that developing a strong partnership with LRCH will further identify additional opportunities as the project progresses.	
L&SE 1.7	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		Strongly support and welcome the fact that LRCH will be a development that is accessible and inclusive.	LRCH notes this response
L&SE 1.8	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		<p>There is no doubt that the proposed development of the Swanscombe Peninsula and the creation of the London Resort will greatly enhance the economy of the surrounding area and of Kent.</p> <p>The mix of paid entry via the theme parks and inclusion of other facilities means that it has wide appeal to a wide demographic beyond that of the park attractions. This will ensure footfall at all times of the day and night, working to create a vibrant day and night-time economy which can only be to the benefit of local people and businesses.</p> <p>As a railway that has helped to open up large parts of East Kent with our HS1 service, we understand the value of sensitive regeneration and support the creation and development of new opportunities that benefit the region in which we operate.</p>	LRCH notes and welcomes this response
L&SE 1.9	London & South Eastern Railway Limited, trading as Southeastern.		As stated, we would like to begin conversations with LRCH at the earliest opportunity in order to work together to develop a robust strategy that will benefit passengers and visitors to the area.	As above
LBB 1.1	London Borough of Bromley	Land transport/ Air quality	At this stage the primary concerns for the London Borough of Bromley are expected to be the potential for increased traffic in the Borough, resulting in congestion and a consequential impact on air quality. We would request that these matters are considered and addressed in the formal DCO application and reserve the right to comment further at that stage.	The assessment of air quality effects of the scheme are assessed within Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).
LPC 1.2	Luddesdown Parish Council		<p>We strongly oppose the road access proposal . LRCH has provided no published plan to achieve this.</p> <p>The provision of 10,500 parking spaces for 53,000 visitors + service vehicles, 6000 full, 7,100 part time workers per day would lead to gridlock on local approach roads.</p>	Full details are included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The includes a Travel Demand Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) which looks at addressing a number of the

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

		<p>The statements regarding planning and modelling are not supported by Highways England (who have stated elsewhere that the traffic flows for this project have not been modelled) and the technical notes (TN1-TN4) referred to in your PEIR that detail your plans in this regard have not been issued.</p> <p>The use of busses is a sensible step, but where do the busses come from? How would people be routed onto them, and how would people travel to the bus departure point? In any event, 250 coaches will only deliver 14,000 people (unless you use very big busses!).</p> <p>Your suggestion of using Fastrack and local bus services as a feeder system is sensible, but what about the parking impact at the pickup points? If you run a free feeder bus from BlueWater – it will just ensure all the parking at Bluewater is over subscribed. The same is true of any local pickups; you create the danger of fly parking in residential areas. Where is your strategy to manage this, as there is no information in your PEIR?</p> <p>Your guide and PEIR do not make clear your arrangements for the ‘ticketing strategy’ which is key to control this issue and which has not been published. How will you ensure people don’t just turn up (queue on the A2 for a parking space)?</p> <p>We strongly oppose this on the basis that the strategy as published does not meet the requirements and the effects of it are likely to blight all residents in the area.</p>	<p>concerns raised including managing traffic and use of public transport in order to access the Resort.</p>
--	--	--	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

LPC 1.3	Luddesdown Parish Council		<p>Strongly oppose environment and biodiversity proposal. None of the key information (actual impact assessments on wildlife) have been published. The statements you have made on construction phase GHG emissions amount to doing nothing or TBC. On this basis there is insufficient information to support your approach at this time.. We are therefore opposed to your seeking DCO in that you have no clear plans to protect the environment.</p>	<p>The habitats present on the Project Site have been identified, mapped and described within Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12) through a combination of industry-standard Phase 1 Habitat Survey, and detailed botanical survey where areas of higher botanical value are present. A detailed description of the habitats present is provided within the Ecology Baseline Report (Document Reference 6.2.12.1). We have assessed who life carbon (including construction stage embodied carbon) within the ES Chapter 20, Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document reference 6.1.20).</p>
---------	---------------------------	--	--	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

LPC 1.3	Luddesdown Parish Council		<p>The guide to consultation makes some bold claims regarding sustainability and low carbon principles, but the PEIR does not support the guide fully on some very important points:-</p> <p>Since you have stated in your PEIR submission on GHGs that you intend to do nothing about ‘embodied carbon’ due to the construction phases (paras 20.39+20.40) and on 124,600 tonnes of construction waste you simply state your primary contractor will be responsible (19.106). We are left wondering what your guide means by “Sustainable and low-carbon principles are integrated across the emerging Masterplan, in terms of design, construction and operation.”</p> <p>However there is some consideration for separating operational waste given in the PEIR, and there appears to be a commitment to low carbon energy supply, although this does not go as far as stating you will provide charging points for electric vehicles or mandate EVs for delivery vehicles. Given the weakness of your PEIR policies on transportation, this leads us to have concerns about a high level of vehicular pollution from your site.</p> <p>Strongly oppose sustainability proposals. As your sustainability policy is at a very early stage of development and has no commitment to reducing environmental impact from construction we cannot support your approach.</p>	<p>We have assessed who life carbon (including construction stage embodied carbon) within ES Chapter 20, Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document reference 6.1.20). Once at the detailed design stage, a whole life carbon assessment will be undertaken for each building to identify opportunities to reduce embodied carbon through design, material specification and construction processes.</p> <p>Electric vehicle charging infrastructure shall be installed within the car parks. The impact on air quality of additional road traffic generated by the proposed development has been considered in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).</p>
LPC 1.4	Luddesdown Parish Council		<p>Strongly oppose pedestrian and cycle path proposals. Apart from the very general statements in the guide, we have found no evidence of what your approach is.</p> <p>There are 13 paths on the peninsula; what is your plan with regard to each of them?</p> <p>You make statements regarding increasing access and providing cycle routes: are these re-purposing existing rights of way or are you proposing to create new ones?</p> <p>On the basis that there is no information regarding your plans; we strongly oppose your submission.</p>	<p>Full details are included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Transport Assessment and DCO plans set out the PROWs that will be retained or upgraded, furthermore, the TA sets out the proposed routes for accessing the London Resort, including the new wake / cycle provision between Ebbsfleet Station and the Resort.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

LPC 1.5	Luddesdown Parish Council	Cultural heritage	Neutral on cultural heritage. Your approach to the cultural heritage seems reasonable. However we are not expert on the area and will leave comment on this aspect of your plans to others.	LRCH notes this response
LPC 1.6	Luddesdown Parish Council		<p>Problems outweigh benefits. While we are very keen to see regeneration and job creation in the area, our overriding concerns at the lack of detail presented and lack of accountability to these statements following the grant of DCO.</p> <p>The lack of breakdown of the types of jobs to be created in terms of zero hours contracts or temporary work verses long term stable employment (with a permanent job contract) mean we cannot assess the benefits that may accrue locally. We are also concerned at the high proportion of roles described as ‘seasonal workers’ who would necessarily have to come from abroad, given the UK job market’s (DHSS rules) current bias against that class of worker.</p> <p>We also note that LRCH has been unapproachable by the workers and employers currently on the peninsula, failing to agree adequate settlements with them and extending the blight on their places of work and future employment – something your guide and PEIR does not mention, failing either to enumerate the existing employers affected or the number of jobs which will either be lost or those which can be re-located. Given LRCH’S stone walling of the local business community to date; we find the suggestion that you will in future operate to the benefit the local community to be out of character.</p> <p>We believe the project will therefore create problems for the local communities.</p>	<p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) provides a detailed breakdown of jobs by type, role, occupation, skill level and more. The strategy also pledges that we will align with best practice on zero-hour contracts using guidance from the CIPD (CIPD, Zero-hours contracts, April 2020) and engage with the Work Foundation on this issue.</p> <p>LRCH is confident that it has taken sufficient steps in order to consult with PILs affected by the proposed development and has served notice on each one in accordance with requirements of the Planning Act 2008. Additionally specific consultation events were aimed at PILs with five webinars being held between July and September 2020.</p>
LPC 1.7	Luddesdown Parish Council		Neutral on accessibility and inclusivity proposals. We are not expert on these matters.	LRCH notes this response
LPC 1.8	Luddesdown Parish Council	Project description	The masterplan provides an overview of the absolute maximum heights of the built environment. It does very little else and provides no overview of what the development will look like. It is therefore impossible for us to comment or support it.	The leisure core is a series of parameters to provide a development envelope, and sufficient for worst-case assessments. The design of the main leisure facilities will be the subject of requirements
LPC 1.9	Luddesdown Parish Council	Project description	<p>In reviewing your presentation, we have become increasingly concerned at the lack of detail and evidence of LRCH’s capability to deliver this project. Aside from the ‘explanatory memorandum’ which has clearly been drafted in detail by a properly qualified legal team to maximise your legal benefit from the grant of a DCO; there is little substantial or final information presented at statutory consultation.</p> <p>From our perspective, the failure of this project, or wilful mis-appropriation of the NSIP processes would be the worst case.</p>	The 2020 PEIR reflected the information that was available at the time of consultation and was an accurate representation of information available at that time. LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail. The adoption of a parameters approach remains sensible. It is allowing the detailed design work for the leisure core to follow, which is important as these elements cannot be planned too far ahead as

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>We are deeply concerned that such a large and unique project is seeking to utilise the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach to DCO, 8 years after its inception, when that should have allowed ample time for completion of a fully detailed design to be presented.</p> <p>Allied to this is the concern that the property may be sold or passed to a third party post DCO, leading to a long term battle to overturn consent for mixed development on sections of the development land in this project which then may be broken up and sold on.</p> <p>It is also our concern that LRCH has been un-approachable by members of the Peninsula Management Group, whose livelihoods have been blighted by this project and who potentially face CPO or eviction as a result of successful DCO application.</p> <p>Since there is no recourse to hold LRCH or its directors accountable to aspirations expressed in the PEIR once DCO has been issued and the company has divested itself of the land; we will not support this application.</p>	<p>they will be subject to change, plus they are not integral to the decision making process. LRCH and its team has engaged with local landowners, business occupiers and their advisers.</p>
LPC 1.1	Luddestown Parish Council		<p>Strongly oppose transport proposals. It is very difficult from the PEIR to work out what your strategy is. In para 9.12 you set out the worst case scenario as 53,000 persons a day, but the supporting paragraphs do not detail how that number of people could possibly be transported.</p> <p>The section on public transport (of which you make a great deal) does not appear to provide transportation for more than 2,000 visitors/day far less than the 12,000 people per day (24%) your guide suggests need to arrive by public transport. In PEIR Ch 9.243 you appear to indicate Ebbsfleet International station is operating at its design capacity (i.e. that there is no capacity for your use). In your PEIR Ch 10.56 & 10.57 you appear to indicate 1M passengers a year (2,750/day) could arrive by Thames Clipper, however that would require one every 3 minutes without allowing for tide, weather or closure of the Thames Barrier. You say that the traffic conditions locally will be modelled, but Highways England (in their consultations on the Bean Interchange and Lower Thames Crossing) have repeatedly stated that no modelling has been done on your traffic flows. Clearly your PEIR gives no substance to your strategy.</p> <p>As local residents, dependent on the use of the A2, which is already at capacity and at a standstill on many occasions; we are concerned that your strategy appears to place a lot more traffic on local roads leading to grid lock in peak times and during exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>The full breakdown of visitors is set out in detail within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) which clearly sets out the modal choices available to guests and how capacity can be provided.</p>
MMO 1.1	Marine Management Organisation	Project description	<p>Section 3.21 (Marine Planning) refers to the draft South East Marine Plan. The MMO would expect to see a robust policy assessment of the project against this marine plan.</p>	<p>Policy reviews are contained within Chapter 17 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

MMO 1.2	Marine Management Organisation	Marine ecology and biodiversity	As outlined in the MMO Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping response, dated 20 July 2020, the MMO advised that matters relating to Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) and Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) Assessment be robustly considered and that the ultimate output will be two separate assessments. This is still lacking especially regarding Zone of Influence. It would be preferable if this was outlined pre-application along with consultation. However, this is at the discretion of the developer.	The need for a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) is acknowledged and information to assist the competent authority in making such an assessment is provided in Appendix 12.4: Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.4). A Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8) has now been completed, providing further detail on impacts and mitigation.
MMO 1.3	Marine Management Organisation	Noise and vibration	Chapter 13 sets out the cumulative and in-combination effects of the project. Section 13.216 refers to underwater noise and vibration effects, particularly plans/projects which involve piling activity could have cumulative effects on fish and marine mammals. The MMO would expect to see modelling of this noise. Similarly, 13.217 refers to dredging activity. Again, the MMO would expect to see modelling of these effects.	Consideration of underwater noise is included in the Noise and Vibration assessment in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15). Because the piling will be flight auger (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) the underwater noise impact will be minimized. The noise associated with dredger movements is included in the assessment.
MMO 1.4	Marine Management Organisation	Marine ecology and biodiversity	Section 13.39 refers to surveys undertaken. The MMO believes that future intertidal and subtidal surveys (including a focus on relevant designated species) are necessary and that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) assessment will be required	Consideration of underwater noise is included in the Noise and Vibration assessment in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15). Because the piling will be flight auger (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) the underwater noise impact will be minimized. The noise associated with dredger movements is included in the assessment.
MMO 1.5	Marine Management Organisation	Marine ecology and biodiversity	Fish ecology is referred to in 13.82 and 13.83. with the suggestion that any effect is of minor significance for protected species and of negligible significance for other fish species. The MMO would expect to see a demonstration of why this is the case, rooted in robust and credible evidence. The MMO is encouraged by the mitigation set out in 13.212, however expect development of the rationale behind the suggested mitigation.	Consideration of underwater noise is included in the Noise and Vibration assessment in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15). Because the piling will be flight auger (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) the underwater noise impact will be minimized. The noise associated with dredger movements is included in the assessment.
MMO 1.6	Marine Management Organisation	Noise and vibration	The MMO is encouraged by the information provided regarding underwater noise/vibration and the effect that this is expected to have upon fish but would expect to see modelling to support this. Further the MMO	Consideration of underwater noise is included in the Noise and Vibration assessment in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15). Because the piling will be

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			acknowledges that information regarding the potential effect of underwater noise arising from piling and dredging activity and vessel use on sensitive marine receptors within the River Thames has been expanded since the scoping report. As above the MMO expect to see a robust consideration of our points supported by evidence.	flight auger (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) the underwater noise impact will be minimized. The noise associated with dredger movements is included in the assessment.
MMO 1.7	Marine Management Organisation	Marine ecology and biodiversity	Section 13.92 states that at this stage of the project it is not known when piling will take place and so a worst-case scenario has been assessed whereby piling may take place at any time of the year. Although the MMO acknowledges this forms part of the Rochdale Envelope, the MMO expect this to be streamlined as the project progresses. The MMO advise the assessment should consider the timing and duration of required piling and dredging works in relation to the sensitive spawning and migration periods of tidal Thames fish.	Consideration of underwater noise is included in the Noise and Vibration assessment in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15). Because the piling will be flight auger (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) the underwater noise impact will be minimized. The noise associated with dredger movements is included in the assessment.
MMO 1.8	Marine Management Organisation	Noise and vibration	Section 15.115 refers to additional assessment areas that will be investigated in the Environmental Statement (ES). However, this does not fully satisfy the concern raised in the scoping response dated 20 July 2020 which outlined that the MMO expect to see robust evidence as to whether underwater noise is likely to propagate across the width of the estuary and cause an acoustic 'barrier' to fish movement and migration.	Consideration of underwater noise is included in the Noise and Vibration assessment in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15). Because the piling will be flight auger (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) the underwater noise impact will be minimized. The noise associated with dredger movements is included in the assessment.
MMO 1.9	Marine Management Organisation	Noise and vibration	An underwater noise assessment should be presented, using appropriate unweighted metrics, which should use either modelling or case studies of a similar nature to support conclusions made on the likelihood and significance of impact.	Consideration of underwater noise is included in the Noise and Vibration assessment in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15). Because the piling will be flight auger (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) the underwater noise impact will be minimized. The noise associated with dredger movements is included in the assessment.
MMO 1.10	Marine Management Organisation	Noise and vibration	The various hearing capabilities of those fish species that will be spawning near to, or migrating past the site, during the months/weeks that piling will be taking place should be considered. Please refer to Popper et al. (2014) for guidelines on the classification of fish into four categories based on the presence/absence of a swim bladder, and for appropriate assessment of the potential impacts of noise on fish including injury, mortality and behavioural impacts.	Consideration of underwater noise is included in the Noise and Vibration assessment in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15). Because the piling will be flight auger (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) the underwater noise impact will be minimized. The noise associated with dredger movements is included in the assessment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

MMO 1.11	Marine Management Organisation	Noise and vibration	An estimate of the duration for the installation of each pile and the month/s in which piling, and dredging will be carried out should be outlined in the ES. This should discuss the timing of piling and dredging works in relation to the sensitive spawning and migration periods of tidal Thames fish to determine whether the mitigation measures described in the supporting information will be adequate.	This level of detail into the construction and piling methods for the Proposed Development are not yet available for the project.
MMO 1.12	Marine Management Organisation	Noise and vibration	The MMO notes that this chapter includes details regarding methodology to assess cumulative impacts, in-combination effects, and consultation. As outlined in section 2 of this response the MMO would expect to see modelling of the predicted noise, vibration and sediment plumes	This level of detail into the construction and piling methods for the Proposed Development are not yet available for the project.
MMO 1.13	Marine Management Organisation	Noise and vibration	The MMO note than an early iteration of the Deemed Marine Licence (DML) has been made publicly available. The MMO strongly urge the applicant to develop this further ahead of submitting the project to the Planning Inspectorate. The MMO advise the applicant to refer to recently granted Development Consent Orders (DCO) which require a DML as a basis for developing the current version. There have been previous instances whereby the MMO has commented upon developing DMLs. The MMO suggest that this would be an appropriate course of action in this case. The MMO expect the applicant to contact the MMO so that this might be facilitated.	These items are included in the Noise and Vibration Assessment (document ref 6.2.15.4)
MMO 1.14	Marine Management Organisation	DCO	The MMO advise the following wording is included in respect to arbitration: 'Any matter for which the consent or approval of the Secretary of State or the Marine Management Organisation is required under any provision of this Order shall not be subject to arbitration.'	Noted. This is being reviewed as part of the revised draft DCO (document ref 3.1), which will be included in the submission.
MMO 1.15	Marine Management Organisation	Water resources and flood risk	Since the MMO provided the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping consultation response the London Resort have put forward potential plans for dredging in the area in front of Bell Wharf and the Tilbury Landing Stage site. In view of this the MMO would expect to be consulted regarding sampling of these areas. The MMO encourage early engagement on this matter.	Please see the appendix within the water chapter of the ES (page 49) (document ref 6.1.17)
MMO 1.16	Marine Management Organisation	Water resources and flood risk	The MMO notes that there are some elements of the project that may or may not be taken forward to development, such as the wastewater treatment plant and Water Source Heat Pump (WSHP). Accordingly, there is little to no information on the timing and duration of construction work or the specific construction activities that will be required. The MMO would expect the ES to provide a more detailed construction methodology and	Please see the appendix within the water chapter of the ES (page 49) (document ref 6.1.17)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			schedule for works to be carried out below Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) once the final project design has been confirmed	
MMO 1.17	Marine Management Organisation	Water resources and flood risk	The MMO observe scoping report does not indicate what relevant indicators will be assessed (though receptors such as ‘River Thames’ are defined). Given that coastal process indicators are not defined, it would be beneficial for assessment of the scope if the report were to indicate what scales of coastal process change would be a significant impact on relevant receptors. The MMO acknowledge that this may not be known in detail at this stage but would expect to see further detail in the ES.	Please see the appendix within the water chapter of the ES (page 49) (document ref 6.1.17)
MMO 1.18	Marine Management Organisation	Water resources and flood risk	The MMO note that reference is made to using the most up-to-date models for coastal process modelling, but no specific details of the modelling work to be undertaken is provided. The MMO expect to see this in future documentation, including, but not limited to, likely methods, data types and sources for relevant flow and sediment transport processes.	Please see the appendix within the water chapter of the ES (page 49) (document ref 6.1.17)
MMO 1.19	Marine Management Organisation	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	With regards to cumulative and inter-related impacts, section 6.19 refers to a matrix-based approach, implying a similar approach to the rest of the EIA. However, coastal processes are not considered in a stand-alone manner and so the means by which their cumulative impacts will be assessed are not clearly described. Furthermore, the means by which multiple impacts are to be combined to yield a single assessment is not made explicit in the EIA. The MMO suggest clarification of this matrix in future documents.	Noted. The Water Resources and Flood Risk chapter in the ES (document ref 6.1.17), plus the draft Navigational Risk Assessment (document ref 6.2.10.1) capture these elements.
MMO 1.20	Marine Management Organisation	Water resources and flood risk	The MMO would expect to see detailed information outlining data to be collected in respect of coastal processes with an explanation as to how it will be used to inform an assessment. It would be appropriate for this information to be considered in the future ‘Baseline Review’ document, as alluded to in the scoping report.	Please see the appendix within the water chapter of the ES (page 49) (document ref 6.1.17)
MMO 1.21	Marine Management Organisation	Water resources and flood risk	The MMO would expect to see assessments of changes in the existing patterns of sediment transport (erosion and deposition due to changes in the flow around new marine infrastructure, including scour) and any potential for changes in the stability of the shoreline at and adjacent to the development sites would be expected.	Please see the appendix within the water chapter of the ES (page 49) (document ref 6.1.17)
MMO 1.22	Marine Management Organisation	Water resources and flood risk	In order to address these appropriate areas of concern the MMO anticipate that assessments would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o baseline assessment of sediment type, deposition and erosion patterns at the site; o baseline assessment of the rates of shoreline change (i.e. rates of shoreline retreat/saltmarsh loss; o baseline assessment of flood storage areas; o specific scour assessments for the new marine structures (including 	Please see the appendix within the water chapter of the ES (page 49) (document ref 6.1.17)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>prospective elements like the Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) and Water Source Heat Pump (WSHP));</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o assessment of future boat wash impacts relative to the present baseline; o assessments of hydrodynamic changes due to the presence of the proposed new structures, or due to any major changes to existing ones; o assessment of any changes in sediment supply or stability and the scale/locations over which these changes may be expected. This should include consideration of the waste materials around the site (as described in Section 5.18, 5.27) and the former Broadness marsh (Section 5.27), which is listed for improvement, as probable net benefit. It should also include consideration of the rate of recovery of the foreshore following any disturbance during construction works. 	
MMO 1.23	Marine Management Organisation	Water resources and flood risk	<p>In summary, the scoping report appears to suggest that the ES will encompass the principal coastal process concerns affecting this development, but these are not explicitly laid out and are distributed across many chapters. The scoping provides no details on the data and methods which will be applied for the majority of coastal process assessments (the level of detail required is likely to differ across applications and receptors) and so it is not possible to judge how appropriate individual assessments are likely to be. Nonetheless, the document suggests that there is an awareness of the required range of assessments</p>	<p>Please see the appendix within the water chapter of the ES (page 49) (document ref 6.1.17)</p>
MMO 1.24	Marine Management Organisation	Waste and materials	<p>The MMO note the lack of detail relating to the dredging activity itself, including, the amount or type of material to be removed, the methodology, including depth, or the disposal option(s). A licence would be required to be able to dredge and dispose of the material.</p>	<p>Dredging arisings have been estimated and outlined in the Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk, including how this waste will likely be handled.</p>
MMO 1.25	Marine Management Organisation	Waste and materials	<p>The MMO would expect to see details of previous dredge campaigns to confirm this at a later stage and recommends the collection of sampling data of the sediment to determine the risk of contaminants as suggested in point 12.29. The Port of London Authority (PLA) and MMO should be consulted</p>	<p>Dredging arisings have been estimated and outlined in the Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk, including how this waste will likely be handled.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			regarding sampling requirements. OSPAR and MMO guidelines for contaminant testing should be followed. The MMO seek clarification regarding whether dredge operations are capital or maintenance. Should dredge and disposal be required, the disposal method must be provided, and the volume of disposed material must be estimated and included in the application in order to make an assessment of impact. The MMO recommends providing the amount of dredge material that will be removed, the general type of material and disposal option(s). The MMO further recommends providing the depths to which dredging will take place and the number of dredge campaigns per year.	
MMO 1.26	Marine Management Organisation	Project description	The MMO expect to see a robust and comprehensive assessment of risk of major accidents and disasters relevant to the project, particularly as no decommissioning of the project has been outlined.	Noted. This is captured in the ES.
MMOC1.1	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 10: River Transport	Paragraph 10.30 notes that construction can affect marine habitats through sediment disruption and noise; paragraph 10-59 identifies noise, emissions and navigational risk from river traffic. In addition, the MMO would anticipate an assessment of river vessel movements on sediments, particularly around retained natural reserves. This is actually discussed under section 13.160 in a separate chapter – it would be beneficial for readability if the activities were clearly listed along with the impacts they generate and the locations of these assessments, within the methods chapter, as the structure is not necessarily intuitive.	Activities are more fully described in ES Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13)
MMOC1.2	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 10: River Transport	Since the PEIR was issued the MMO understands there are potential plans for dredging in front of Bell Wharf and Tilbury Landing stage. As such the MMO would expect to see information regarding the volume of material for extraction for each location with description of the proposed methods of dredging and the timing of dredging events. Details of the proposed methods of disposal and /or locations for the disposal of the dredged material should also be included in the Environmental Statement (ES).	A rochdale envelope approach to the affects of dredging has been included in the assessment in ES Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13)
MMOC1.3	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 10: River Transport	The MMO notes noise related to river transport is assessed in chapter 15. Construction activities connected to marine infrastructure with the potential to create disturbance to marine habitats are considered in chapter 13. Therefore, these will be discussed in sections 3 and 2.	Noted
MMOC1.4	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 10: River Transport	Although the description of the project lacks specific details such as the number and size of piles needed for the jetty or the area of intertidal frontage that is to be lost, sufficient information is presented to allow one to assess whether the relevant impacts have been identified and regarding the pertinent receptors.	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

MMOC1.5	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 13 Marine Ecology	The MMO notes there is reference to recognised methods for both intertidal and subtidal survey approaches and for the framework adopted to assess the overall significance of each impact.	Noted
MMOC1.6	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 13 Marine Ecology	In regard to the overall assessment of significance for several impacts (Tables 13.16 and 13.17 for construction and operational impacts respectively), the MMO notes that while it is stated that the matrix of overall significance (Table 13.8) does not reflect a prescribed formula, there may be a tendency to conclude on the minimum significant effect where Table 13.8 provides more than one level of significance. For example, there are cases of high value, high sensitivity and minor magnitude impacts being classed as ‘minor’ overall significance where this may alternatively be concluded as ‘moderate’ significance. Justification should be given to underpin the logic used to come to these conclusions. It might be argued that for certain impacts, such as changes in hydrodynamics and sediment accretion/erosion associated with the operational impacts on intertidal habitats and species, the magnitude should be considered ‘moderate’ (not ‘minor’) at this stage until modelling studies can provide evidence that such impacts are likely to be of ‘minor’ magnitude.	Noted. Based on the outputs of the hydrodynamic modelling studies, changes in hydrodynamics and sediment accretion/erosion are considered to be minor.
MMOC1.7	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 13 Marine Ecology	The MMO notes the significance of potential impacts to the designated features of the Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) will be subject to an MCZ assessment.	A Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8) has been completed, providing further detail on impacts and mitigation.
MMOC1.8	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 13 Marine Ecology	The MMO note several paragraphs within Chapter 13 refer to fish as “highly mobile and could swim away from the area if disturbed”. This statement is too generalised. Fish are mobile species, however, their ability to move quickly away from any significant disturbance will depend on a variety of physiological factors including size and swimming capabilities. For example, small fish and fish in their larval stages may be less mobile and/or slower and may not be able to move quickly away from an impacted area.	Noted
MMOC1.9	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 13 Marine Ecology	Appendix 13.2 provides a good description of the marine and migratory fish that live in or transit through the Thames during part or all of their life stages. Migratory species and species of conservation importance found in the Thames Estuary have also been recognised.	Noted
MMOC1.10	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 13 Marine Ecology	The MMO notes that the greatest potential impact to marine and migratory fishes will be underwater noise and vibration arising from in-river piling during construction and renovation of pontoons and jetties. The PEIR recognised underwater noise and vibration generated by piling can cause physiological and behavioural effects on fish (Popper <i>et al.</i> 2014) and has the potential to create an acoustic barrier which may impede fish movement and	A worst case of piling at any time of year has been assumed for the assessment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>migration. The MMO would expect the ES to include suitable robust evidence that determines whether or not underwater noise from piling is likely to propagate across the width of the estuary and cause an acoustic barrier to fish movement and migration. An estimate of the duration for the installation of each pile and the month/s in which piling will be carried out should be provided. The timing of the piling in relation to the sensitive spawning and migration periods of Thames fish to determine whether the mitigation measures described in the PEIR will be adequate should be considered.</p>	
MMOC1.11	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 13 Marine Ecology	<p>The MMO is of the opinion that the need for additional mitigation or monitoring for fish will need to be determined upon the outcome of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), particularly in reference to underwater noise, cumulative and interrelated impacts.</p>	Noted
MMOC1.12	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 13 Marine Ecology	<p>The MMO note that although chapter 15 focuses on noise and vibration the information most relevant to underwater noise is contained in chapter 13 (Marine Ecology). MMO would appreciate clear signposting to relevant chapters.</p>	Noted
MMOC1.13	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 15 Underwater noise	<p>As the MMO has noted, detailed information on each specific activity has not yet been provided at this stage, such as the number of piles to be provided. It is also unclear how many vessels are likely to be required for the construction works (para 13.117).</p>	A Rochdale envelope approach has been used for the assessment process with a reasonable 'worst-case' scenario allowed for assessment of piling as described in ES Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13)
MMOC1.14	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 15 Underwater noise	<p>The MMO is of the opinion that in general, the preliminary assessment of the potential effects of underwater noise is adequate. However, as previously noted above specific details of the proposed construction and operation are not yet known therefore it is expected the assessment will be further refined at the ES stage.</p>	Further refinement of underwater noise assessment is included in ES Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13)
MMOC1.15	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 15 Underwater noise	<p>The MMO notes an informative baseline assessment has been undertaken (specifically Appendix 13.2) to identify sensitive fish, marine mammal and marine invertebrate species that may be present. It is appropriate that information on the seasonal use of the Thames Estuary by selected fish species (including migratory species) has been provided in Table A4 of Appendix 13.2). Cefas fisheries advisors will be able to comment further in the adequacy of the baseline assessment.</p>	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

MMOC1.16	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 15 Underwater noise	The MMO agree that the biggest potential source of noise and vibration will be from piling operation, e.g. piling for the new passenger Pier at the Kent Project Site, extension of the jetty and mooring area at the Essex Project site. During the operational phase, noise and vibration will be generated by vessels and Clipper ferries utilising the new jetties and moorings.	This is included in the assessment as set out in ES Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13)
MMOC1.17	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 15 Underwater noise	The MMO note that effort has been undertaken to derive typical source levels for expected construction vessels and activities. Para 13.91 states that, “as the size and number of piles have not been finalised for the Project a worst-case scenario has been assumed which is a very large cast-in-stainless-steel (CISS) pile of 2.4m diameter. A study of piling of this type in approximately 10m water depth indicated peak estimated noise levels at source were 220dB re 1 µPaPeak ³ , 205 dB re 1 µPaRMS ⁴ and 195 dB SELcum ⁵ ”. There is no reference to support this study; this should be provided.	The reference has been added (Caltrans 2015)
MMOC1.18	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 15 Underwater noise	The assessment refers to appropriate noise exposure criteria for fish (e.g. Popper et al., 2014) and marine mammals (e.g. Southall et al., 2019). The assessment compares the noise criteria for fish and marine mammals against the typical source levels to make assumptions on the likely potential effects. In general, the conclusions are reasonable.	Noted
MMOC1.19	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 15 Underwater noise	Please note Chapter 13 Marine Ecology states, “ <i>Examples include Atlantic salmon, mackerel, sea trout, European smelt, short-snouted seahorse</i> ”. Please note that mackerel does not possess a swim bladder.	Mackerel has been removed from this text
MMOC1.20	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 15 Underwater noise	The MMO is in agreement with the mitigation detailed in para 13.212 of Chapter 13 and also note that in 13.92 it is assumed that general construction hours would likely be 08:00 hours to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 hours to 13:00 hours on Saturday, with no working on Sundays. Therefore, there will be extensive windows of no piling activity when fish could move past the area (see also para 13.110).	Noted
MMOC1.21	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 15 Underwater noise	The MMO would expect the preliminary noise assessment (provided at PEIR) to be built upon. It is noted that appropriate receptors have been identified. These include resident and migratory fish species, and species which use the area for spawning and nursing. Marine mammal species have also been considered including seals, harbour porpoise and bottlenose dolphin.	Assessment of noise has been expanded upon

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

MMOC1.22	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood risk	The MMO notes the PEIR is largely restricted to relative terminology (e.g. paragraphs 17.152-17.153 say elevated sediment loads ‘could occur and have adverse effects’ and ‘have potential for large impacts on named receptors’) and the range of increase, existing levels, and the range that would be considered ‘large’ are not stated. These details will ultimately be required for detailed review of the environmental impact to ensure consistency in coastal process assessment.	Noted
MMOC1.23	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood risk	The MMO note paragraph 13.43 discusses the operation of a potential wastewater treatment works outfall. However there does not appear to be sufficient detail to understand whether an assessment of the potential impacts of an outfall on the surrounding sediment (scour from the structure and jet) would be required (i.e., if the outfall would impact ‘intertidal habitats’ or ‘designated sites’ receptors). For example, paragraphs 17.171 discusses outfalls under the heading ‘increased sediment loads’, but it is unclear where scour would be considered.	The impact of outfall construction on marine ecology is assessed within ES Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13). At this stage, the exact locations of outfalls is not known. However, it is acknowledged that appropriate scour protection would be provided and that appropriate measures to be in place to reduce impact on habitats. The details of these will be developed at the next stage of design.
MMOC1.24	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood risk	Along with the details of assessment scales noted previously, for review of the final EIA the MMO would expect that details of the coastal process information collected would be given – e.g. paragraph 17.69 <i>Establishing the existing (baseline) hydrological regime at the two marshes is challenging. Review of historic maps, aerial photography and records from site visits are used to map out the location of the drains. Walkover surveys combined with CCTV survey will be undertaken to establish inflows to the marshes. Surface water discharge consents to the marshes are currently being retrieved from the EA’s database”</i> - this detail is not presently given for all coastal process assessments.	A coastal Hydrodynamic and Sedimentation Assessment has been completed to provide further details. See Hydrodynamic and Sedimentation Assessment Appendix 17.4 and ES Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk (document ref 6.1.17).
MMOC1.25	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 21 Cumulative effects	The MMO notes that the potential effects are referred to in Chapter 21 and it is stated that a full appraisal will be conducted within the ES.	A more comprehensive cumulative assessment has now been completed. The approach to cumulative and in-combination assessments are contained in each relevant ES chapter, as well as ES Chapter 21, Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects (document reference 6.1.21)
MMOC1.26	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 21 Cumulative effects	In relation to coastal processes section 6.19 of the scoping referred to a matrix-based approach, implying a similar approach to the rest of the EIA. The PEIR provides only two paragraphs referring to the how the cumulative and in-combination assessments will be carried out but provides no description at this stage of what these impacts and effects might be. Paragraph 21.4 indicates that cumulative assessments will be based on details of effects (duration, extent, frequency), resilience of receptors and mitigation – paragraph 21.9 suggests that in-combination effects will be assessed qualitatively.	A more comprehensive cumulative assessment has now been completed. The approach to cumulative and in-combination assessments are contained in each relevant ES chapter, as well as ES Chapter 21, Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects (document reference 6.1.21)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

MMOC1.27	Marine Management Organisation	Chapter 21 Cumulative effects	Therefore, at this stage the MMO are unable to state whether it will be possible to separate the cumulative coastal process impacts as a specific area of expertise from the overall marine ecological or water resource assessments.	Noted
MMOC1.28	Marine Management Organisation	Other points to note	As noted in previous advice at the Scoping stage, it is unclear what coastal process information will be collected and how it will be used. It was recommended that it would be appropriate for this information to be considered in the future 'Baseline Review' document, presaged in the scoping report.	Noted
MMOC1.29	Marine Management Organisation	Other points to note	The baseline report reviewed focuses largely on the present state of habitats and ecology but includes no reference to coastal processes data as such or the present baseline habitat change. As a minimum the baseline should include details as to the expected sources of data on sediment suspensions, hydrodynamics and sediment accretion/erosion (as these are explicitly given as section headings in the PEIR representing impacts to be assessed).	Sediments and hydrodynamics are included in ES Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13)
MMOC1.30	Marine Management Organisation	Other points to note	The MMO appreciate the separate chapters provide headings which identify the coastal process impacts being assessed e.g. chapter 13 discusses " <i>Change in hydrodynamics and sediment accretion/erosion</i> " but it would be helpful if these were linked to activities and assessments in a central location outside of each individual chapter.	The project description has been extended to assist in this regard.
MMOC1.31	Marine Management Organisation	Other points to note	There is a degree of inconsistency in the presentation of the impact assessment structure and interchangeable use of terminology which should be addressed.	This has been addressed in ES Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13)
MMOC1.32	Marine Management Organisation	Other points to note	EIA in general uses strictly different meanings of the terms 'impact' and 'effect' but these are not clearly separated in this PEIR (for example, sections 13.26 to 13.34).	This has been addressed in ES Chapter 13 (document ref 6.1.13)
MMOC1.33	Marine Management Organisation	Other points to note	In introducing the EIA methods, Table 6.1 is headed receptor 'sensitivity' but the table text would be interpreted as describing receptor 'value'. Further, impact magnitude (Table 6.2) appears to be compounded with 'effects' in the table heading, and in the description of examples seems principally to refer to the spatial scale of effect. It is more usual in EIA to reserve the term sensitivity for a measure of the susceptibility of a receptor to a specific pressure, and magnitude for a measure of the amount of change measured. This need not be a major problem as this description of the method simply rolls up the elements of the assessment earlier and less transparently than other methods. However, while the EIA is laid out in similar terms in chapter 17, the definition of terms used for the assessment in chapter 13 reverts to the more explicit separation of sensitivity and value (and magnitude of impact and effect though these are still confounded in Table 13.7). Because the coastal process elements of the assessment are dispersed throughout	Terminology in Chapter 13 has been checked to indicate magnitude of impact and significance of effect (document ref 6.1.13).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			the chapters, they are presented using these differing schemes and terminology. It would be beneficial if the report could adopt a consistent terminology across all section.	
MMOC1.34	Marine Management Organisation	Other points to note	<p>"Regarding coastal processes assessment the following list provided in previous scoping advice remains relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline assessment of sediment type: deposition and erosion patterns at the site; • baseline assessment of the rates of shoreline change, i.e. rates of shoreline retreat/saltmarsh loss; • baseline assessment of flood storage areas; • scour assessments for the new marine structures, including prospective elements like the wastewater treatment works and water source heat pump; • assessment of future boat wash impacts relative to the present baseline; • assessments of hydrodynamic changes due to the presence of the proposed new structures, or due to any major changes to existing ones; • assessment of any changes in sediment stability and the rate of recovery of the foreshore following any disturbance during construction works; • consideration of the effect of sea (river) level rise in each case." 	Noted and incorporated into ES Chapter 13 as appropriate (document ref 6.1.13).
MMOC1.35	Marine Management Organisation	Other points to note	Following consultation with CEFAS the MMO welcomes the progress that London Resort has made to date to assess the environmental impacts of the project, however there are additional points to address. The MMO will be providing further comment on the London Resort Hydrodynamic and sedimentation assessment Inception report prepared by H.R. Wallingford in due course.	Noted
MC 1.1	Medway Council	Land transport	Paragraph 1.1.5 of Technical Note 1 acknowledges that there is currently no agreement in place concerning the technical aspects of assessing the impacts of the proposed development. The Department for Transport's 'Circular 02/2013' and the relevant Highways England guidance are clear that these aspects should be discussed at the earliest possible opportunity. The technical notes present proposed methodologies for some aspects, so the applicant is currently unable to present the impacts of the proposed development.	The principle of the modelling methodology is agreed with Highways England.
MC 1.2	Medway Council		Medway Council has been working with Highways England to prepare a new Local Plan. The technical aspects of assessing the impacts of growth in Medway to 2037 have taken circa one year to agree before the work can	The relevant transport information is in the land transport Chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.9)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>proceed. It therefore seems unlikely that the impacts of the proposed development, with few relevant case studies in a similar context, combined with current and foreseeable future uncertainty, can be demonstrated in a timely manner. Therefore, an application for a DCO is considered to be premature. The technical aspects are for Highways England Spatial Planning Team to consider. This response is concerned with growth in Medway being included in the assessment.</p>	
MC 1.3	Medway Council	Land transport	<p>Medway Council notes that the assessment methodology will rely on outputs from the A2 Bean Ebbsfleet traffic model and the Lower Thames Area Traffic Model. As in Medway Council’s response to the proposed Lower Thames Crossing consultations, it is important to note our concerns regarding the Lower Thames Area Model and specifically the Core Scenario. The Lower Thames Crossing ‘Traffic Modelling Update’ (as part of the 2020 Supplementary Consultation) noted that ‘growth associated with government housing targets which have not yet fully progressed through the planning system is not included.’ Medway Council intends to meet its development needs, including the government’s assessment of Local Housing Need according to the Standard Method, through the new Local Plan. The classification of future inputs as required by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standard and WebTAG Unit M4 restricts the Core Scenario to sites under construction or benefitting from unimplemented planning consent. Most of these developments are likely to be completed within five years. In other words, Medway’s future growth for the proposed assessment years of 2026, 2031 and 2038 (understood to be the ‘maturity year’) would be excluded from the assessment. In this way, the Core Scenario appears to be detached from the government’s requirements for housing growth in Medway, located in the heart of the Thames Estuary. Despite the pre-draft plan status of Medway Council’s emerging Local Plan, following the government’s announcement in November 2019, the successful bid for upfront infrastructure funding under the Housing Infrastructure Fund means there is more certainty for growth on the Hoo Peninsula, including 10,600 new homes. It is understood that these homes would have been excluded from the Core Scenario, given their planning stage.</p>	<p>Traffic growth in the area has been included by reference to committed developments and TEMPRO growth which includes Medway's future growth.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

MC 1.4	Medway Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	<p>It is noted that the proposal seeks to deliver approximately 22,000m2 of retail, dining, and entertainment floorspace, which is a significant scale with direct competition implications for neighbouring centres, the current economic climate aside. It is not clear how this figure is split between retail, dining, and entertainment. The ability for high streets and centres to remain relevant and attract the footfall required to remain healthy is questionable in the current climate and warrants a revisit of the role of many but also requires policy approaches flexible enough to accommodate such radical shifts over short periods of time.</p> <p>The scale of the proposal raises concerns regarding the impact on businesses and high streets alike given its proximity to numerous centres. Further to this, it is not clear how the retail aspect of the proposal can be managed to avoid non-visitors of the wider leisure uses making trips to the retail element only. It is understood that retail, dining, and entertainment are complementary and increase dwell time at the location. However, the proposal states that the retail area will sit outside of the gates to the main use. It can therefore function independently of the leisure destination implying that this retail element is not ancillary to the main use as should be. How this is delivered without impacting upon neighbouring areas is vital. Retail, dining, and entertainment needs to be more tightly linked to the visitation, i.e. within the gates of the leisure destination rather than outside, which will undoubtedly perform a wider function beyond just supporting the main leisure destination.</p>	The Retail and Leisure Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9) considers these issues: it considers the impact on nearby town centres and other retail locations and how the offer at the London Resort will be linked to the London Resort, and therefore differ from existing offers.
MC 1.5	Medway Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	Parking is also located near the retail element enabling use by non-visitors. Will visitors be required to purchase an entry ticket to be able to park in the designated parking area and/or will parking be charged to disincentivise day trips for retail therapy. There simply is not sufficient detail to understand how this will be managed and thereby the management of impact on neighbouring centres lies in the balance.	There will be charges to park in the Resort carpark. The number of spaces has been calculated using the likely mode shares to the Resort. The Transport Assessment, alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel. An off-site parking strategy (Appendix TA-Y) has been written to outline the management of people parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
MC 1.6	Medway Council	Cumulative, in-combination, and transboundary effects	Having reviewed the retail and leisure implications within this chapter, impact on Medway does not appear to be mentioned except within the Kent & Medway wider strategy. To appropriately consider the impact on neighbouring centres, it is important to appropriately define the catchment area for consideration, i.e. defined by the scale of the proposal in relation to the trade draw. The cumulative impact of the proposal in relation to other proposals should also be considered.	The nature and scale of the retail and leisure facilities are bespoke for a global entertainment facility, and not forming any competition with any nearby centres, nor Medway. Indeed, it is expected the nearby centres will benefit significantly. This is covered in the Retail and Leisure Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

MC 1.7	Medway Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	Impact on Medway town centres in particular its main city centre Chatham needs to be factored in as well as the value of the offer at Medway's leisure destinations like Medway Valley Park, Dockside and Hempstead Valley Shopping Centre all of which provide a leisure offer to its residents. These destinations offer the convenience of free parking, dining, leisure such as cinema and shopping. The offer at the London resort, whilst the details of which is unknown, can function independently if the main use and can therefore be a direct competitor to Medway's leisure destinations.	The Retail and Leisure Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9) considers the impact of the London Resort on local retail and leisure, including town centres. This assessment focuses on the impact in the host authorities since that is where the majority of the effects are expected, but the impact on Medway is discussed.
MC 1.8	Medway Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	There is little detail about the economic impacts of the London Resort in the consultation materials to make an informed judgement of the feasibility of the proposals. Sight of a full economic assessment would be required to be able to make a meaningful judgement on the proposals based on economic forecasts.	A detailed assessment of the economic impacts is contained in Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) and the Employment and Regeneration Statement (document ref 7.5)
MPC 1.1	Meopham Parish Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	As a rural Parish Council, we would naturally have concerns regarding the environmental impact of this project on the wildlife habitats on the marshland namely Black Duck Marsh, Broadness Marsh, and Botany Marsh. There is no information on the richness and variety of biodiversity on the Peninsula which has been vacant since 1991. The Theme Park will both reduce the area of open land for wildlife and introduce greater human activity than at present. We therefore question the impact of noise, light pollution and public access on the wildlife populations.	All direct and indirect impacts on habitats and species have been fully assessed within the Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12)
MPC 1.2	Meopham Parish Council	Land transport	We note that the Environmental Impact Scoping Report June 2020 states that the development is expected to use the Strategic Road Network. We have serious concerns about the implications of this and the traffic using the A2. There is reference to a new access road to be built from the Ebbsfleet Junction. The new Bean Junction being re-figured for the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation housing numbers will reduce the A2 to 3 lanes in each direction, and there is no detailed information on how heavy volumes of traffic which may well have built up from this pinch point can then exit safely at the Ebbsfleet Junction. You state that you will be working with Highways England but HE has yet to provide traffic data for the Lower Thames Crossing and the impact of their project on the surrounding strategic network despite the fact that the A2 is being reduced to 2 lanes each way to accommodate the slip roads for the LTC.	Detailed merge and diverge assessments for the A2 are included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). It should be noted that the vast majority of Resort traffic is outside of the peak hours. The Assessments undertaken take account of both with and without LTC.
MPC 1.3	Meopham Parish Council	Land transport	Meopham is a parish of some 7000 residents plus 3 schools. The A227 runs through the entire Parish and is in continual use by vehicles driving North or South to and from the A2. It seems reasonable to assume that the opening of the Lower Thames Crossing will increase this volume considerably but there is no official acknowledgement of the environmental impact this will have on	Noted - the relevant traffic assessments are included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			our Residents. It is therefore of major concern to us that there will be an access road at Ebbsfleet for, as you state, the sole means of visitor access by car to the Resort. It must be inevitable that many vehicles will use the A227 to reach this and we therefore urgently require detailed traffic data showing the impact on Meopham together with mitigation proposals.	
NATS 1.1	NATS		NATS operates no infrastructure in the vicinity of the proposal. Accordingly it anticipates no impact and has no comments to make on the Application.	Noted
NE 1.1	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity/ Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p>We advise that the London Resort proposal is likely to result in significant direct and indirect impacts to local, nationally and internationally designated nature and geological conservation sites, protected species and a number of priority habitats and species of significant nature conservation value. In summary, we advise that the PEIR has identified that the proposal will result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The direct loss of the Baker’s Hole Site of Special Scientific Interest. - Significant functionally-linked land habitat loss and increased disturbance to birds associated with the internationally important coastal Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Sites. - Direct loss of habitat from within the Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone and significant indirect impacts. - Indirect impacts to a number of designated sites along the Thames Estuary from disturbance. - The loss of habitat supporting an invertebrate and plant assemblage highlighted as being of national importance by the Project’s ecologists. - Significant direct and indirect impacts to wintering, breeding and passage birds of conservation concern. - Significant direct and indirect impacts to priority habitats and species of significant nature conservation importance. -Significant direct and indirect impacts to protected species. 	Detailed comments and responses to issues raised are provided below.
NE 1.2	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Whilst our assessment of evidence is not yet finalised, earlier discussions with the London Resort’s Ecologists have highlighted that sites in and around the London Resort’s proposed scheme boundary appear to hold important assemblages of invertebrates.	A suite of ecological mitigation strategies for protected/priority species is included within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3). The individual mitigation strategies including one for invertebrates were subject to further consultation and detailed discussion with NE via its Discretionary Advice Service prior to submission of the DCO application.
NE 1.3	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Given the rich and diverse environmental assets present within the application site, Natural England strongly encourages the Resort to fully reflect the ‘avoid, mitigate, compensate’ hierarchy within the National Planning Policy Framework. This should include a comprehensive	Further detail on the application of the mitigation hierarchy was submitted to Natural England (NE) in a briefing note (Report reference: edp5988_r022 "Ecology Briefing Note - Natural England Consultation") on 21

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>consideration of alternative ways in which the development could be realised which could include, but is not limited to, the scheme design/layout and the retention of habitats on the application site which may result in a lesser or no environmental impact. As part of the London Resort’s commitment to become a sustainable Resort, Natural England recommends that the avoidance of impacts to biodiversity and geodiversity should be at the heart of the proposal as this is a key factor to demonstrate the sustainability of a project.</p>	<p>August 2020. A copy of this report is included in the correspondence to the rear of Appendix 12.5 (Document Reference 6.2.12.5). NE have provided no further comments. In addition, Chapter 12 of the ES: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.1.12) has been updated to include further information on how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied.</p>
NE 1.4	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>Natural England has significant concerns regarding the impacts to the habitats and species of conservation significance and the geodiversity of the Kent Site. We are disappointed that very limited survey information has been provided for the Essex Site and recommend this is remedied within the environmental statement. We also remain very concerned with the lack of clarity on the avoidance and mitigation measures for ecological and geological impacts and are not able to concur with the conclusions regarding the scale of the impact and appropriateness of the avoidance and mitigation measures detailed within the PEIR. Significant residual impacts are predicted for a variety of habitats and species with high degrees of uncertainty for many other features due to the lack of certainty/clarity on the mitigation measures.</p>	<p>The scope of ecological surveys has been designed in consideration of the habitats present on site, and following best practice guidance. As acknowledged by NE, the Essex Project Site offers limited ecological potential which is reflected by the level of survey effort applied, in comparison to the Kent Project Site.</p>
NE 1.5	Natural England	Assessment methodology	<p>Natural England is concerned that the PEIR details that the areas which have been surveyed support features of significant geological and nature conservation value which will be directly and indirectly impacted...these are significant impacts which affect features including Baker’s Hole Site of Special Scientific Interest, the Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone, land functionally linked to the coastal Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Sites along the Thames, an invertebrate and plant assemblage assessed within the PEIR as being of national importance along with a number of bird species of conservation concern and protected species. In addition, there are potential indirect impacts to a number of SSSIs within the wider zone of influence. The PEIR highlights that significant direct and indirect impacts to all of these assets resulting from the London Resort. Little information is provided on the avoidance and mitigation measures proposed to demonstrate how the scheme will be an exemplar of sustainable development following the principles within the National Planning Policy Framework. The PEIR also highlights significant residual impacts for a number of habitats and species groups with a high degree of uncertainty over the mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter 11 on Landscape and Visual Effects (document reference 6.1.11), Chapter 12 on Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.12) and Chapter 13 on Marine Biology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.13) address the survey results, status of the site and other relevant areas.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.6	Natural England	Relevant law and policy	Natural England acknowledges that there are no National Policy Statements that cover the nature of the London Resort development proposal. We note that for the transport elements of the scheme, the National Policy Statements for National Networks and for Ports will be directly relevant. In addition, we welcome and support the commitment from the London Resort to ensure that the policy requirements within the National Planning Policy Framework are adhered to within the application.	The NPPF is referred to in the relevant policy assessments, including ES Chapter 5 on Relevant Law and Policy (document reference 6.1.5), and the Planning Statement (document reference 7.4).
NE 1.7	Natural England	Assessment methodology	Paragraph 175 of the NPPF details the ‘avoid, mitigate, compensate’ hierarchy. That is, measures to avoid impacts (for example through the location, or scheme design and layout) should be fully explored; where impacts cannot be fully avoided then measures to reduce these impacts should be considered in the mitigation measures and as a last resort habitat compensation measures can be considered. Given the hierarchical approach, Natural England recommends that the design of the Resort should fully reflect the rich environmental assets that are found within and adjacent to the Kent and Essex Sites and is designed in a way that avoids and minimises the impacts from the scheme.	The London Resort scheme has carefully reflected ecological considerations for protection, enhancement, and where necessary for compensation. This is reflected in the Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1), and in ES Chapter 11 on Landscape and Visual Effects (document reference 6.1.11) and Chapter 12 on Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology & Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.12)
NE 1.8	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	Given the conservation significance of the application site, and the Kent Site in particular, a robust assessment of alternative options, which avoid or have a lesser environmental impact should be included within the environmental statement. As part of the London Resort’s commitment to be a sustainable Resort, the avoidance of impacts to biodiversity and geodiversity should be at the heart of the scheme layout and design. As such, Natural England recommends that clarity is provided on how the layout and design of the scheme has avoided and reduced the impact to the ecological and geological assets of the site. Such an approach is in accordance with the sequential ‘avoid, mitigate, compensate’ hierarchy required within Paragraph 175(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework and Section 2.3.6 of the Planning Inspectorate’s July 2020 Scoping Opinion which states that: ‘The Scoping Report describes alternative locations around England considered for the proposed development along with alternatives for road access schemes in Chapter 4 (Alternatives considered). It does not state the alternatives regarding details of the Proposed Development that will be considered within the ES, however, and does not provide much information concerning options for site layout, building location and design. The Inspectorate would expect to see a discrete section in the ES that provides details of the reasonable alternatives studied and the reasoning for the selection of the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the environmental effects.’	Chapter 4 of the ES addresses alternatives (document ref 6.1.4). The London Resort has undergone many masterplan iterations as explained in the Design and Access Statement (document ref 7.1). The current scheme seeks to minimise the effects on the marshes, reflecting significant analysis.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.9	Natural England	Relevant law and policy	Reference is made throughout the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) to the formal Scoping Opinion requirements from 2014. Given the changes to the scheme and the updated Scoping Opinion provided by the Planning Inspectorate in July 2020, the environmental statement should ensure that it fully reflects the requirements within the 2020 and the updated advice provided by the consultees.	Noted, and the ES does contain references to the most up-to-date Scoping Opinion from the Planning Inspectorate - ES Chapter 6 (document reference 6.1.6) explains this further.
NE 1.10	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Natural England is further concerned that there is a lack of ecological survey information for the potential direct and indirect impacts to the Essex Site. Whilst the existing car parking facility at the Essex Site may offer limited ecological potential, indirect impacts to the adjacent areas, including the grassland and intertidal habitat (and the species they support) need to be robustly considered within the environmental statement. As such, Natural England recommends that much greater clarity on the potential for direct and indirect impacts resulting from the proposals for the Essex Site is provided. It should be noted that this is likely to require detailed survey information to support the assessment, some of which will require surveys during particular seasons/times of the year.	The scope of ecological surveys has been designed in consideration of the habitats present on site, and following best practice guidance. As acknowledged by NE, the Essex Project Site offers limited ecological potential which is reflected by the level of survey effort applied, in comparison to the Kent Project Site. The Proposed Development makes provision for the use of the existing car park at Tilbury for parking for visitors and hotel guests; and works in/adjacent to the River Thames will be extremely limited, comprising the extension of the existing floating pontoon within an active dockside; and there are no land use changes and no significant indirect impacts anticipated to adjacent habitats. The potential for indirect impacts on the intertidal habitats (and species they support) is provided within ES Chapter 13: Marine Ecology and Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.1.13).
NE 1.11	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	As part of the environmental statement and to aid the discussions on the appropriateness (or otherwise) of the mitigation measures proposed, a habitat balance sheet would be helpful. This should provide full details of the areas of each habitat type directly and indirectly impacted by the Resort and associated infrastructure during construction and operation along with the retained and habitat mitigation areas post development. Such a comparison will be key to ensure that there is no net loss of habitat of conservation value, either for the habitat in its own right or for the species which the habitat supports.	An assessment of habitat losses and gains has been calculated using the Defra Biodiversity Metric 2.0, a copy of which was submitted alongside the PEIR and a final version of which is included in Appendix 12.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.2). This quantifies the full extent of existing (baseline) habitats across the DCO Order Limits, and quantifies the amount of habitat to be lost, retained, or retained and enhanced, culminating in an overall net biodiversity score.
NE 1.12	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Notwithstanding Natural England's advice in relation to the need to fully avoid or mitigate impacts, and that the NPPF clearly states compensation should be seen as a 'last resort', we note that the PEIR refers to the potential need for off-site mitigation land. As there is the potential for elements of the off-site mitigation land to be identified through the consideration of the scheme in the DCO process, we would recommend that an assessment is made of the impacts such provision may have on existing habitats and species of conservation value. Such proposals would therefore need detailed	Further detail with regard to off-site mitigation is presented in General Principles for Off-site Mitigation (Document reference 6.2.12.10)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			survey information to support the assessment, some of which would require surveys during particular seasons/times of the year which would need to be included within the environmental statement.	
NE 1.13	Natural England	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	It will be important for any assessment to consider the potential cumulative effects of this proposal, including all supporting infrastructure, with other similar proposals. We advise therefore that a thorough assessment is undertaken of the cumulative effects of the proposed development with any existing developments and current applications through the environmental statement. Unfortunately, no details of the projects that are to be considered as part of the cumulative assessment, nor an indication of the likely cumulative impacts has been provided within Chapter 21 (Cumulative Assessment) of the PEIR. Natural England recommends that a comprehensive cumulative assessment is provided within the environmental statement which may result in greater impacts to environmental features than those currently presented within the PEIR. This cumulative assessment should cover the full breadth of environmental matters which need to be considered within the environmental statement.	The ES contains cumulative and in-combination effects across the relevant topics, including Chapter 12 on Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.12) and Chapter 13 on Marine Ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.13).
NE 1.14	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Given the functional linkage of habitats within the application boundary to the coastal designated sites, a Habitats Regulations Assessment will need to be undertaken (please see further our comments on the designated sites in Section 2 below). Disappointingly, the Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology Chapter (Chapter 12) of the PEIR makes no reference to the need for such an assessment. Guidance from the Planning Inspectorate contained within their 'Advice note ten: Habitats Regulations Assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects' ¹ strongly advises that applicants engage with the statutory nature conservation body as early on in the process as possible to ensure that sufficient information is provided for the application for it to be validated.	The need for a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) is acknowledged and information to assist the competent authority in making such an assessment is provided in Appendix 12.4: Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.4). The Shadow HRA was submitted in draft to NE on 24 September 2020 and comments received on 19 October 2020. The comments made have been considered and addressed within the submitted Shadow HRA.
NE 1.15	Natural England	Marine ecology and biodiversity	In addition to the impacts to land functionally linked to the coastal Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Sites, the provision of residential accommodation for staff as part of the Resort will need to consider whether this could increase recreational disturbance to the coastal sites. The Thames, Medway and Swale Estuaries Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy ² provides details on the nature and types of impacts that can result from residential development, the zone of influence and measures that can be taken to mitigate these.	The potential effects of recreational disturbance on the coastal SPAs as a result of the new residents in the proposed residential accommodation has been addressed within the Shadow HRA (Document Reference 6.2.12.4).
NE 1.16	Natural England	Air quality	Natural England also recommended in our response to the 2020 EIA Scoping Opinion that the potential for traffic generated air quality impacts to designated sites should be considered within the environmental statement	The potential for traffic generated air quality impacts on designated sites has been considered within Chapter 16 of the ES - Air Quality (document reference 6.1.16).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			which may also need to be included within the Habitats Regulations Assessment.	
NE 1.17	Natural England	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	Given the Mucking Flats and Marshes SSSI is the underpinning SSSI for the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site in Essex, we recommend that this site should also form part of the environmental impact assessment. In addition, Natural England advised in our response to the 2020 Scoping Opinion request that the potential for transport generated air quality impacts to the North Downs Woodland Special Area of Conservation should also be fully considered within the environmental statement.	Noted, these have been considered in Chapter 16 of the ES, Air Quality (document reference 6.1.16).
NE 1.18	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<u>Medway Estuary and Marshes and the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPAs</u> Given that no details have been provided on the nature, location or scale of the 'biodiversity offsetting' land to be provided to address the loss of functionally linked land, Natural England has significant concerns regarding the conclusions reached in the PEIR. Similarly, very little information is provided on the measures to avoid disturbance and the other indirect impacts. Natural England is therefore not able to concur with the conclusions regarding the impacts to these sites at present. We recommend that much greater detail and clarity is provided within the environmental statement.	Whilst the final details of the off-site mitigation land and associated biodiversity offsetting schemes are not yet available, a number of guiding principles regarding the nature, scale and location of such offsets have now been clearly set out within Appendix 12.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.2) and within Appendix 12.10: General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation (Document Reference 6.2.12.10). These provide a greater level of certainty that relevant effects on important ecological features can be avoided or mitigated, and that a net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.
NE 1.19	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<u>Medway Estuary and Marshes and the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPAs</u> Natural England notes that the information contained within the PEIR confirms that the Kent site is functionally linked to one or more of the coastal Special Protection Areas given the results of the wintering bird surveys undertaken. Unfortunately the 2019/2020 wintering bird survey does not appear to have been included within the Technical Appendices accompanying the PEIR consultation as Annex EDP 3 Wintering Bird Surveys (edp5988_r003b) to Appendix 12.1: Ecology Baseline Report only contains a blank sheet meaning we are unable to provide detailed advice at present on the suitability of the methodology or the results. From the summary information provided within the Ecology Chapter of the PEIR, Natural England notes that the wintering and passage surveys have focussed on the Kent Site rather than encompassing both the Kent and Essex Sites along with areas outside of the DCO boundary where disturbance to birds may result. We also note that only a single year of recent wintering bird survey has been undertaken (the winter of 2019/20). For projects where significant impacts to birds associated with SPAs and Ramsar Sites are likely to result, Natural	This report was omitted in error but was issued to NE on 01 October 2020 to inform consultation in respect of the Shadow HRA.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>England would normally expect a minimum of two years of recent survey data to be provided. The PEIR includes surveys from 2012/13, 2015/16 and references the 2019/20 surveys. Given the nature and scale of the impacts, and the absence of surveys for the Essex Site, it is likely that further survey information will be required to fully understand the impacts to birds associated with the designated site as part of the environmental statement and the Habitats Regulations Assessment. Similarly, the passage bird surveys should have started in mid-August based on previous studies for the Thames.</p>	
NE 1.20	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Medway Estuary and Marshes and the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPAs</u> The Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site covers habitat on both sides of the Thames. Natural England advise that the area of foreshore and surrounding terrestrial habitat between Tilbury Fort and Coalhouse Fort should be considered as functionally linked to the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site. Surveys for other NSIP schemes have highlighted the importance of the intertidal habitat in the vicinity of Tilbury Fort (in close proximity to the London International Cruise Terminal) with significant congregations of birds recorded. Natural England therefore recommends that much greater clarity on the potential direct and indirect impacts to habitats supporting birds associated with the SPAs and Ramsar Sites is provided for the Essex Site which may require further wintering and passage bird surveys to be undertaken. There may be the potential for collaborative working with other developments (such as the Lower Thames Crossing and the Thurrock Flexible Generation scheme) to share data if agreement can be reached between the parties.</p>	<p>The assessment of effects Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site includes indirect effects on relevant land which is functionally linked to the SPA/Ramsar, taking into account the details of the development proposals and effect-receptor pathways.</p>
NE 1.21	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Medway Estuary and Marshes and the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPAs</u> For other large infrastructure projects within the vicinity of the London Resort, nocturnal vantage point surveys have been useful in gaining a full understanding of how birds associated with the designated sites are using the functionally linked land on both sides of the Thames. It is unclear whether such an approach has been undertaken for this project.</p>	<p>Nocturnal surveys have not been completed. However, dusk dawn vantage point surveys were carried out, with dawn surveys commencing one hour before sunrise and dusk surveys ending one hour after sunset which therefore captured some nocturnal activity. The survey work completed provides a full understanding of how birds associated with the designated sites are using the functionally linked land which is at risk of adverse impacts and no additional surveys are considered necessary.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.22	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<u>Medway Estuary and Marshes and the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPAs</u> We advise the environmental statement should include a comprehensive assessment of the indirect impacts to the designated site. Such impacts are likely to result from direct loss of functionally linked land, disturbance from noise, lighting, visual impacts, recreational activities and increased boat movements, for example. Where impacts are likely to result these will also need to be considered through a Habitats Regulations Assessment.	The ES and accompanying Shadow HRA (document reference 6.2.12.4) include a comprehensive assessment of the indirect impacts to the designated site.
NE 1.23	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<u>Medway Estuary and Marshes and the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPAs</u> Section 12.75 of the PEIR - It is unclear whether the '30 Ramsar/SPA/SSSI qualifying species' include the named species and/or the broader range of species which make up the assemblage. Once this information is shared with Natural England, we will be pleased to provide more detailed advice.	This 2019/20 survey methodology and data was omitted from the PEIR in error but was issued to NE on 01 October 2020 to inform consultation in respect of the Shadow HRA (document reference 6.2.12.4) .
NE 1.24	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<u>Medway Estuary and Marshes and the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPAs</u> Natural England is concerned that the consideration of water quality and quantity to the freshwater grazing marsh and reedbed habitats on the Kent Site have not been included within the PEIR. In addition, the impacts of lighting on these terrestrial habitats and the intertidal habitat around the passenger ferry terminals does not appear to have been considered. We therefore recommend that these are fully considered within the environmental statement.	The ES has been updated to include assessment of these potential impacts.
NE 1.25	Natural England	Land transport	<u>Baker's Hole SSSI</u> Natural England recommend that the transport corridor should be selected on the basis of detailed survey information to demonstrate how measures to avoid and minimise the impacts to the SSSI have been incorporated into the design.	A detailed assessment has been undertaken on the People Mover route through the SSSI. Prior to submission, the NE were engaged on the route options with the preferred option set out in detail within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
NE 1.26	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<u>Baker's Hole SSSI</u> Baker's Hole is a nationally important geological site which is irreplaceable. The London Resort will need to provide clarity within the environmental statement on how the scheme avoids or minimises impacts to Baker's Hole and the wider suite of SSSIs in accordance with Paragraph 175(b) of the NPPF.	Baker's Hole SSSI is designated for its geological interest, as such impacts are addressed within the Cultural Heritage Chapter of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.14).
NE 1.27	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	<u>Baker's Hole SSSI</u> From the information provided, Natural England notes that the route for both the access road and the people mover facility will be built across the SSSI. Disappointingly, the route presented does not reflect the discussions held between the design team and Natural England for earlier iterations in 2016 and 17 which aimed to minimise the land take or avoid the SSSI altogether. Given the stated desire of the London Resort for the project to be an exemplar of sustainable development, a key component of this should be the avoidance of impacts to geological and ecological assets. Avoiding	The scheme description with regard to Baker's Hole is set out in ES Chapter 3 on Project Description (document reference 6.1.3), and the effects on this area are covered in Chapter 14 on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document reference 6.1.14). The various route options have been subject to separate dialogue with Natural England, Historic England and a report issued in autumn 2020.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			development which harms this nationally important site should be a key test of the sustainability for the resort and should be a key component of the environmental statement.	
NE 1.28	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Baker's Hole SSSI</u> The 2020 EIA Scoping Report stated in Section 4.47 that 'The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and ES for the project will explain in detail the measures proposed to safeguard and manage the Baker's Hole SSSI and scheduled monument'. Disappointingly, such information does not appear to have been provided within the PEIR. Given that the geological studies have yet to be undertaken, the recommendations within the PEIR as to the impacts to the SSSI will need to be revisited in light of the survey results.</p>	Baker's Hole SSSI is designated for its geological interest, as such impacts are addressed within the Cultural Heritage Chapter of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.14).
NE 1.29	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	<p><u>Baker's Hole SSSI</u> Natural England is disappointed that despite these concerns, and the policy protection afforded to SSSIs, that the London Resort is continuing to propose a route which will result in the burying of significant areas of the SSSI, in effect destroying the site through preventing future study. Previous routes discussed with Natural England for the access road and the people mover route would have resulted in significantly less impacts to the SSSI and as such, we recommend these should be revisited. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these in more detail with the Project Team in the near future.</p> <p>Such an approach of avoiding impacts through design in preference to mitigation would appear to be in accordance with the advice provided by the Planning Inspectorate in their Scoping Opinion adopted by the Secretary of State on the 28 July 2020 (section 2.3.6 of the Scoping Opinion replicated in Section 1 of this letter). In addition, the National Policy Statement for National Networks³ states in Section 5.29 that: 'Where a proposed development on land within or outside a SSSI is likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI (either individually or in combination with other developments), development consent should not normally be granted. Where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely, an exception should be made only where the benefits of the development at this site clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and</p>	The scheme description with regard to Baker's Hole is set out in ES Chapter 3 on Project Description (document reference 6.1.3), and the effects on this area are covered in Chapter 14 on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document reference 6.1.14). The various route options have been subject to separate dialogue with Natural England Historic England and a report issued in autumn 2020.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>any broader impacts on the national network of SSSIs. The Secretary of State should ensure that the applicant’s proposals to mitigate the harmful aspects of the development and, where possible, to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the site’s biodiversity or geological interest, are acceptable. Where necessary, requirements and/or planning obligations should be used to ensure these proposals are delivered.’</p> <p>Similarly, Paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework⁴ states: ‘b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest’</p> <p>Consequently, Natural England recommends that the ‘avoid, mitigate, compensate’ hierarchy for impacts to designated sites should be followed. That is, based upon robust survey information the scheme design should be modified in a way which avoids impacts wherever possible, where this is not possible then the impacts should be minimised and where there are still residual impacts further measures will be required.</p>	
NE 1.30	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	<p><u>Baker’s Hole SSSI</u></p> <p>Natural England notes that the limit of deviation for the access route and transport hub (works numbers 11 and 17 in the draft DCO) allow works to take place within the entire SSSI boundary. We are particularly concerned with the approach that is being adopted in relation to this nationally important site and would welcome a much greater degree of engagement from the applicant in relation to the SSSI.</p>	The Order Limits and proposed works have been refined since consultation. The Works Plans (document reference 2.5) and Heritage Designation Plans (document reference 2.10) show the interface between the proposal and the designated area.
NE 1.31	Natural England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p><u>Baker’s Hole SSSI</u></p> <p>We have yet to be consulted on the detailed scope of the geological investigation to be undertaken in respect of Baker’s Hole SSSI. The Cultural Heritage chapter of the PEIR refers to the archaeological work undertaken in respect of the Scheduled Ancient Monument but acknowledges that ‘A strategy for evaluating the Scheduled Monument and SSSI is currently being devised’ (section 14.227). It is disappointing that the impacts to a nationally important site have not been considered fully within the PEIR and Natural England would be pleased to provide advice on the scope of the survey methodology which should be agreed ahead of the works being undertaken to ensure that a robust evidence baseline is provided within the environmental statement. This will need to be designed to fully understand the likely impacts to the geological (and archaeological) interest at the Baker’s Hole SSSI and Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p>	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.32	Natural England	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	<p><u>Baker's Hole SSSI</u> For clarity, the scale of the impact to Baker's Hole SSSI that needs to be considered within the environmental statement is not restricted to the area that will directly impacted by the proposed access road and people mover route but the indirect impacts adjacent to these structures. The environmental statement will need to consider, for example, compaction, impacts from ground works to facilitate the transport infrastructure construction and the restriction of any geological investigations in these areas which may compromise the transport infrastructure all need to be considered within the environmental statement. As such, Natural England recommends that the full zone of impact/influence is identified and considered within the environmental statement.</p>	These issues are contained in the ES, including Chapter 3 on Project Description (document reference 6.1.3), and Chapter 14 on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document reference 6.1.14).
NE 1.33	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Darenth Woods SSSI</u> It would also be helpful if confirmation can be provided that there will be no direct impacts to the SSSI given that the DCO boundary encompasses areas of the SSSI; no such confirmation appears to have been provided within the PEIR.</p>	The Proposed Development will result in no direct land take from within the SSSI. Whilst the DCO boundary previously included the ancient woodland parcels between the A2 and A296 slip roads, these have since been removed and will not be affected by The London Resort proposals, which will be limited to minor highway works in this area such as road markings and signage. As a point of clarity, a small number of individual trees will be lost on the edge of 'The Thrift' Ancient Woodland on the southern boundary of the A2 and the slip road as a result of the separate A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet Junction improvement works which was permitted in 2020.
NE 1.34	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Darenth Woods SSSI</u> As the air quality assessment has not detailed the impacts to ecological features, Natural England is not able to concur with the conclusions at present and recommend further clarity is provided within the environmental statement.</p>	The ES includes a thorough assessment of the potential for traffic-generated air quality impacts to relevant ecological features both during construction and operation. This takes into account the baseline information and mitigation recommended within Chapter 16 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.16).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.35	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Inner Thames Marshes and West Thurrock Lagoon and Marshes SSSIs</u></p> <p>The measures proposed within the PEIR rely on providing compensatory habitat for the loss of functionally linked land. Natural England has significant concerns with this approach and the conclusions reached within the PEIR. Similarly, very little information is provided on the measures to avoid disturbance and the other indirect impacts.</p> <p>As the West Thurrock Lagoon and Marshes SSSI (where it is proposed to reroute a public right of way to avoid impacts) has not been subject to any ecological surveys and is not included within the DCO boundary, it is unclear how the effectiveness of these measures can be assessed. Given these concerns, Natural England is therefore not able to concur with the conclusions regarding the impacts to these sites at present. We recommend that much greater detail and clarity is provided within the environmental statement.</p>	<p>Whilst the final details of the off-site mitigation land are not yet available, a number of guiding principles regarding the nature, scale and location of such land have now been clearly set out within Appendix 12.10: General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation (Document Reference 6.2.12.10). These provide a greater level of certainty that relevant effects on important ecological features can be avoided or mitigated.</p>
NE 1.36	Natural England	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	<p><u>Would ham to Detling Escarpment SSSI and the North Downs Woodland SAC</u></p> <p>Section 12.74 of Chapter 12 of the PEIR states that ‘it is considered highly unlikely that the Proposed Development will have any adverse effects on North Downs [Woodland] or Peters Pit SAC Consequently, both designations are scoped out of the EclA and not considered further’. Natural England’s advice in relation to the 2020 Scoping Report details that the potential for traffic generated air quality impacts during the construction and operation of the Resort, both alone and in-combination with other plans or projects should be fully considered within the environmental statement.</p> <p>The consideration of traffic generated air quality impacts should be in accordance within the advice note entitled ‘Natural England’s approach to advising competent authorities on the assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations (NEA001)’5. Depending on the results of traffic modelling this may also need to be considered within the scope of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p>	<p>This extent of required assessment in relation to air quality is contained in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).</p>
NE 1.37	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>It is stated throughout the Marine Ecology Chapter of the PEIR that potential effects to the MCZ will be detailed within an MCZ assessment, conducted at the DCO stage. Natural England advises that consideration should be given to the MCZ assessment as soon as possible, in order to ensure that there is sufficient evidence and assessment to understand impacts to the site. Delaying the MCZ assessment until the DCO stage is likely to pose a consenting risk. We would be happy to engage on the MCZ assessment during the pre-application period to try and find a solution where impacts are likely to occur.</p>	<p>Engagement has taken place regarding the Marine Conservation Zone, and is reflected in the ES Chapter 13 on Marine Ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.13)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.38	Natural England	Relevant law and policy	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>From the information provided, Natural England has concerns about impacts to the site. Whilst we cannot predetermine the outcome of an MCZ assessment, due to the size and location of the project footprint it is advised that the applicant familiarise themselves with the requirements of the legislation, including the legal process that follows when it cannot be concluded that a development proposal will not hinder the conservation objectives of an MCZ. In this scenario further considerations must take place including alternatives to the current proposal; public benefit tests; and the requirement to implement measures of equivalent environmental benefit.</p>	Engagement has taken place regarding the Marine Conservation Zone, and is reflected in the ES Chapter 13 on Marine Ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.13)
NE 1.39	Natural England	Relevant law and policy	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>Currently there is no published conservation advice that is specifically for the Swanscombe MCZ. Natural England therefore advise that the Conservation Advice package for the Medway Estuary MCZ7 is used to aid assessment of TLW. In addition, the Medway Estuary & Marshes SPA8 conservation advice package has information within the ‘Advice on Operations’ section that will be useful for understanding pressures and sensitivities associated with intertidal mud in the southeast region, which will be applicable for Swanscombe. The package for The Dart Estuary MCZ9 will contain further information on attributes for intertidal mud in the ‘Supplementary Advice’ section. Although some of the information in these packages is area/site specific, they will provide information which is important for understanding how to assess and maintain feature condition.</p>	Engagement has taken place regarding the Marine Conservation Zone, and is reflected in the ES Chapter 13 on Marine Ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.13).
NE 1.40	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>Natural England has concerns about the permanent loss of intertidal mud as a result of construction of the ferry terminal and roll on, roll off slipway, and the extension of Bell Wharf. Intertidal mud is a feature of the Swanscombe MCZ, as well as supporting habitat for the tentacle lagoon worm. In addition, there would be a permanent loss of subtidal mud and other sediment habitats that may support tentacled lagoon worm as a result of the proposed construction of the passenger jetty. The footprint of the development does overlap with a known hotspot for the presence of the tentacled lagoon worm within the site. The full extent of any habitat loss and the functional importance of lost habitat for the form and function of the site must be assessed within the environmental statement.</p>	A Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8) has now been completed, providing further detail on impacts and mitigation and incorporating comments from Natural England.
NE 1.41	Natural England	Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>It is noted that dredging is not currently considered to be required for construction and the PEIR assumes that dredging will not be conducted. Natural England advises that evidence should be provided to support this assumption, as any dredging requirements within the Swanscombe MCZ</p>	The potential impacts from dredging are considered in the Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8) incorporating comments from Natural England.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			would be subject to further designated site assessment. Potential pressures exerted from dredging would include habitat structure changes (i.e. extraction), penetration and abrasion of sediment habitats.	
NE 1.42	Natural England	Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>Tentacled lagoon worm have specific habitat requirements (including, for example, salinity, sediment composition, levels of exposure) with a preference for sheltered, low energy environments and are sensitive to disturbance from boat wash. Therefore, Natural England advise that there is a potential for persistent impacts on the tentacles lagoon worm, as a result of regular vessel movement within the MCZ and vessel docking procedures during the operational phase of the project. There may be additional impacts to the intertidal mud feature too. The impact of the operational phase of the jetty and vessels must therefore be fully assessed.</p>	A Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8) has now been completed, providing further detail on impacts and mitigation and incorporating comments from Natural England.
NE 1.43	Natural England	Marine ecology and biodiversity/ Water resources and flood risk	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>It is noted that the proposal for a wastewater treatment facility has not been considered further on the basis that water discharged would meet any water quality criteria required for consent. However, Natural England advises that consideration should be given to habitat loss/disturbance as a result of scour caused by discharged water from the outfall into the MCZ. We would also recommend further information is provided on the details of any construction works required for this facility, including the outfall. All direct and indirect impacts must be assessed fully within the environmental statement.</p>	This has been considered in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13)
NE 1.44	Natural England	Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>The PEIR provides details of some schemes for habitat creation, most notably saltmarsh creation around the peninsula. If this takes place within or adjacent to the MCZ then impacts to the designated features must be assessed, including any direct loss of MCZ features. It is possible that the creation of habitats within or in close proximity to the site, such as saltmarsh, may not be compatible with the conservation objectives of the MCZ. As such, further clarity is required and Natural England would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further in the coming weeks.</p>	Saltmarsh creation details are provided in the Landscape Strategy (document reference 6.2.11.7). It is not anticipated that there will be impacts on the MCZ as a result of these proposals. A meeting was held on 8th December with NE and EA to discuss the proposals.
NE 1.45	Natural England	Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>It is stated in the PEIR that species such as tentacled lagoon worm may be disturbed or displaced and some individuals may be subject to injury/mortality as a result of construction activities. However the number of individuals affected are considered to be negligible in relation to the wider population. As detailed above, the MCZ assessment must consider the conservation objectives for the population of tentacles lagoon within the site boundary. The development footprint, particularly the passenger ferry berth,</p>	A Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.8) has now been completed, providing further detail on impacts and mitigation and incorporating comments from Natural England.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>overlaps with a known concentration of tentacled lagoon worm records within the DCO boundary. Therefore, a detailed assessment of impacts arising from the project, for the full lifetime for the project, must be carried out.</p> <p>Likewise for intertidal mud, there must be a detailed site specific assessment for the Swanscombe MCZ. As well as potential loss of habitat, disturbance may affect the communities/biotopes that live within the sediment. The functional importance of lost or altered biotopes needs to be considered in the assessment.</p>	
NE 1.46	Natural England	Noise and vibration	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>Natural England welcomes the proposed use of soft-start piling and vibropiling methods, and piling at low tide to reduce noise levels in the marine environment.</p>	<p>Consideration of underwater noise is included in the Noise and Vibration assessment (document reference 6.2.15.3) Because the piling will be flight auger (rather than impact / percussive / vibro-percussive) the underwater noise impact will be minimized. The noise associated with dredger movements is included in the assessment.</p>
NE 1.47	Natural England	Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p><u>Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone</u></p> <p>We recommend that advice is sought from the Environment Agency with regards fish species in the Thames Estuary.</p>	<p>The EA have been consulted with regard to fish in the Thames estuary as described in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13).</p>
NE 1.48	Natural England	Air quality	<p>Natural England welcomes confirmation within Chapter 16 Air Quality of the PEIR that an assessment of air quality impacts to ecological designated sites will be undertaken. However, the methodology and objectives appear to relate to human receptors rather than ecological receptors. The air quality assessment should consider the potential for impacts to designated sites using the site and habitat specific criteria available on the Air Pollution Information System.</p>	<p>Noted, these have been considered in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).</p>
NE 1.49	Natural England	Air quality	<p>The environmental statement will need to consider whether there will be an increase in deposition to designated sites from the project. Such impacts may, for example, result from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an increase in road traffic generated air quality impacts to designated sites within 200 metres of the affected road network (both during construction and operation); - impacts from river traffic during construction and operation of the scheme; - impacts from any energy generation (including energy from waste) facilities associated with the project; and - project generated dust. <p>Where impacts are likely to occur, full details of the mitigation measures will be implemented need to be included within the environmental statement.</p> <p>Where impacts to a Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation</p>	<p>Noted, these have been considered in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			and/or Ramsar Site may result, these impacts will need to be considered through a Habitats Regulations Assessment. The assessment should be in accordance with the guidance contained within 'Natural England's approach to advising competent authorities on the assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations (NEA001)	
NE 1.50	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The PEIR highlights significant direct and indirect impacts to a number of local wildlife sites within the zone of influence, many of which support species and habitats of principal importance or conservation concern. Natural England recommends the advice of the relevant county wildlife trust or the local authority is sought in respect of these sites.	Consultation meetings have been held with both Kent Wildlife Trust and Kent County Council to discuss the impacts of the Proposed Development and associated mitigation. Both parties were consulted formally through the PEIR consultation, and their responses have been taken into consideration in the ES. Further details are provided within Appendix 12.7: Non-statutory consultee responses to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (Relevant to Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology) (Document Reference 6.2.12.7).
NE 1.51	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Natural England notes that a number of protected species have been undertaken/are ongoing within the application boundary. These, as with the other surveys, appear to primarily focus on the Kent Site rather than both the Kent and Essex Sites. Whilst there may be limited habitat for protected species within the boundary of the Essex Site, both the Kent and Essex Site should be subject to robust ecological surveys.	The scope of ecological surveys has been designed in consideration of the habitats present on site, and following best practice guidance. As acknowledged by NE, the Essex Project Site offers limited ecological potential which is reflected by the level of survey effort applied, in comparison to the Kent Project Site. The level of survey effort is considered robust to adequately assess the ecological value of the Essex Project Site, determine predicted impacts and devise appropriate mitigation where necessary.
NE 1.52	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	From the information provided within the PEIR, the Resort will result in impacts to a number of protected species including bats, dormice, Schedule 1 bird species, widespread reptiles, otters and water voles. Natural England will be pleased to work with the London Resort to better understand the impacts and mitigation proposals for protected species, especially those for which Natural England will need to provide licensing advice through the Letter of No Impediment to be submitted with the DCO application.	A suite of ecological mitigation strategies for protected/priority species is included within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3). The individual mitigation strategies for dormice, bats, water vole, otter, birds, and invertebrates were subject to further consultation and detailed discussion with NE via its Discretionary Advice Service prior to submission of the DCO application.
NE 1.53	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Natural England is concerned with the approach taken to valuing habitats and species of principal importance and conservation concern within the PEIR. For example, ancient woodland, which is an irreplaceable habitat, is valued as being of conservation importance at the county level (alongside local nature reserves and local wildlife sites). Similarly, habitats and species of principal importance for England under Section 41 of the Natural	The approach taken to valuing habitats has been revised in light of NE's comments.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) are valued at the local level alongside 'common and relatively widespread species' (Section 12.24 of Chapter 12 to the PEIR). Given that species and habitats of principal importance are national priorities for conservation in England, the impacts of the development on significant nature conservation assets may be under reported using the valuing criteria within the PEIR.	
NE 1.54	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Guidance for road schemes contained within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges ¹² , (whilst accepting these are not applicable to the entire London Resort proposal), values priority habitats as being of national conservation importance (Table 3.9). Consequently, Natural England recommends much greater clarity is provided within the environmental statement on the criteria that have been used to value the ecological receptors that are to be impacted by the London Resort proposal.	The CIEEM EcIA Guidelines recommend that the value of areas of habitat and plant communities should be measured against published selection criteria where available. Examples include criteria for Local Wildlife Site selection in Kent and criteria for Priority Habitats/Habitats of Principal Importance in England, although the value of specific Priority Habitats must then be judged on a case by case basis.
NE 1.55	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Given the absence of recent detailed survey information within the PEIR for wintering, passage and breeding birds, Natural England is not able to provide detailed advice in relation to the potential impacts to these species. However, given the significant direct habitat loss that will result from the project, we are not able to concur with the conclusions reached within the PEIR at present. Much greater detail should be provided in relation to the nature of the impacts and the proposed avoidance, mitigation measures within the environmental statement.	The Applicant's Ecologist were in regular contact with NE officers following submission of the PEIR and it was not confirmed that the wintering bird report was missing. The report was subsequently issued to NE on 01 October 2020
NE 1.56	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Despite the PEIR stating that the invertebrate assemblage is of national importance, it is disappointing that residual impacts to habitats which support the invertebrate assemblage from the Kent Site are likely to occur. Natural England is concerned that despite the PEIR concluding that the invertebrate assemblage is of 'national importance', there is a residual 'moderate negative' impact predicted; at present we are not able to concur with the nature of the impact nor the acceptability of the mitigation proposals.	The PEIR predicted that some significant residual negative effects could occur, subject to further development of the ecological mitigation and enhancement strategy, including the off-site mitigation land. Since the PEIR was submitted, a significant amount of additional baseline information has become available across a range of disciplines, which has enabled more detailed consideration of potential impacts and further development and refinement of the ecology mitigation strategy. Having completed the full assessment informed by this additional information and the proposed mitigation, Chapter 12 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.12) concludes that there would be no significant residual effects on important ecological features.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.57	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Whilst our assessment of evidence is not yet finalised, the survey results and the conclusions drawn within the PEIR state that the assemblage of invertebrates across the Kent Site is of 'national importance', confirming the previous assessment by the Project Team. Our advice to the London Resort has and continues to be to avoid possible impacts on areas that appear to be important for their biodiversity and geological value.	Noted
NE 1.58	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Whilst the surveys for invertebrates have focussed on the Kent Site, Natural England recommends that the potential impacts to the Essex Site are also considered within the environmental statement. In particular, the land adjacent to the proposed multi-storey car parks at the London International Cruise Terminal is known to have a semi-natural character and may support species of conservation concern. No assessment of the suitability of these habitats for invertebrates appears to have been included within the PEIR. Whilst the habitat appears to be outside of the DCO boundary, there are the potential for indirect impacts to the habitat which may result from lighting, surface water drainage and air quality, for example. If the semi-natural habitats surrounding these carparks is unsuitable for invertebrates or is unlikely to be impacted, evidence should be provided to demonstrate this. However, if invertebrate assemblages have potential to be impacted, this should be considered.	The scope of ecological surveys has been designed in consideration of the habitats present on site, and following best practice guidance. As acknowledged by NE, the Essex Project Site offers limited ecological potential which is reflected by the level of survey effort applied, in comparison to the Kent Project Site. The Proposed Development makes provision for the use of the existing car park at Tilbury for parking for visitors and hotel guests; there are no land use changes and no significant indirect impacts anticipated to adjacent habitats
NE 1.59	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Table 12.5 of the PEIR summarises the mitigation proposals as aiming to enhance remaining habitat. This may provide benefits for some species but given the varying ecological requirements for the species (particularly those of conservation concern) recorded across the site, much greater certainty on the mitigation measures should be provided to ensure there is no residual impact for all species. Further information is required on the nature of the habitat enhancements and how this will provide the habitat requirements for all of the species impacted by the proposal.	A suite of ecological mitigation strategies for protected/priority species is included within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3). The individual mitigation strategies for dormice, bats, water vole, otter, birds, and invertebrates were subject to further consultation and detailed discussion with NE via its Discretionary Advice Service prior to submission of the DCO application.
NE 1.60	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Natural England has significant concerns regarding the impacts to what is assessed as being a vascular plant assemblage of 'national importance' within the PEIR. We are also concerned regarding the proposed avoidance and mitigation measures for vascular plants at present. Given the varying ecological requirements of these species, much greater detail on the mitigation strategy will need to be provided before Natural England is able to advise on the acceptability or otherwise of the strategy to maintain (and enhance) the populations of plants which the project has assessed as being of national importance.	The vascular plant mitigation strategy has been developed in further detail and is included within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.61	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Despite the reported national significance of the plant assemblage and the significant direct loss of habitat based upon the masterplan, the impacts are assessed as being significant at the regional level. The residual impacts are considered negligible as plants and seed will be transplanted and the success of this is dependent upon the green infrastructure strategy for the site which is as yet uncertain.	The vascular plant mitigation strategy has been developed in further detail and is included within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3). This has been prepared in parallel with the Landscape Strategy (Document Reference 6.2.11.7).
NE 1.62	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	In addition, the botanical survey undertaken in 2012/15, included within the appendices to the Scoping Report, highlights that some of the grassland areas within the Kent Site demonstrated affinities to species rich neutral (MG5) grassland. This does not appear to be reflected within the updated surveys not the PEIR.	The detailed updated botanical surveys of the Kent Project Site in May 2020 did not record grassland which resembles the MG5 NVC community.
NE 1.63	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	Reference is made within the PEIR and supporting documents to the Kent Site being selected as it is largely brownfield, former industrial land. Brownfield sites are often very rich in the wildlife they support. As detailed within the appendices supporting the PEIR, the Swanscombe Peninsula supports a rich and diverse array of protected, priority and notable species along with a significant number of species of conservation concern. Paragraphs 117 and 118 of the NPPF (and the associated footnotes) provide confirmation that the preferential reuse of brownfield sites should not be promoted 'where this would conflict with other policies in this Framework, including causing harm to designated sites of importance for biodiversity'.	The majority of the scheme built footprint is on land identified on adopted development plans for major leisure-led development
NE 1.64	Natural England	Conclusion and mitigation comments	Given that much of the land within the development consent order boundary is included within the national Priority Habitat Inventory, Natural England would expect the environmental statement to fully detail how the proposal has been designed to avoid and fully mitigate the impacts to all of the priority habitats resulting from this proposal. Such information on how impacts are to be avoided (for example through changes to the scheme design), mitigated or fully compensated do not appear to have been provided within the PEIR unfortunately.	The scheme evolution to reflect ecological considerations is contained within the Design & Access Statement (showing scheme changes) plus identified in ES Chapter 12 on Terrestrial and Freshwater ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.12).
NE 1.65	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Whilst the PEIR details that, for most habitats, there will be no or limited residual impacts given the habitat mitigation measures are to be provided through the proposed 'offsetting', no details of the habitat areas to be lost compared to those to be created has been provided within the PEIR. This approach does not appear to be in accordance with the 'avoid, mitigate, compensate' hierarchy.	This is fully detailed in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12).
NE 1.66	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Natural England has significant concerns regarding the conclusions within the PEIR in relation to the impacts to priority habitats and the effectiveness of the mitigation measures proposed.	Discussions with NE to better understand their concerns have taken place and further detail is provided within Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.67	Natural England	Landscape and visual effects	<p><u>Kent Downs AONB</u> In the appendices accompanying the 2020 Scoping Opinion, that the plan entitled 'Zone of Theoretical Visibility (based on broad parameters)' (drawing reference edp5988_d033b dated 8 June 2020) highlighted that areas of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) fall within the zone of theoretical visibility. As such, we recommended that a detailed assessment of the potential impacts to the setting of the AONB is included within the environmental statement. To aid this assessment, Natural England recommends that the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan is included within the documents to which the assessment will have regard. The Management Plan provides guidance and polices on the special qualities and importance of the setting including views to and from the AONB.</p>	EDP have consulted with NE and Kent Downs AONB Unit with regarded to the scope of the assessment in relation to the AONB and the LVIA reflects these discussions.
NE 1.68	Natural England	Landscape and visual effects	<p><u>Kent Downs AONB</u> Natural England notes that discussions have been held with the District and County council's in Kent and Essex to agree the viewpoints for the landscape and visual impact assessment. Given that the AONB falls within the zone of theoretical visibility, we would recommend that further engagement with Natural England and the Kent Downs AONB Unit is undertaken to discuss and agree the viewpoints to undertake the landscape and visual impact assessment in respect of the protected landscape. The assessment will need to consider summer and winter impacts during both the day and night.</p>	Microsoft Teams meeting held with Natural England and Kent Downs AONB Unit on 22/09/2020. Viewpoints consulted and 2 additional views added from Kent Downs AONB. Night Views agreed to be taken from photo viewpoints located within AONB. Summer and Winter Views discussed. Agreed that Applicant has taken majority in Winter to reflect worst case scenario but also understood that additional requested views by consultees may be taken in late summer/early autumn due to project time constraints.
NE 1.69	Natural England	Landscape and visual effects	<p><u>Kent Downs AONB</u> Section 11.41 of the PEIR Chapter 11 – Landscape suggests that for the impact assessment the local landscape character assessments will be used rather than the National Character Assessments (NCAs). It may be appropriate to refer to the relevant NCAs across the development boundary as these provide helpful guidance on positive measures that can be implemented to restore or enhance the character area within the Statements of Environmental Opportunity. The project is committed to delivering biodiversity net gain but environmental net gain would be a more holistic approach to sustainable development. As mentioned in our response to the 2020 EIA Scoping Opinion, the environmental impact assessment should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. We encourage the use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive</p>	The NCAs are referred to within the Landscape and Visual Baseline (Appendix 11.1; document reference 6.2.11.1)).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character, as detailed proposals are developed.	
NE 1.70	Natural England	Landscape and visual effects/ Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	<u>Kent Downs AONB</u> [In relation to LVIA] The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. In this context Natural England advises that the cumulative impact assessment should include other proposals currently at Scoping stage. Due to the overlapping timescale of their progress through the planning system, cumulative impact of the proposed development with those proposals currently at Scoping stage would be likely to be a material consideration at the time of determination of the planning application.	The cumulative assessment of landscape and visual effects of the proposed development and cumulative schemes is contained in Appendix 11.6: Schedule of Cumulative Effects (Document Reference 6.2.11.6) and summarised within Chapter 11 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.11)
NE 1.71	Natural England	Landscape and visual effects	<u>England Coast Path</u> Given the development proposed, the environmental impact assessment should fully consider the potential direct and indirect impacts to the England Coast Path. Natural England notes from the 'Landscape and Ecology Initiatives Plan' submitted alongside the PEIR (drawing number edp5988_d090 dated 24 July 2020) that the route of the England Coast Path is not shown. Natural England recommends that full details of any amendments to the England Coast Path that may be proposed are provided within the environmental statement. Any variation of the England Coast Path will need to be mindful of the supporting legislation and whether there are powers available to undertake this within the DCO process.	The England Coast Path has been added to the relevant plans, along with a proposed diverted route closer to the resort boundary to avoid increased footfall in the ecologically sensitive area of Broadness Salt Marsh at the northern end of Swanscombe Peninsula.
NE 1.72	Natural England	Relevant law and policy	<u>England Coast Path</u> Any variation of the England Coast Path will need to be mindful of the supporting legislation and whether there are powers available to undertake this within the DCO process. It may also be appropriate for the London Resort to seek legal advice as to whether there are powers within the DCO process for a variation or whether this will be required separately under the Marine and Coastal Act (2009).	Noted. This is addressed in the ES Chapter 5 on Relevant Law and Policy (document reference 6.1.5) as well as the draft DCO (document reference 3.1)
NE 1.73	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	<u>England Coast Path</u> In addition, a safe, clearly signed and suitable route for users must be provided throughout the construction phase of the development in order that people can follow a continuous route along the England Coast Path at all times. The relevant highway authority will be able to advise on this in due course but this should be detailed within the environmental statement.	Noted. This can be captured through a requirement

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.74	Natural England	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	Natural England notes that a five kilometre zone has been used for identifying projects to be considered as part of the cumulative impact assessment (Section 21.7, Chapter 21 Cumulative Assessment). The application of a buffer may not be sufficient for consideration of some environmental impacts and it would seem more appropriate for the projects to be considered on the likely cumulative pathways rather than distance. For example, traffic generated air quality impacts to designated sites from projects are likely to need to be considered at a distance greater than five kilometres.	The approach to cumulative and in-combination assessments are contained in each relevant ES chapter, as well as ES Chapter 21, Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects (document reference 6.1.21)
NE 1.75	Natural England	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	The environmental statement should include an impact assessment to identify, describe and evaluate the effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects and activities that are being, have been or will be carried out. The following types of projects should be included in such an assessment, (subject to available information): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - existing completed projects; - approved but uncompleted projects; - ongoing activities; - plans or projects for which an application has been made and which are under consideration by the consenting authorities; and - plans and projects which are reasonably foreseeable, i.e. projects for which an application has not yet been submitted, but which are likely to progress before completion of the development and for which sufficient information is available to assess the likelihood of cumulative and in-combination effects. 	The approach to cumulative and in-combination assessments are contained in each relevant ES chapter, as well as ES Chapter 21, Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects (document reference 6.1.21)
NE 1.76	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity/ Marine ecology and biodiversity	The delivery of net gain should be considered when the impacts from the scheme have been fully avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated. Given the PEIR reports that there will be residual ecological impacts, these need to be fully addressed within the environmental statement.	Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12) provides details on the proposed enhancement measures to be provided by the Proposed Development. In particular, details on habitat creation and enhancement, and long term management and monitoring are provided within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3).
NE 1.77	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	As part of an overall enhancement package, Natural England recommends that options for reconnecting habitats through the creation of new semi-natural habitat, linking in with local priorities this part of the Thames estuary. Similarly, we would encourage the applicant to work closely with other major projects on both sides of the Thames to deliver a coherent, landscape scale mitigation and enhancement strategy.	The approach to integrating the ecology and landscape elements is shown in the Design & Access Statement (document ref 7.1), and also in ES Chapter 11 on Landscape & Visual effects (document reference 6.1.11), ES Chapter 12 on Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.12) and Chapter 13 on Marine Ecology and Biodiversity (document reference 6.1.13)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.78	Natural England	Conclusion and mitigation comments	Where habitat mitigation will be required for any of the habitats or species impacted by the development, the long-term security and management of the site(s) needs to be secured and we recommend that the mechanism for this should be detailed within the environmental statement.	These protections and controls will be developed through the DCO Requirements
NE 1.79	Natural England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	<p>For avoidance of doubt, Natural England would expect a full and comprehensive investigation of Baker’s Hole SSSI to be undertaken to inform the environmental statement, rather than being undertaken at the post consent stage. The assessment should provide an understanding of the potential impacts from the scheme to the notified interest of the SSSI and a robust consideration of ways of achieving the proposed development which avoid, or have a lesser impact to the SSSI.</p> <p>Having reviewed the works plans, Natural England is concerned that the limits of deviation for works number 11 (the access corridor from the A2) and number 17 (the dedicated terminal building for guests arriving by public transport) encompass the entire area of Baker’s Hole SSSI. As mentioned above, Natural England expects a comprehensive assessment of the alternative approaches for the transport infrastructure including those previously discussed with Natural England to ensure that impacts to the SSSI are avoided or minimised. We would request the opportunity to fully discuss this significant concern with the London Resort in the near future.</p>	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)
NE 1.80	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	Natural England notes there is reference throughout the draft DCO to the issuing of deemed consent should a decision if the consenting body fails to notify the undertaker of its decision within a 28 days period from the date the application was made. Given the significant environmental constraints across the development site, wider consultation may be required, particularly given the desire to agree significant matters post consent. As such, we would recommend that there should be flexibility in the approach along with an agreed approach for ensuring sufficient time for consultation and comments to be provided.	This is a matter to be discussed with Natural England to understand better any issues on requirements procedure
NE 1.81	Natural England	Water resources and flood risk	Section 20(6) - Given the sensitive environment within and surrounding the development footprint (including the Marine Conservation Zone and wetland habitats supporting species associated with internationally important nature conservation sites), measures to ensure that contaminated water does not impact these features must be secured.	The proposed wastewater treatment facility outfall will discharge significantly downstream of the MCZ. Outfalls (surface water and waste water) will be appropriately designed to avoid scour impacts. The impact of outfall construction on marine ecology is assessed within Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.82	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	Section 22(1) and Section 34(1) - Given the presence of statutory designated sites within the DCO boundary, along with the proposed disapplication of Natural England's consenting role, there is the potential for significant impacts to the designated sites resulting from these proposals. Natural England is unlikely to be able to agree to these sections within the DCO.	This is a matter to be discussed with Natural England to understand better any concerns
NE 1.83	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	Section 42.(1) (Felling or lopping trees) of the draft DCO details that the undertaker may fell or lop and trees, shrub or hedgerow near any part of the development or cut back its roots. Given the presence of Darenth Woods SSSI within the application boundary, this is unlikely to be something that Natural England will be able to support without much greater clarity and protection measures being implemented.	This may be a matter to be addressed through draft DCO discussions
NE 1.84	Natural England	Project development and alternatives	The 'Other relevant works' section of the draft DCO makes no mention of the geological mitigation measures that may be required, particularly in relation to Baker's Hole SSSI. As such, greater clarity on the mitigation measures for geological impacts must be reflected in the draft DCO unless the scheme is redesigned to avoid impacts.	This may be a matter to be addressed through draft DCO discussions
NE 1.85	Natural England	Conclusion and mitigation comments	Whilst ecological mitigation measures are included within the 'Other relevant works' section of the draft DCO, no mention is made of the off-site mitigation area that is identified within the PEIR as being a key component of the ecological mitigation strategy for the scheme. Natural England recommends that all elements of the environmental mitigation and net gain strategy are clearly referenced within the DCO.	Further information on the approach to off-site mitigation is contained in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12) - Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity
NE 1.86	Natural England	Conclusion and mitigation comments	Similarly, Section 5 (Phases of development) does not refer to the full suite of ecological mitigation measures or biodiversity net gain that is referenced within the PEIR nor the geological mitigation measures for impacts to Baker's Hole SSSI. Natural England would recommend that the draft DCO is amended to more fully reflect the environmental full range of mitigation measures required.	Further information on the approach to ecological mitigation is contained in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12) - Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity
NE 1.87	Natural England	Conclusion and mitigation comments	Reference is made within Section 6 (Ecological management plan) to the on-site mitigation measures; it is unclear from the wording whether this section will also apply to the potential offsite ecological mitigation areas that are referenced throughout the PEIR as needing to be provided. We would recommend that much greater clarity is provided in this respect within the DCO.	Further information on the approach to off-site mitigation is contained in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12) - Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.88	Natural England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Natural England notes that the construction ecological impacts will be mitigated through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Section 7) but again no reference is made to the offsite mitigation areas that the PEIR identifies. Reference is again made to the archaeological written scheme of investigation being secured through the CEMP. In relation to Baker's Hole SSSI, a sufficient level of detail needs to be provided within the environmental statement to understand the likely impacts and the consideration of alternative approaches. It is not appropriate to defer this to the post consent stage.	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14). Furthermore, consideration is given in the ES Appendix 3.2 Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Document Reference 6.2.3.1)
NE 1.89	Natural England	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Section 21 (European protected species) makes reference to the need for a protected species licence where impacts to species protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) may result. There may also be the requirement for licences for other protected species present on the site such as the water vole or Schedule 1 (to the Wildlife and Countryside Act) birds; as such this section should reflect that there are additional species considerations.	The need for protected species licences is detailed in Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12) and the Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document reference 6.2.12.3)
NE 1.90	Natural England	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Section 22 - It is unclear whether this refers to the geological interest within the wider development footprint or if this also includes the nationally important Baker's Hole SSSI which is to be directly impacted by the proposal. It is important to note that Baker's Hole Site of Special Scientific Interest, which would be significantly harmed by the current proposal, is a site of national importance for its geological interest. If it is to include the SSSI, as mentioned previously, a robust impact assessment and consideration of alternative designs/layouts of the scheme, based upon a detailed survey, must be included within the environmental statement and cannot be deferred to the post consent stage. Given that a permanent geological conservation site exists within the development boundary (Baker's Hole SSSI), greater clarity should be provided on the expectations of Section 22(2).	This is noted and addressed in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement - Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Document Reference 6.1.14) and further explored in ES Appendix 14.5 Technical Note 1- People Mover Route - Alignment Options Appraisal, 2020 (Document reference 6.2.14.5) and ES Appendix 18.13 Route options across Bakers Hole SSSI (Document Reference 6.2.18.13)
NE 1.91	Natural England	Relevant law and policy	As part of Part 4, Section 19 to Schedule 12 of the draft DCO (the deemed Marine Management Licence) Natural England notes that 'Interim reports of survey and assessment of SPA, Ramsar and SSSI bird populations and trends must be submitted to the MMO for review at years [2] and [4] and the final report must be provided at the end of year [5]. Natural England is the statutory agency responsible for SSSIs, SPAs and Ramsar Sites in England and as such this information should also be provided to Natural England. If the surveys show that impacts to species associated with these designated sites is occurring, additional mitigation measures may be required and a mechanism for securing this should be detailed within the DCO.	The required survey information will be issued to the relevant organisation(s)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

NE 1.92	Natural England	Landscape and visual effects	Whilst not specifically included within the draft DCO, since the consideration of potential impacts to the Kent Downs AONB has yet to be undertaken, there may also be a requirement for additional landscape mitigation measures in relation to the AONB to be included within the DCO once the landscape and visual impact assessment has been completed.	Effects upon the Kent Downs AONB are considered through the viewpoint assessment in Appendix 11.2 (document reference 6.2.11.2) and 11.3 (document reference 6.2.11.3) and summarised in the ES.
NE 1.93	Natural England	Relevant law and policy	<p>Natural England notes the desire of the London Resort to disapply Natural England’s consenting role under Section 28 E of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) through the DCO. The Explanatory Memorandum states:</p> <p>5.18 The article modifies the legislation listed in Schedule 3 so that it does not apply to the proposed development, thus obviating the need for these extra consent processes for the development.</p> <p>5.19 Schedule 3 part 1 modifies the following Acts:</p> <p>5.19.1 [section 28E of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 – for works in the Baker’s Hole SSSI];...</p> <p>5.20 Schedule 3 part 2 lists those consents which can be included in a DCO provided the body normally responsible for granting the consent has agreed for the consent to be included pursuant to section 150 of the Act and of Part 1 of the Schedule to the Infrastructure Planning (Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2010 (SI 2010/105). LRCH has not yet obtained the consent of certain bodies but will aim to do so...’</p> <p>Natural England is unlikely to agree to the disapplication of our SSSI consenting role where there are likely to be significant impacts to designated sites as is the case with the London Resort. Given the lack of information provided within the PEIR, the lack of a geological survey undertaken to understand the nature and scale of the impact to Baker’s Hole SSSI and the absence of any avoidance measures, Natural England has significant concerns with the approach proposed in relation to the SSSI. There is also the potential for impacts or exploratory works within the boundary of Darenth Woods SSSI as this is included within the DCO boundary. We would therefore recommend that the draft DCO and Explanatory Memorandum are amended to reflect these significant concerns. This concern is heightened by the limit of deviation contained within the works plans accompanying the PEIR consultation (see our comments in relation to the draft DCO above).</p>	This may be a matter to be addressed through draft DCO discussions
NE 1.94	Natural England	Project description	Natural England notes that Section 10.8 states that ‘It also include[s] a requirement not to carry out material operations in winter unless a wintering birds survey and, if appropriate, a scheme of mitigation, has been incorporated into the ecological management plan’. Given the functional linkage of the application site to the coastal Special Protection Areas and	This may be a matter to be addressed through draft DCO (document ref 3.1) discussions

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			Ramsar Sites within the Thames Estuary, a cold weather restriction should also be included to cease all works during prolonged periods of sub-zero temperature conditions.	
NR 1.1	Network Rail	Land transport	Network Rail propose that new interchange facilities between rail and the resort are introduced at Swanscombe station. The new facilities will reduce the carbon footprint and improve safety for resort visitors by removing the requirement for rail passengers to use local buses from Northfleet or Greenhithe for Bluewater stations.	Noted
NR 1.2	Network Rail	Land transport	The Kent Route Study proposed a southern access link from the Chatham Main Lines to Ebbsfleet International station which should be revisited ahead of the new link road being constructed as it could be located in a box beneath the road as it is useful for decarbonization.	Noted
NR 1.3	Network Rail	Land transport	In the medium to long-term, it is likely that more trains will be required to run to cater for demand, these could be extended Crossrail services to Ebbsfleet International which could enable direct services to another 26 stations and London Heathrow Airport.	The assessment assumes no Crossrail extension, although this would only be a benefit. An agreed assessment by all relevant stakeholders is being undertaken to identify the required level of mitigation.
NR 1.4	Network Rail	Land transport	Network Rail will continue to work with London Resort Holdings and local stakeholders throughout the development of this project and our North & East Kent Connectivity Continuous Modular Strategic Planning study.	Noted
NR 1.5	Network Rail	Land transport	An Asset Protection Agreement is required to be signed before proceeding with any design or construction work alongside, above or below Network Rail's Infrastructure. Prior to any development/construction or alterations to the site by LRCH, further site-specific safety requirements, engineering technical approval and detailed conditions will need to be sought from Network Rail's Asset Protection teams. For works within Anglia approval will need to be obtained from the Asset Protection Anglia team (AssetProtectionAnglia@networkrail.co.uk) and for works within Kent, approval will need to be obtained from the Asset Protection London South East team (AssetProtectionSouthEast@NetworkRail.co.uk).	Noted
NR 1.6	Network Rail	Land transport	Network Rail have standard protective provisions which will need to be included in the DCO as a minimum. LRCH should therefore contact Janie Thorn -Janie.Thorn@networkrail.co.uk (for the works in Anglia) and Emma Colquhoun - Emma.Colquhoun@networkrail.co.uk (for works within Kent) to request a copy of these and to discuss any other agreements that will need to be entered into with Network Rail.	Noted
NR 1.7	Network Rail	Land transport	A number of legal and commercial agreements will need to be entered into, for example, Asset Protection Agreements (as already stated), Method Statements, Connection Agreements, Property Agreements and all other relevant legal and commercial agreements. This list is not exhaustive and will need to be reviewed once more details of the scheme are discussed between	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			the parties. It should be acknowledged that any easement required in relation to the proposed bridge widening over the railway will need to go through Network Rail's clearance process and other rail industry processes.	
NR 1.8	Network Rail	Land transport	LRCH should be aware that they may be responsible for charges/costs associated to Network Rail's pre-application engagement in relation to the proposed 'The London Resort' project.	Noted
NHS 1.1	NHS Kent and Medway CCG	Human Health	The proposed 500 houses for site workers will impact on primary care and hospital services, as will the growth in visitors and other workers at the Resort, but there is insufficient detail to comment specifically. We would expect a S106 agreement to cover contributions to both primary care and hospital services in respect of this.	Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) considers the impact of the workers (including those living onsite) and visitors on social infrastructure, including health services. Whether any contributions are required will depend on the extent of impact and the on-site medical provision.
PLA 1.1	Port of London	Project description	It remains unclear from the submitted documents the approach that the applicant is taking to consenting in the context of the Port of London Act (1968) ("PLA Act") as amended. Chapter 10 of the PEIR states "the Proposed Development will include a number of marine transportation facilities which will form River Works requiring licencing from the Port of London Authority (PLA)" This implies that a River Works Licence would be sought from the PLA. This directly contradicts the powers sought in the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	The revised draft DCO (document ref 3.1) has clarified the relevant powers
PLA 1.2	Port of London	Project description	Discussions are still required with the PLA to establish the impact and implications of the proposed development on existing licensed works, PLA infrastructure, licences and legal agreements and river users. These need to be fully understood and where necessary mitigated. Any proposals for relocation/removal and/or enhancements should be clearly set out.	Discussions with the PLA on the Preliminary Navigational Risk Assessment 6.2.10.1 and ES Chapter 10 on River Transport (document reference 6.1.10) has clarified matters.
PLA 1.3	Port of London	Project description	The Land Plans set out the land acquisition that is proposed along with the powers sought. In Kent it is proposed to take temporary possession of a large area of the river, which may extend out into the navigable channel. Given the works proposed in the river are limited and the Works Plans show that no works are proposed in the majority of the area where temporary possession is sought, there would appear to be no justification for temporary possession extending this far out or along the River. In the vicinity of Bells and Whites jetty, it is proposed to permanently acquire land under Bells and White's jetty (but not any new jetty), take temporary possession of land and to permanently acquire rights. The hatched area shown on drawing LR-DG-LRS-DCP-003.1 is closer in area to the temporary possession of land the PLA considers the project would require, given the works proposed. It needs to be clarified what permanent rights are sought.	The Order Limits in the River Thames have been significantly reduced.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

PLA 1.4	Port of London	Project description	It is proposed to acquire the land where the PLA's navigational tower and Broadness cruising club are located. Detailed comments on the PLA's navigational equipment is provided in the response to the Scoping Opinion. It is questioned why London Resort are seeking to acquire Broadness Creek when no works appear to be proposed to the Creek. There are a number of vessels moored in the Creek and the impact on licensed works needs to be considered.	A approach has now been discussed regarding the PLA navigational requirements across the Peninsula - this includes sight lines and the radar beacon
PLA 1.5	Port of London	Project description	In Essex, it is proposed to permanently acquire the PLA's riverbed. No justification for the land acquisition or consideration of the implications of the acquisition is provided which is surprising given the existing uses that take place at Tilbury.	Clarification is provided on the extent of works being required at the Tilbury landing stage in the Statement of Reasons (document reference 4.1).
PLA 1.6	Port of London	Project description	The boundary at Northfleet Wharf should be clarified. It is difficult to compare, but it would appear that safeguarded land is included within the Order Limits. It should be clarified whether this is a drafting error. Given the importance of wharves in the sustainable transport of freight, if it is proposed to include part of the wharf within the Order Limits, the reason for its inclusion should be given and an assessment carried out of the impact on the wharf. The Order Limits still need to be overlaid on a PLA chart and still need to be re-drawn to the minimum necessary to deliver the project.	The Order Limits have been revised. Any land within the Order Limits is clarified and the extent of works being required provided in the Statement of Reasons (document reference 4.1).
PLA 1.7	Port of London		<p>Navigational Equipment - The PLA's comments remain as set out in the response to the request for a Scoping Opinion [these comments are as follows]:</p> <p>The Scoping Report refers to a "PLA radar beacon" at paragraph 5.3.1 however, this is not strictly correct. The applicant needs to understand the complex navigational equipment, microwave links and radar site lines that operate across the Peninsula along with the physical lines of sight that the pilots rely on when navigating around the Peninsula. These include:</p> <p>(1) A radar and data communications facility on Broadness Peninsula - this consists of a dual redundant radar transceiver and antenna (including telecommunication links), a backup generator, UKPN electrical service and BT telecom ISDN and telephone landline. The site is also identified by the PLA to include CCTV for vessel tracking, as a future navigation aid.</p> <p>(2) A navigation light (beacon) on Broadness Peninsula which is a fixed reference point relied upon by mariners when they are navigating around the point.</p> <p>(3) Microwave Links from Broadness to Northfleet and Gravesend to Erith</p> <p>(4) Radar sight lines around the Peninsula</p> <p>(5) Pilot lines of sight across the Peninsula</p>	A approach has now been discussed regarding the PLA navigational requirements across the Peninsula - this includes sight lines and the radar beacon

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>All of the above are critical in maintaining the safety of vessels navigating on the River Thames.</p> <p>Whilst it is proposed that the northern part of the site would be landscaped it is not yet clear how the PLA's radar and data communications facility would fit in with the development. The applicant may be aware that when the Millennium Dome was built at Greenwich Peninsula, this resulted in the PLA's Charlton Radar being re-built (at the applicant's expense) providing a new facility that complements the new surrounding within which it is now located. Has the applicant given any consideration to this? How will uninterrupted access to this facility and to the navigation light be provided for the PLA by cars, lorries and occasionally large cranes to ensure that emergency repairs and routine maintenance can be undertaken? How will power supply be maintained? Is there any scope through the application to get a potable main water supply and connection to a mains foul sewer to the PLA's facilities?</p>	
<p>PLA 1.8</p>	<p>Port of London</p>		<p>Navigational Equipment - The Illustrative Parameter Plans show proposed heights/massing for the various areas within the Order Limits. It has been established that there will be impacts on the PLA's navigational equipment and lines of sight and discussions are taking place as to how the impacts could be mitigated. The mitigation currently being discussed is wide ranging but could include the potential relocation of equipment to a higher point within the Order Limits. Discussions have also been taking place regarding the need for tighter defined parameters across the areas of the site where the PLA's navigational equipment and lines of sight might be affected to ensure that any subsequent re-development of buildings/rides does not cause an impact.</p> <p>It is not clear whether any temporary buildings would be proposed in the landscaped area (it would appear that one permanent building is) and what the extent of the earth berm improvements and extension would be (it is of note that previous piles of excavated materials stockpiled on the site have caused detrimental impacts on the PLA's navigational equipment). It needs to be ensured that the earth berm improvements and extension do not slope toward the radar site and any associated access routes.</p> <p>Additionally, in the absence of detailed information, the PLA cannot be certain at this stage that the proposed development, will not detrimentally affect the microwave links and require the relocation of the radar to a higher point, so that navigation along the river is not affected.</p> <p>Pilots coming from the lower reaches of the River benefit from having clear sightlines across the peninsula. The Applicant should plot these sightlines</p>	<p>A approach has now been discussed regarding the PLA navigational requirements across the Peninsula - this includes sight lines and the radar beacon</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>over the proposed development to demonstrate how they will remain unaffected by the proposal.</p> <p>Other considerations include the flexibility sought by the applicant to change rides and attractions over time. How will it be ensured that future proposals for the site will not have a detrimental impact on the PLA's navigational equipment? Additionally, it is noted that a helipad is now sought on the site. An assessment of this on the PLA's navigational equipment will also be required.</p> <p>Finally, the Harbour Master has highlighted how consideration needs to be given to the general lighting on the peninsula and how any glare etc might affect navigation. Coloured flashing lights within the Order Limits might cause confusion with the Northfleet sector light and other aids to navigation.</p>	
PLA 1.9	Port of London	Project description	<p>Juxtaposition - The PLA's comments remain as set out in the response to the request for a Scoping Opinion [these comments are as follows]: As can be seen on figure 5.1 there are wharves in close proximity to the Order Limits. These wharves handle a range of goods which vary from aggregates to paper products and a number of them are safeguarded through the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (see policies CS07 and CS11) and the Kent County Council Minerals and Waste Local plan (2013-2030) (see policy CSM6).</p> <p>The noise, air quality, transport and lighting chapter of the ES must consider the juxtaposition issues associated with placing new development in close proximity to operational wharves. In particular, the scoping report identifies how any on-site sensitive receptors (such as hotels) have the potential to be affected by operational noise.</p> <p>When undertaking the noise assessment, it must be undertaken using both BS 8233 and BS 4142. This is because when assessing noise of an industrial nature, from premises such as wharves, the assessments require that the 'rating level' of the noise is determined. The rating level is the noise emission level plus a correction (which is determined using the provisions of BS 4142) for the character of the noise, which can then be compared to the background sound level (BS 4142) or guideline values (BS 8233). It is recommended that the wharf operators are contacted prior to any baseline monitoring noise monitoring taking place to ensure that representative noise levels will be obtained.</p>	<p>The Order Limits have been significantly revised as applied to the River Thames. The juxtaposition of uses in close proximity to the London Resort are considered in the assessments contained in the ES, including Chapter 11 on Landscape and Visual Effects (document reference 6.1.11) and Chapter 15 on Noise and Vibration (document reference 6.1.15).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

PLA 1.10	Port of London	Noise and Vibration	<p>Juxtaposition - The noise and vibration chapter of the PEIR highlights how it is a preliminary assessment of noise and vibration associated with the Proposed Development. i.e. there is still no specific consideration of the impact of existing noise associated with the wharves etc on the proposed development. Whilst it is appreciated there will be noise associated with the proposed development, wharves often operate 24/7 with the tides so there may well be operations occurring at night. It needs to be ensured that the potential for complaints from the staff accommodation / hotels and visitors to the quieter landscaped areas does not result in nuisance complaints being made against the wharves which could ultimately result in their working hours being adversely affected.</p> <p>It is noted that baseline ambient noise levels have been established around the proposed development. It is not clear if these noise levels have been cross checked with the wharf operators to establish whether representative noise levels of their operations were obtained. This is standard practice for development in the vicinity of a wharf. What adjustment was made for the nature of the noise from wharves?</p>	The juxtaposition of uses in close proximity to the London Resort are considered in the assessments contained in the ES, including Chapter 15 on Noise and Vibration (document reference 6.1.15).
PLA 1.11	Port of London	River transport	Whilst the PLA welcomes a specific chapter on river transport and is in discussions with the Applicant regarding the scope of the navigational risk assessment, it would appear that the river transport chapter has been written after the marine ecology chapter as there is a discrepancy in vessel movements expected. There is also conflicting information about the need for dredging.	Please see the latest River Transport chapter in the ES (document ref 6.1.10)
PLA 1.12	Port of London	River transport	It is stated at paragraph 10.61 of the River Transport chapter that “The proposals will not affect the operation of the existing Tilbury to Gravesend Ferry as neither the physical infrastructure nor vessel movements for the London Resort will infringe on the route of the ferry.” This is not correct. The ferry berths on the inside face of the existing infrastructure and access/egress to its mooring point could be affected both during construction and during operation. In addition, the dDCO seeks powers to extinguish the public right of navigation, which if implemented at Tilbury could impact on the operation of the ferry. See comments about Article 41 attached.	Consultation has been undertaken with the Gravesend to Tilbury ferry operator (currently Jetstream), the Port of Tilbury and Kent County Council to ensure that the proposals for Tilbury to resort ferry do not compromise the continued operation of the Gravesend to Tilbury ferry.
PLA 1.13	Port of London	River transport	There is also reference in the Transport Chapter of the PEIR (paragraph 9.226) to the PLA consenting dredging. The PLA also consents various other aspects (works, safety and navigational lighting) of the project, which are also relevant to the PEIR/EIA in the best design and impacts that need to be assessed.	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

PLA 1.14	Port of London	River transport	The PLA welcomes the reference at paragraph 5.75 of the PEIR to the London Resort being net carbon neutral once operational. This should extend to the decarbonisation of the vessels (service and passenger transport) and the PLA looks forward to working with the Applicant on this aspect of the Proposed Development.	Noted
PLA 1.15	Port of London	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The PLA would also welcome discussions with the Applicant to create on site and off site estuary habitat (intertidal) net gain. The PLA would like to see a natural approach to habitat creation rather than simply the provision of terraces which are designed to compensate in areas of vertical walls.	Further consideration of habitat creation is included in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13).
PLA 1.16	Port of London	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The PLA would also draw attention to the impact of current vessel practices on water quality (sewage discharges) and wash for sensitive sites (West Thurrock) already suffering from impacts of coastal squeeze. The impact on other areas of priority habitat such as mudflats also needs to be assessed.	This assessment is included in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13).
PLA 1.17	Port of London	Air Quality	Paragraph 10.28 of the PEIR identifies that additional vessel movements will bring with it an increase in vessel emissions. Once the data is available and modelled it should be used to inform the air quality impacts of construction and operation. The PLA's Clean Air Strategy aims to reduce harmful emissions to air from marine sources within the tidal Thames, whilst facilitating the Port and London's sustainable growth. This will require everyone to play their part to reduce emissions, including London Resort.	The impact of vessel emissions has been assessed qualitatively in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16).
PLA 1.18	Port of London	River transport	Given the length of the project, long term planning is required which looks to future proof the proposed development to facilitate low carbon transport and provides enough energy for future charging of vessels if required and/or provides space for alternative fuel provision. These future changes may result in changes in vessel design and for example, vessel draft which could impact on the design of the in-river infrastructure. The PLA would draw attention to the likely projected technologies in the inland roadmap (www.pla.co.uk/environment).	There is no proposed habitable development within 500m of the Swanscombe and Northfleet Wastewater Treatment Works, therefore any assessment has been scoped out.
PLA 1.19	Port of London	Greenhouse gases and climate change	The impact of climate change will require full assessment. For example, changes in the operation of the Thames Barrier and increased extreme sea conditions, fog and winds and drops in tide could all have an impact which must be assessed and mitigated where possible. The PLA produces periodic climate adaptation plans to consider general aspects of port operations and the Environment Agency (EA) also makes predictions both of which the Applicant may find beneficial to review.	The impacts of climate change have been assessed within the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.20). In addition, each ES chapter includes a section on climate change and how this may affect their assessment and conclusions.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

PLA 1.20	Port of London	River transport	Paragraph 10.64 of the PEIR identifies how it is not possible at this point to determine the residual effects of the London Resort but that post-mitigation residual effects are predicted to be 'not significant'. Given the current and the largely unknown proposed vessel movements to the application sites, the lack of assessment to date and the issues outline above, the PLA considers that it is not possible to reach this conclusion without a full and proper assessment being carried out. To assist the Applicant's assessment, the PLA would advise that baseline shipping inventory emissions are available from the PLA as well as predictions of annual emissions from the passenger vessels, and local (and relevant) diffusion tube data.	Noted and included in the River Transport Chapter in the Environment Statement (document ref 6.1.10)
PLA 1.21	Port of London	Relevant law and policy	Table 13.1 sets out a summary of legislation and conventions of relevance to the proposed development. It is worth noting that the PLA is also the lighthouse authority and the positioning of lights on new or refurbished structures will be of interest to both navigational safety and ecology.	We have assessed whole life carbon (including construction stage embodied carbon) within the ES Chapter 20, Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document reference 6.1.20). Once at the detailed design stage, a whole life carbon assessment will be undertaken for each building to identify opportunities to reduce embodied carbon through design, material specification and construction processes.
PLA 1.22	Port of London	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Table 13.9 sets out the surveys carried out or to be carried out at both the Kent and Essex project sites in 2020. The PLA recommends, given the proposed extent of change at both marine sites, that there should be fish surveys undertaken at the Essex project site as well, or a strong justification should be provided for not carrying them out. It is questioned whether any of the sampling proposed/undertaken is going to be analysed for contaminants as well as composition and ecology? Much of the habitat on the Thames helps consolidate contaminants away from impacting water quality so this could help inform the planned enhancements. Also, the gradient of the mudflats that were sampled could help appraise the condition/value of the existing habitat.	Fish survey consultation has been undertaken and agreed no further fish surveys required. Further detail is provided in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13).
PLA 1.23	Port of London	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	It would be helpful to know from the data presented in figure 13.1 how strategically the surveys have been placed in relation to the Order Limits to help inform the impact on 'enhancement' of the flood defences and existing marsh habitat around the peninsula. There are many strong patches all the way around the area which should not be considered as gain for this project, unless they are also being removed and then they must be replaced at higher value habitat for longer areas. A net gain assessment should be provided in order that the actual impacts can be established.	As above

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

PLA 1.24	Port of London	River transport	Figure 13.2 raises issues of consistency in terms of what is proposed in the marine environment and its assessment. A ro-ro slipway is shown in a location that has not been discussed with the PLA. The ro-ro slipway is located within Work no. 14a yet the description of this Work in the dDCO makes no reference to river infrastructure. An area is shown as the Tilbury mooring area but such a facility has not been discussed with the PLA and as can be seen from figure 13.2 this is an extensively used facility and mooring would need to be carefully considered and managed i.e. it would not be possible to simply moor anywhere in this area.	Noted - Buro Happold are liaising with the Port of London
PLA 1.25	Port of London	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	Table 13.11 asserts that saltmarsh is only present at the Kent Project site, however in Essex there are saltmarsh areas adjacent that will be affected by a change in operation. This could be an opportunity to create more saltmarsh in this area.	Noted.
PLA 1.26	Port of London	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The marine ecology chapter mentions a water source heat pump, an extension of Bell's wharf into the river for the ferry terminal and a slipway to facilitate Ro-Ro traffic . The physical works will be subject to hydrodynamic and sediment transport modelling. The PLA would like to see the detailed scope of works for assessing this operation from a regime perspective as this has potential to affect a much larger area through the impacts of wash on the intertidal area, a number of which are protected.	A sediment modelling assessment has now been completed and results incorporated into the assessment in Chapter 13 of the ES (document reference 6.1.13).
PLA 1.27	Port of London	Water resources and flood risk	It is not clear if dredging is required and if it is, the worse case scenario needs to be assessed. The PLA will need to advise as soon as possible on the sampling requirements to facilitate a full and complete WFD, MCZ Assessment and EIA. It should also be confirmed if any dredging is required for the extension at Tilbury.	Engagement with the PLA is ongoing and a complete WFD and EIA have been undertaken for the application.
PLA 1.28	Port of London	Relevant law and policy	Security and Safety Provisions - The PLA reiterates its comments on this topic and would draw attention to the guidance that it has recently published with the support of the Tidal Thames Water Safety Forum members and marine engineers regarding the provision of life saving equipment on riparian site: www.pla.co.uk/watersafety	Noted
PLA 1.29	Port of London	Project description	The PLA would also emphasise the desire to see the new section of the England Coast Path provided within the Order Limits and the need for the DCO to secure its provision.	The Coastal Path is included, and discussions with Natural England and others on the details

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

POTL 1.1	Port of Tilbury London	Project development and alternatives	PoTLL does object to any attempt through the draft DCO to obtain powers to compulsorily acquire any PoTLL land or rights across this land; or any powers that will circumvent any of PoTLL's powers and abilities to operate as a statutory undertaker. PoTLL considers that the exercise of these powers would potentially cause a serious detriment to the carrying on of PoTLL's undertaking, within the meaning of section 127.	These are matters being discussed with the Port of Tilbury London (POTL) as part of commercial arrangements
POTL 1.2	Port of Tilbury London	Project description	PoTLL will also wish to agree with the Applicant how their proposed uses interact with port-related operations including the operation of the Cruise Terminal and its jetty and associated car parking and vessel movements to and from the existing Port of Tilbury and Tilbury2.	These are matters being discussed with the Port of Tilbury London (PoTLL) as part of commercial arrangements
POTL 1.3	Port of Tilbury London	Project description	At the present time in the description of development contained in Chapter 5 of the PEIR, there is no mention of Work Nos. 21b or 22. Nor is there any mention of 'flood defence works' on the Essex Project Site identified in Work no. 16. Further detail on this will be needed for the application, to be discussed with PoTLL in advance.	The proposed flood defence works are captured in Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) on Water Resources & Flood Risk. The various Works Plans have been updated.
POTL 1.4	Port of Tilbury London	Project development and alternatives	PoTLL will wish to discuss with the Applicant the extent of the DCO boundary to ensure, such as it affects PoTLL land, that this is no larger than necessary to accommodate the proposed car parking. For example, it is noted that the DCO boundary extends to the west of Fort Road into PoTLL land, including the use of internal port roads – PoTLL will wish to understand why this is necessary.	The Order Limits have been discussed and agreed with PoTLL.
POTL 1.5	Port of Tilbury London	Cultural heritage and archaeology	Moreover, it is considered that more detail will in particular be needed as to the proposals for the Riverside Terminal and the proposed Marine Infrastructure to allow for the full assessment of the Proposed Development on the heritage asset and on the operation of the Riverside Terminal when cruise ships are on the berth. The Applicant, working with PoTLL, will need to devise solutions for the movement of large volumes of pedestrians across Ferry Road from the car park to the Riverside Terminal.	Noted
POTL 1.6	Port of Tilbury London	Project development and alternatives	PoTLL notes that the statutory consultation materials include a draft version of the DCO for London Resort; but that within this draft DCO, no provision is made for Protective Provisions for the benefit of PoTLL. As a statutory undertaker affected by the proposals, PoTLL would expect such protective provisions to be included in the DCO that is submitted with the application for the DCO. PoTLL would be happy to discuss the drafting of such protective provisions with the Applicant. However as a starting point, it would expect them to provide that the following powers currently set out in the current draft DCO would not be able to be utilised to the extent that they are required on	The draft DCO is being discussed with PoTLL including the protective provisions.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>PoTLL's land or would affect PoTLL's statutory undertaking without PoTLL's consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • article 13: Street works; • article 18: Access to and from streets; • article 21: Protective work to buildings; • article 22: Authority to survey and investigate land; • article 23: Compulsory acquisition of land; • article 24: Power to override easements and other rights; • article 26: Compulsory acquisition of rights and imposition of restrictive covenants; • article 27: Private rights over land; • article 31: Acquisition of subsoil or airspace only; • article 32: Rights under or over streets; • article 33: Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised development; • article 34: Temporary use of land for maintaining the authorised development; • article 35: Statutory undertakers; and • article 36: Apparatus and rights of statutory undertakers in stopped up streets; <p>PoTLL would expect the protective provisions to deal with a wider range of issues such as (but not limited to) the following (in respect of its undertaking):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approval of 'plans' and construction methodologies (as discussed below); • providing scope for protective works if considered necessary by PoTLL; • provision of indemnities and costs recovery for PoTLL as statutory undertaker and particularly as harbour authority; and • protection against sediment accumulation and erosion. 	
POTL 1.7	Port of Tilbury London	Project development and alternatives	<p>PoTLL also note that articles 52 and 53 of the draft DCO provided at consultation provide for the Applicant to be able to dis-apply local enactments and to create new byelaws; with the latter referring in particular to prospective byelaws to regulate activities within the River Thames.</p> <p>As the Applicant may be aware, there are byelaws that apply within the port limits of Port of Tilbury, and there are also other byelaws that apply to Tilbury2 by virtue of the DCO for that project. These byelaws would be potentially affected by the use of these articles 52 and 53 powers; as could the use of PoTLL's statutory undertaking generally.</p> <p>PoTLL would therefore welcome the opportunity to discuss the need for and scope of these powers with the Applicant but in the first instance does not accept that they should apply within its port limits.</p>	The draft DCO is being discussed with PoTLL including the bylaws

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

POTL 1.8	Port of Tilbury London		<p>PoTLL also notes that the draft DCO provided at consultation does not appear to set out how the Proposed Development will interact with the existing regulatory regime within the River Thames, as modified in respect of Port of Tilbury. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is surprising to see that there is not included a 'Works in the River Thames – conditions' article that has been found in previous River Thames-related DCOs such as Tilbury2, Silvertown Tunnel and the Thames Tideway Tunnel (and which we would expect would include a role for PoTLL); • it is not clear how the proposals would interact with the Port of London Act 1968 (as amended by the Port of Tilbury Transfer Scheme 1991 Confirmation Order 1992 and further amended by the Tilbury2 DCO, in its application to the Port of Tilbury) and which the PLA is developing further changes to through a proposed Harbour Revision Order; • it is not clear how the proposals will interact with the existing River Works Licences that apply to the existing marine structures at the Riverside Terminal; and • it is not clear under what auspices any necessary dredging and scour protection would be carried out, as there is no explicit provision for it within the DCO but only within the DML – PoTLL would expect to have some say on the extent and undertaking of such dredging. <p>Clarity is needed on these points and PoTLL would expect the Applicant to discuss these points with it prior to submission of the application for the Proposed Development.</p>	The draft DCO is being discussed with PoTLL including other regulations
POTL 1.9	Port of Tilbury London	Project description	In respect of the DCO, PoTLL wishes to discuss with the Applicant why it has classified Work No 3b, the multi storey car park that will be built on PoTLL's statutory undertaking, as part of the NSIP within Schedule 1 of the DCO, rather than as 'Associated Development', given, as the Applicant will understand, that this has the potential to limit the flexibility as how this land can be used in the future.	The draft DCO (document ref 3.1) has been revised to reflect the principal and associated elements
POTL 1.10	Port of Tilbury London	Project description	Chapter 5 - The PEIR at para. 5.13 describes the Essex Project Site as lying “immediately to the east of the port of Tilbury” and at para. 5.18 as lying “between the ports of Tilbury and Tilbury2.” PoTLL wish to clarify that the majority of the Essex Project Site is part of the Port’s operational estate, with the exception of those parts that are public highway.	The project description is set out in ES Chapter 3 (document ref 6.1.3)
POTL 1.11	Port of Tilbury London	Project description	Chapter 5 - As noted above, some of the works identified in the draft DCO on the Essex Project Site do not appear to be discussed in the PEIR. The extent of works beyond the construction of the multi-storey car parks needs to be clarified and discussed with PoTLL.	The project description is set out in ES Chapter 3 (document ref 6.1.3)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

POTL 1.12	Port of Tilbury London	Project description	Chapter 5 - PoTLL notes and welcomes the intention to provide a Construction Method Statement (CMS) incorporating a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP). PoTLL considers these should be considered in some detail through the application process itself and would want to have a role in the approval of the final documents to ensure the maximum use of the river and Port for construction as well as ensuring that construction methodologies are acceptable in the context of Port operations on and in the vicinity of the Essex project Site.	Noted.
POTL 1.13	Port of Tilbury London	Project description	Chapter 5 - PoTLL considers that the Essex Project Site, and the Port more generally, could play a role in servicing the Resort, whether by providing staff car parking, materials required for operation, or the facility to accommodate recyclable waste streams arising from the development.	These matters are under discussion between LRCH and PoTLL
POTL 1.14	Port of Tilbury London	Land transport	Chapter 9 - The description of the existing highway network will need to be updated to reflect the completion of the new lengths of highway infrastructure constructed pursuant to the Tilbury2 DCO that are located within the vicinity of the Essex Project Site.	Agreed and updated
POTL 1.15	Port of Tilbury London	Land transport	Chapter 9 - At present there is no baseline assessment of highway conditions on the north side of the river. The PEIR accepts that at this time, the highway impacts of the proposals north of the river are unknown and will need to be assessed within the Transport Assessment and the ES Transport Chapter. The assessment will need to take into account Tilbury2 operating at full capacity.	Details of the highway conditions north of the river and the impacts and proposed mitigation are included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
POTL 1.16	Port of Tilbury London	Land transport	Chapter 9 - The PEIR notes at para. 9.121 that the documents related to the Tilbury2 DCO include a Transport Assessment of the local links and roads in the area of Port of Tilbury. It is accepted that information from that TA will be of assistance albeit the baseline has clearly changed given the opening of Tilbury2 itself. It should be noted that the Transport Assessment which formed part of the Tilbury2 DCO application was subject to review and updating through the Examination of the Tilbury2 DCO and a series of technical notes following on from its submission will also be relevant. PoTLL will have further engagement with the Applicant in this regard.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) is based upon the latest available traffic data and information.
POTL 1.17	Port of Tilbury London	Land transport	Chapter 9 - It is noted that the “Asda Roundabout” on the A1089 to the north of the Port of Tilbury has been included in the draft Order Limits for the London Resort DCO in case the traffic assessment reveals a need for physical highway enhancements. This junction is on the main access to the Port of Tilbury (including Tilbury2). An early understanding of traffic impacts (and any associated environmental effects) on this junction is clearly important to the Proposed Development and to PoTLL to ensure that there is no adverse impact on access to the Port. As highlighted above, PoTLL have recently undertaken safety improvements to this junction associated with	Details of a proposed improvement to mitigate the impact at the Asda roundabout are included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			the Tilbury2 development and will wish to ensure that both highway conditions and safety are not adversely affected by additional traffic associated with the London Resort.	
POTL 1.18	Port of Tilbury London	Land transport	Chapter 9 - PoTLL considers that the potential for visitors to arrive at Tilbury station and be transferred to ferry services by bus should be explored and maximised. PoTLL has long supported the use of public transport including rail, bus and the Tilbury-Gravesend ferry and supporting public transport infrastructure on the north side of the river should be integral to the Proposed Development.	Agreed - a shuttle bus service is proposed from Tilbury station to the Park and Glide ferry service
POTL 1.19	Port of Tilbury London	Land transport	Chapter 10 - It is noted at para. 10.25 that the NRA will cover a 6 mile stretch of the River Thames between Tilbury Landing Stage and QEII Bridge. PoTLL considers this should be extended to past the Tilbury2 jetty to ensure that construction stage movements are taken into account, which are likely to use the CMAT jetty at Tilbury2. The assessment will need to take account of the forecast increase in vessel movements at Tilbury2.	A Navigation Risk Assessment (document ref 6.2.10.1) has been prepared and is included in the Environment Statement
POTL 1.20	Port of Tilbury London	Cultural Heritage/ Archaeology	Chapter 14 - The PEIR recognises the value and importance of the Riverside Station that is owned and maintained by PoTLL. The PEIR describes it as 'unused' but PoTLL does make use of the space for various activities including community activities and conferencing. PoTLL have invested in the building, maintaining its heritage integrity. PoTLL note that at para. 14.126 the Applicant states that the proposals for the building are at an early stage. Clearly, PoTLL will wish to have further detailed discussions with the Applicant to ensure that the proposals are brought forward with a detailed appreciation of the value of the asset and a full understanding of the future maintenance regime and responsibilities.	Noted and LRCH looks forward to a continued close working relationship with Port of Tilbury Ltd as the application progresses
POTL 1.21	Port of Tilbury London	Cultural Heritage/ Archaeology	Chapter 14 - Para. 14.155 considers the potential impact of the proposed car parking on the Essex Project Site on Tilbury Fort. PoTLL notes that there are buildings between Tilbury Fort and the area for the proposed car park structure, but that the proposed parameters allow for buildings which are likely to exceed the height of these intervening buildings. However, PoTLL agrees that this area of the Port does not make a positive contribution to the setting of the Fort and also agrees broadly that the car park buildings will result in a medium magnitude of effect resulting in a moderate adverse effect.	Noted and welcomed
POTL 1.22	Port of Tilbury London	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	Chapter 21 - The PEIR does not set out a list of cumulative projects; nor does it include a preliminary Cumulative Effects Assessment. A list of Cumulative Projects was included in the Applicant's Scoping Report.	These matters are included in the ES as specific chapters and then in Chapter 21, Cumulative and In-combination Effects (document reference 6.1.21).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

POTL 1.23	Port of Tilbury London	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	Chapter 21 - PoTLL would advise that Tilbury2 needs to be fully taken into account in the EIA process, whether as part of the baseline or as a cumulative project. As noted above, Tilbury2 will be largely complete by Spring 2021 and may therefore be better considered as part of the baseline rather than a future baseline or cumulative project, providing on-going baseline survey work can take account of its operational effects. PoTLL will liaise further with the Applicant regarding future port growth and expansion potential.	The information on Tilbury 2 will be kept under review as the project is delivered.
POTL 1.24	Port of Tilbury London	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	Chapter 21 - As set out in the Applicant's Scoping Report, the Lower Thames Crossing should be considered as a cumulative project. This is clearly of particular importance in respect of the strategic highway network but also the local access arrangements to Port of Tilbury and the proposed car parking for the Proposed Development at the Essex Project Site, including any potential changes to traffic flows at the Asda roundabout.	The Lower Thames Crossing is addressed in the ES Chapter 9 (document ref 6.1.9) on Land Transport and the accompanying Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
POTL 1.25	Port of Tilbury London	Cumulative, in-combination and transboundary effects	Chapter 21 - PoTLL note that an application for a gas fired power station known as Thurrock Flexible Generation Plant, located to the east of Tilbury2, has recently been accepted by the Secretary of State for examination under the Planning Act 2008. This is located some 1.5km east of the Essex Project Site but may give rise to cumulative effects on environmental topics including landscape and heritage. It will also need to be considered in respect of traffic assessments, particularly the operation of the Asda Roundabout, which will play a key role for that project during construction as vehicles will access that site via the A1089 and Tilbury2.	The Thurrock Power Station project is addressed in the relevant ES chapters and included in the Schemes for Cumulative Assessment (document reference 6.2.14.11).
SPC 1.1	Shone Parish Council	Project development and alternatives	<p>For several reasons we disagree with the selection of Swanscombe as a suitable site. Various aspects contrast unfavourably with the situations usually found at major theme park locations. We consider that the choice should be revisited:</p> <p>Physical constraints: The proposed location is a roughly triangular, spatially constrained site that is distant from the A2, the critically important major road network access route. It is locally constrained by potentially remaining environmentally sensitive areas ("Black Duck, Broadness and Botany Marshes") and hemmed in by the River Thames on two sides. The only direct road access is via a narrow corridor that includes environmentally protected areas of the Ebbsfleet Valley and essential local road access to the Dartford-Gravesend Road, Ebbsfleet International station, residential areas, schools and health centres.</p> <p>The "wrong" side of London: Being on the east side of London, it is further away from the bulk of the catchment population. There is only a two-track railway line which serves a multitude of other functions. The site is close to and will rely on some of the busiest roads in the country, being the M25 and A282, and the A2 and A13. Some use of river transport and ferries is</p>	The site selection process, including other site options identified and reviewed, is set out in ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4) and supporting documentation.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			<p>proposed. Site selection: The documents refer to other sites considered but it is not clear whether they were genuinely considered before choosing Swanscombe or whether they have been included subsequently to retrospectively justify the choice. We are unable to assess the comparative suitability of most of the sites, however we disagree with several of the RAG ratings for Kent sites including for the Environmental and Transport/Access ratings of the Swanscombe site itself, which in our view are definitely “Red”. Closeness to residential areas: Nearby residential areas will be directly damaged by increased air and noise pollution, litter and traffic and parking. Noise mitigation measures cannot be applied to high, open rides with screaming users. They will also be overshadowed and overlooked by massive buildings that will negatively impact their amenity and privacy. Loss of local businesses: The Peninsula area presently houses a variety of local businesses that are used by residents. These will be displaced but there is no detail or provision as to where. Project drift over time: The project has drifted considerably in size and scope from what was originally proposed, hence another reason why suitability of the site should be revisited. Local housing supply: It is mentioned that 500 staff accommodation flats will be built but an effect of the project will be for local housing to be lost to local residents if instead taken by incoming workers. This will exacerbate the overall supply, price residents out of the area and lead to extra demand for housing in currently green areas. Traffic: The site chosen is possibly one of the worst areas in the country for excessive traffic, only worsening year by year.</p>	
SPC 1.2	Shone Parish Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>Closeness to environmental protection areas on Swanscombe Peninsula: It will not be possible to build something so massive, in a constrained space immediately next to supposedly protected environmental areas and to expect that those areas will survive. The foundations will be very deep, which is likely to cause dewatering of adjacent/nearby land. Direct pollution, including noise, and indirect effects of increased public access will destroy them physically and bird populations will be deterred.</p>	All direct and indirect impacts on habitats and species have been fully assessed within the Chapter 12 of the ES (Document 6.1.12)
SPC 1.3	Shone Parish Council	Marine ecology and biodiversity	<p>Effect on recommended Marine Conservation Zone: This will be compromised by direct pollution from the site itself and also from suggested increased river traffic and ferries. This pollution will also have effects downstream and anywhere it is carried to by tides.</p>	All direct and indirect impacts on the Marine Conservation Zone have been fully assessed within the Chapter 13 of the ES (Document 6.1.13)
SPC 1.4	Shone Parish Council	Cumulative, in-combination, and transboundary effects	<p>Effect on Ebbsfleet Valley: This will be directly impacted by road building, air and noise pollution, and litter</p>	A Construction Method Statement (document ref 6.2.3.1) identifies the approach to the delivery of the Access Road. This seeks to minimise disturbance on the Ebbsfleet Valley.
SPC 1.5	Shone Parish Council	Landscape and visual effects	<p>More distant environmental impacts: The vast size of the buildings, up to 20 storeys from the sketches, will have visual impact over a very wide area. This</p>	Chapter 11 of the ES (document reference 6.1.11) and accompanying Appendices assesses the potential

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			includes views from high ground in Gravesend, Shorne Woods Country Park, The North Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the North Kent Marshes Special Protection Area and the Ramsar Site.	impact upon landscape and visual amenity including from the Kent Downs AONB.
SPC 1.6	Shone Parish Council	Utilities	Utilities supplies unable to meet demand: Water supply in the area is already a problem due to housebuilding. The project, including 500 4-6 bedroomed staff flats and 3550 multi-occupancy hotel rooms let alone several million visitors per year, will use massive amounts of clean water but the amount required, and whether it can be supplied, is not discussed. The possible use of “grey water” is mentioned but the uses that this can be put to are limited, especially outside of a single household. It will require treatment plants and storage. Electricity requirement will also be vast, and will require a major substation and cabled feed, as well as back-up generators, which tend to cause pollution.	Water efficiency measures and measures to reduce demand or recycle have been described in the proposed Utilities Statement (LR-DG-BUR-REP-807.0). The strategy for delivering water supply to the project site with minimal impact to surrounding users and the environment are currently being worked through with Thames Water. Water demand and its implications in an area of water stress has been assessed at an appropriate granularity in the Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.
SPC 1.7	Shone Parish Council	Materials, energy and waste	Refuse and other disposal: The site will generate vast amounts of refuse which will require secure temporary storage and then removal from the site. The routes for these require definition. The site will generate large amounts of foul drainage including oils and sewage, there is no discussion about the location of treatment plants and any discharge points.	The disposal of waste from the development is assessed within Chapter 19 of the ES (document reference 6.1.19) - Waste and Materials ES Chapter (Chapter 19) and the foul drainage for the site and treatment plants are assessed within Chapter 17 of the ES (document reference 6.1.17) - Water Resources and Flood Risk.
SPC 1.8	Shone Parish Council	Land transport	Parking provision in Kent: The plans include 8,000 parking spaces (7,500 visitor and 500 for staff), plus 150 more for coaches and 350 more for motorbikes in Kent. This equates to a vast number of traffic movements per day, all of which will be funnelling to and from the A2, which will compromise its function. Parking instead at Ebbsfleet International Station needs to be prevented.	LRCH have undertaken a worst case private vehicle assessment using a mode share calculated from car parking accumulation. The Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) will incentivise transport by active and sustainable modes. An off-site parking strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-Y) has been written to outline the management of people parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Discussions have been ongoing on this point with KCC and it should be noted that the car parking at Ebbsfleet is primarily for commuter traffic which will be parked in advance of the Resort opening.
SPC 1.9	Shone Parish Council	River transport	Parking provision in Essex, and “Park and Glide”: Another 2500 spaces at Tilbury are supposed to feed into the “Park and Glide” system of river crossings. There needs to be some realism about use of this in colder, wetter, windy or foggy weather and the conflict with commercial river traffic. Even with several boats, the number of people who can be carried per hour at peak times will be constrained.	Thames clipper operational stats show that it is only not operational four days a year due to bad weather. A management strategy will be put in place to mitigate against this as discussed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). LRCH has been in dialogue with the Port of London Authority and existing

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				<p>river operators who have indicated the ability to serve the resort by both barge for construction / operation and passenger service vehicles. A Navigation Risk Assessment (document ref 6.2.10.1) has been undertaken to identify any potential hazards along with appropriate mitigation that could arise from river traffic associated with the Resort. The River Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-U) will allow for use of services by the general public in addition to visitors of London Resort and could be used as an alternative for commuters (who will generally be travelling in the opposite direction to London Resort visitors). The Transport Assessment, alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel.</p>
SPC 1.10	Shone Parish Council	River transport	<p>Ferries from central London: This is another good concept but the practicality, and numbers of people who can be carried, also requires increased realism. Experience of this at the Millennium Dome was not good.</p>	<p>The River Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-U) incorporates the Swanscombe to central London service calling at numerous piers between Westminster and Woolwich, detailed information is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), including an indicative timetable. Thames Clipper achieves a 5% mode share at events at the O2, but consider a 15% mode share target is achievable for the Resort. That being said, the traffic assessment assumes a lower mode share for robustness</p>
SPC 1.11	Shone Parish Council	Land transport	<p>Parking problems for local residents: Visitors (and staff) will unfortunately do anything for their own convenience and to avoid parking charges. This will cause problems for local residents in streets where there is already competition for parking and often single way traffic as a result. Controlled parking zones in a wide area would be essential.</p>	<p>An off-site parking strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-Y) has been written to outline the management of people parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)</p>
SPC 1.12	Shone Parish Council	Land transport	<p>Access problems for local residents: There will be major traffic conflicts with local residents and others more distantly wanting to access homes, schools, Ebbsfleet station, Bluewater regional shopping centre plus commuting and the Channel Tunnel and Ports. Also shopping destinations north of the river. Local residents have rights not to have their lives compromised by the project.</p>	<p>The access strategy has been designed to keep Resort traffic off local roads. The only vehicular access to the Resort for visitors is via the new dedicated Resort access road from the A2 Ebbsfleet junction. Furthermore, the assessments have been undertaken on the busier days of the year meaning the vast majority of days at the resort will see significantly less traffic than modelled.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

SPC 1.13	Shone Parish Council	Land transport	<p>Access to, use of and parking at Ebbsfleet International station: Ebbsfleet International Station does not belong to the Project. It is an essential asset for local residents who need to get there in a timely fashion and be able to park. If use of the station becomes constrained then there will be secondary consequences in Gravesend and Rochester.</p>	<p>One of the reasons for selecting the Project Site was its accessibility via a range of transport modes and connectivity to London and major European cities. Promoting sustainable transport options is a key part of the transport strategy. Ebbsfleet International Station will provide the gateway to the London Resort for the majority of visitors arriving by rail, whether on HS1 from Central London or the Eurostar from Europe. The station will also provide an interchange for bus routes serving the wider local community, including existing villages and emerging development as part of the Ebbsfleet Garden City. A new transport interchange will be developed to the west of Ebbsfleet International Station which will include a 'pick up and drop off' area for the London Resort people mover, bus stops for Fastrack, and a cycle hire facility. Ebbsfleet is not being promoted as a parking option for visitors to the London Resort. Further information is available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)</p>
SPC 1.14	Shone Parish Council	Land transport	<p>New access road: Despite the many years during which it has been discussed, the design of the new access road remains unclear as it is only shown in fuzzy and small-scale drawings. Confidence is not inspired that it will function adequately in practice. It takes a large amount of additional land. There is a risk of traffic backing up across the gyratory and so compromising other local needs including station access and the A2 itself. Pepper Hill is a dangerous place for accidents when there is traffic queuing.</p> <p>The new road appears to be the sole route for all visitors, deliveries and refuse, emergency services etc. It will need a protected hard shoulder. The proposal appears to modify access to Ebbsfleet station including using Wingfield Bank through residential areas.</p> <p>The new road needs to be built prior to any other construction commencing so that it can be used for moving workers and materials.</p>	<p>A full horizontal and vertical alignment design for the access road is included with the application. The new road connects to an upgrade of Highways England's improvement for the A2 Ebbsfleet junction and has capacity to accommodate traffic from the Reost and the Garden City. It will be in place before opening.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

SPC 1.15	Shone Parish Council	Land transport	Effect on major road network: The proposal will obviously have a serious detrimental effect on the A2/M2, the M25 and A282, and the A13 and other important roads in Essex. The constraint on turning east from the M25 northbound at junction 2 will cause/exacerbate queuing on the M25. The project will induce traffic to use unsuitable routes for access, especially if there is (as frequently happens) any blockage or congestion on the major routes, including congestion caused by visitors to the project itself.	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The traffic flows associated with the London Resort are generally outside of the conventional network peak hours, however there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks. The Transport Assessment assumes full occupation of the car park provision, however this is not LRCH's aim as they will be looking to promote public transport as the main travel option to The London Resort.
SPC 1.16	Shone Parish Council	Land transport	Conflicts with other major network users: Being so close to Bluewater Regional Shopping Centre, and Ebbsfleet International Station, there is an in-built major traffic conflict that will be even worse at some times of the year and some times of the day, especially morning and afternoon peak access times. Long-distance commuting to London also has impacts, particularly for late afternoon/evening recreational use.	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The traffic flows associated with the London Resort are generally outside of the conventional network peak hours, however there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks. The Transport Assessment assumes full occupation of the car park provision, however this is not LRCH's aim as they will be looking to promote public transport as the main travel option to The London Resort. LRCH is undertaking a Saturday peak hour sensitivity test to assess the impacts of London Resort and Bluewater in parallel. LRCH has met with Bluewater to discuss implications of the Resort and further meetings will take place as the site develops.
SPC 1.17	Shone Parish Council	Land transport	Conflicts with commuting train use: Experience of these projects is that train use does not always meet expectations due to ticket costs and perceived greater difficulty than driving if several train changes are needed or the weather is poor. While some of the daytime use will be in different directions, in the afternoon/early evening there will be conflict between commuters coming home and visitors to the recreational areas. It is already impossible (in normal times) to get a seat on most trains from London after 4pm. Crowded trains will put off visitors. The capacity for extra trains being scheduled is low as the HS1 route have to accommodate fast trains passing through. There could also be problems locally if visitors also use Ebbsfleet station which is not sufficiently equipped.	LRCH is in discussion with local rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-U) to determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand at the London Resort; This is outlined within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information. The visitor 'traffic' flows associated with the London Resort, including on public transport, are generally outside of the conventional network peak hours, and often going against the flow of commuters. However there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks. Furthermore, and has been shown at other resorts of this type, visitors generally are prepared to travel by rail, even at a greater cost, for the convenience of access to the site. The details of this are set out within the Transport Assessment

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

SW 1.1	Southern Water	Materials, energy and waste	I enclose a spreadsheet listing the SWS's assets/easements in proximity to the proposed works, including approximate Grid references. You will need to obtain copies of SWS's records to ascertain the full extent of plant affected.	These matters are captured in Chapter 19 of the ES (document reference 6.1.19) - Materials and Waste and Chapter 17 on Water Resources and Flood Risk (document ref 6.1.17)
SW 1.2	Southern Water	Water resource and flood risk	Southern Water Services Ltd. records will not necessarily record the location or show information associated with private sewers which may have become public sewers under the transfer of private sewers. Any sewers shown coloured yellow on the plans may be public highway drainage, culverted watercourses or private sewers and should be subject to Site Investigation to establish their ownership and function.	Protection of the assets must be provided in accordance with the Southern Water requirements or diverted through an agreed S185 process. These assets are identified and any proposed works are described within the Utilities Statement (Document Reference 7.6). Order limits no longer include Northfleet wastewater treatment works. Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16) makes reference to the odour from the proposed on-site wastewater treatment facility. Order limits no longer include Northfleet wastewater treatment works.
SW 1.3	Southern Water	Air Quality	The Swanscombe and Northfleet Wastewater Treatment Works are located within the proposed development site. A precautionary buffer zone distance of 500 metres from the perimeter fence of the WWTW has been used for the purposes of this planning consultation response. Due to the potential odour nuisance from a Wastewater Treatment Works, no habitable development should be located within the 1.5 OdU odour contour of the WWTW. An Odour survey will need to be carried out to a specification agreed with Southern Water to identify and agree the 1.5 OdU contour.	There is no proposed habitable development within 500m of the Swanscombe and Northfleet Wastewater Treatment Works, therefore any assessment has been scoped out.
SW 1.4	Southern Water	Water resource and flood risk	The proposed development would lie within a Source Protection Zone around one of Southern Water's public water supply sources as defined under the Environment Agency's Groundwater Protection Policy. Southern Water will rely on your consultations with the Environment Agency to ensure the protection of the public water supply source.	Noted; extensive consultation has been undertaken with the Environment Agency.
SW 1.5	Southern Water	Water resource and flood risk	Alongside the advice regarding the protection of our assets we have also carried out initial capacity checks for water and wastewater. These have indicated a lack of capacity in our current infrastructure within the catchment. To mitigate this would require strategic investment in our water and wastewater networks and treatment works to accommodate the requirements of this development. As the development has not been adopted in the relevant authorities local plan, no provision has been made in Southern Waters Investment plan for AMP7 which covers the period April 2020 to March 2025. Significant investment would be required and would need to be promoted for delivery in AMP8 (April 2025 to March 2030) and it is likely this could not be delivered until March 2030 at the earliest.	Southern Water states that an initial capacity check found that there is a lack of capacity in the current infrastructure within the catchment to service the site. To address this, an on-site wastewater treatment works is proposed. Reference is made to the Utilities Statement (Document Reference 7.6) for details.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

SCC.1.1	Surrey County Council		Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council. We have no comments to make on this application.	LRCH notes this response
SGTC 1.1	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Land transport	We are extremely concerned about the impact of indiscriminate parking within the local area and feel that parking should be free for all visitors to deter people from using local roads for parking and entering the site. If parking cannot be free then a combined ticket scheme should be considered to incentivise the use of public transport, combining entrance tickets with allocated parking.	The number of spaces has been calculated using the likely mode shares to the Resort. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), alongside the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC), sets out how LRCH intends to promote and drive sustainable travel. Free parking would encourage use by private vehicle, which could have knock on effects and minimise uptake of sustainable modes. An off-site parking strategy has been written to outline the management of visitors parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
SGTC 1.2	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Land transport	We feel that Swanscombe Station, as this is the closest proximity station to the site, has been forgotten within the plans and has insufficient access requirements to be used. This is a much more financial attractive and viable option for families than HS1 and is more likely to be used, and should therefore be included in the plans for the resort with the necessary improvements undertaken. Improvements to the site have been considered as part of a project with Govia Thameslink so this could be incorporated with financial support which would be of great benefit the community.	The Public Transport Strategies (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendices TA-U and TA-V) detail the existing provision and proposes mitigation where demand is likely to impact the networks. LRCH is in discussion with local rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy and determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort; details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information. Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe Station.
SGTC 1.3	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Land transport	The Town Council seeks assurances that the proposed dedicated access road from the A2 to the resort would be completed prior to the opening of the site as it is imperative that this happens.	The Access Road will be completed prior to Gate 1 opening.
SGTC 1.4	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Air Quality/ Noise and vibration	That all necessary measures are taken to limit the impact of both noise and pollution on local residents.	The ES assesses the impacts air quality in Chapter 16 of the ES (document reference 6.1.16) and noise and vibration in Chapter 15 of the ES (document reference 6.1.15) of the Proposed Development on local residents.
SGTC 1.5	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Land transport	We ask that the developer has considered the existing proposed improvements being undertaken on the Bean and Ebbsfleet interchange when creating the access road, to that end we request that all the necessary traffic mapping and projections are undertaken.	The Proposed Development does take into account Highways England improvement scheme for the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction, which has begun recently. LRCH has been liaising closely with Highways England and will continue to do so. A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), which includes local junction models. The improvement design for the Ebbsfleet junction will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic.
SGTC 1.6	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The Town Council would like to see Natural England be involved in both the initial creation of the Management Plan for the site but also ensuring the protection of biodiversity of the resort for the duration that the theme park is in situ.	Natural England have been extensively consulted on all aspects of the mitigation hierarchy applied to the Proposed Development.
SGTC 1.7	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	The Town Council would like the developer to consider designating the remaining areas of undeveloped land as either a National Nature Reserve or Local Nature Reserve to protect these enhanced areas of wildlife.	Chapter 12 of the ES (document reference 6.1.12) provides details on the proposed enhancement measures to be provided by the Proposed Development. This document demonstrates how the retained habitats will be protected and managed. In particular, details on habitat creation and enhancement, and long term management and monitoring are provided within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference 6.2.12.3).
SGTC 1.8	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Greenhouse gas and climate change	We would suggest that the developer enhance the car parking provision by including electric vehicle charging points.	Electric vehicle charging infrastructure shall be installed within the car parks.
SGTC 1.9	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Greenhouse gas and climate change	The Town Council would also that the resort introduce a policy to minimise the use of single use plastics, and also promote, and provide, available recycling points within the site.	An Outline Operational Waste Management Plan (document ref 6.2.19.1) has been produced for the proposed development which sets out strategies for reducing operational waste.
SGTC 1.10	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Land transport	The Town Council supports this proposal subject to the suggested free parking being taken forward to minimize the impact on local roads, we would encourage the improvements to cycle and walkways to give access to local residents.	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) provides details on the walking and cycling connections proposed as part of The London Resort. The Active Travel strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-T) identifies any additional improvements required to provide a cohesive network. As stated, free parking would encourage use by private vehicle, which could have knock on effects and minimise uptake of sustainable modes. An off-site parking strategy has been written to outline the management of people

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

				parking locally and walking to the park. This is included within the Transport Assessment.
SGTC 1.11	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Land transport	The developer will need to install measures to ensure that the new cycle and walkways are controlled so they can be used for the purpose they are intended and cannot be accessed by off road motor bikes etc.	As above
SGTC 1.12	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Landscape and visual effects	The developer should ensure that any pathways created on the peninsula take into account the coastal path project currently being delivered by Natural England.	The England Coast Path has been added to the relevant plans, along with a proposed diverted route closer to the resort boundary to avoid increased footfall in the ecologically sensitive area of Broadness Salt Marsh at the northern end of Swanscombe Peninsula.
SGTC 1.13	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The Town Council are unable to support this proposal as the information provided does not appear to provide any mitigating factors showing consideration for the heritage of the area.	Noted and assessed within Chapter 14 of the ES, Cultural heritage and archaeology (document reference 6.1.14).
SGTC 1.14	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	We would welcome the developer consulting with local history groups to ensure that all aspects of local history can be recognised.	Noted and welcomed. LRCH has engaged with Christoph Bull in developing the application and looks forward to further local engagement as the application progresses
SGTC 1.15	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Cultural heritage and archaeology	The words Dartford and Swanscombe should be incorporated to reflect the heritage of the area and not just London.	Noted
SGTC 1.16	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Human Health	The Town Council ask that investment is put forward in all areas of local infrastructure to ensure that employees living in staff accommodation do not add an additional burden on existing stretched health provision.	Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) considers the impact of the workers living on site on social infrastructure, including health services.
SGTC 1.17	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Project description	Further clarity is required on whether the proposed employee accommodation will be aimed at single employees or families, as this would add to the need for places within local schools.	The form and nature of the Staff Accommodation means it is not targeted at families.
SGTC 1.18	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	The Town Council welcomes the job creation/ opportunities that the resort will bring and would like to see recruitment being targeted at local residents. Similarly we would like assurances that local contractors/ suppliers are given priority in tendering for services at the resort.	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref document ref 6.2.7.7) notes how the employment and skills opportunities will be maximised locally.
SGTC 1.19	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	We feel that a local liaison committee be created to ensure that local people who are directly impacted, from a full spectrum of the community, are engaged in the entire process.	LRCH reconvened its Community Liaison Group in 2020, of which the respondent is a member. LRCH is committed to ensuring that local people are engaged throughout the process.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

SGTC 1.20	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Project description	<p>The Town Council feels that without adequate disabled access created at Swanscombe Station the resort would never be completely accessible and the issues with access at Swanscombe Station need to be included as part of the plan and undertaken. This is of paramount importance to the local community.</p> <p>We appreciate that the developer has formed an accessibility and inclusivity liaison group, with local representation, on this subject to tackle the challenges faced and The Town Council looks forward to seeing the input/ feedback from this group regarding the access issues facing Swanscombe Station.</p>	Swanscombe Station has very significant challenges for any meaningful upgrades, and has major implications for Network Rail and operators. LRCH has held regular dialogue with Network Rail.
SGTC 1.21	Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council	Project description	We would welcome a local resident discount scheme to further neighbourly relations between the resort and the community.	This is a matter to be addressed at a later stage.
TW.1.1	Thames Water	Materials, energy and waste	<p>Waste Comments</p> <p>With regard to sewerage and sewage treatment, this comes within the area of Southern Water PLC. For your information, the address to write to is Southern Water PLC, Southern House, Yeomans Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN13 3NY Tel: 0330 303 0368</p>	N/A - no response needed.
TW.1.2	Thames Water	Water resources and flood risk	<p>The proposed development is located within 15m of a strategic water main. Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission. No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement. Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk</p>	Engagement with Thames Water is ongoing. Request for condition acknowledged. Noted.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

TW.1.3	Thames Water	Water resources and flood risk	<p>The proposed development is located within 5m of a strategic water main. Thames Water do NOT permit the building over or construction within 5m, of strategic water mains. Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission. No construction shall take place within 5m of the water main. Information detailing how the developer intends to divert the asset / align the development, so as to prevent the potential for damage to subsurface potable water infrastructure, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any construction must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved information. Unrestricted access must be available at all times for the maintenance and repair of the asset during and after the construction works. Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground strategic water main, utility infrastructure. The works has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.</p> <p>https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk.</p>	Engagement with Thames Water is ongoing. Request for condition acknowledged.
TW.1.4	Thames Water	Water resources and flood risk	<p>There are water mains crossing or close to your development. Thames Water do NOT permit the building over or construction within 3m of water mains. If you're planning significant works near our mains (within 3m) we'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities during and after construction, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.</p> <p>https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes</p>	Noted
TW.1.5	Thames Water	Water resources and flood risk	<p>The proposed development is located within 15m of our underground water assets and as such we would like the following informative attached to any approval granted. The proposed development is located within 15m of Thames Waters underground assets, as such the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings are in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.</p> <p>https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes. Should you require</p>	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			further information please contact Thames Water. Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk	
TW.1.6	Thames Water	Water resources and flood risk	<p>Supplementary Comments</p> <p>Water: Following initial investigations based on demand figures provided, Thames Water has identified a gap between the needs of this development and our existing water treatment infrastructure and supply network. Thames Water are in contact with the development team to discuss and agree a water strategy. This is still in its early stages and as such Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission. The development shall not be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- all water treatment and network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed; or - a infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow some or all of the development to be occupied. Where a infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed infrastructure phasing plan. Reason - The development may lead to no water and treatment and network upgrade works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development. Any necessary reinforcement works will be necessary in order to avoid no water incidents. The developer can request information to support the discharge of this condition by visiting the Thames Water website. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development. Should the Local Planning Authority consider the above recommendation inappropriate or are unable to include it in the decision notice, it is important that the Local Planning Authority liaises with Thames Water Development Planning Department (telephone 0203 577 9998) prior to the planning application approval</p>	Engagement with Thames Water is ongoing. Request for condition acknowledged.
TMBC 1.1	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	Land transport	It is noted that the plans show works to the A2 including a separate access to the proposal to help prevent queuing on the A2. Further technical information would be useful in respect of both the additional pressure on the A2 and the impact on the wider road networks, as the evidence base	The relevant traffic modelling is contained with the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

			(modelling proposed to be carried out by Highways England – see Para 9.127 of the LR PEIR CH9 Transport report) does not appear to be included within the consultation documents at this stage. Although we note that this forms part of the EIA process, it would be useful to have sight of this when it is available.	
TMBC 1.2	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	Land transport	We do also have some concerns in respect of the impact of the proposal on the A227/A228 corridors which run through our Borough. There is the possibility of rat running to the north/south once the resort is open, which could have a harmful impact on the local highways network. Combined with the potential draw of a new Lower Thames Crossing, this could result in significant impact through Tonbridge and Malling. No doubt Kent Highways will be making similar observations in their own responses.	There will be minimal impact on the A227 and A228 corridors in Tonbridge and Malling Borough. This is set out within both the ES Land Transport Chapter (document ref 6.1.9) and Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
TMBC 1.3	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	Land transport	Plans put forward for sustainable transport modes are welcomed.	LRCH notes and welcomes this response.
TMBC 1.4	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	Land use and socio-economic effects	Visitor numbers: although it is highlighted that up to 6.5m visitors per year will visit the site once it is established, it would be useful to have an approximate indication of the likely impacts on other parts of the county. We would imagine that the majority of visitors will either stay on site (and indeed that is the likely business model for the operation) or be day visitors (from London and the south east), but some longer staying visitors may venture further out (most likely into London, but some to Kent) and it would be useful to know if any assessments of linked-trips to neighbouring attractions have been prepared or may be considered in future. Visit Kent will be best placed to advise on existing attractions nearby.	Chapter 7 of the ES (document ref 6.1.7) considers the stay preferences of overnight visitors in order to understand the implications for the housing and accommodation market. The Retail and Leisure Assessment also considers the baseline attractions across the wider area. The impact of linked-trips to neighbouring attractions has been considered, but largely at the Core Study Area level (Dartford, Gravesham and Thurrock) as impacts on a wider area are not expected to be significant in the context of existing demand. The Applicant has engaged with Visit Kent and Locate in Kent on these matters and has received helpful information to inform the assessment of effects.
TMBC 1.5	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	Project development and alternatives	Hotel Development: currently Kent does not have any five-star hotels. This would seem like a clear opportunity to rectify this position and add a complementary offer to the existing provision in the county.	Resort guests will be offered a range of potential hotel accommodation to suit different tastes and budgets. Decisions will be taken at a later stage and will be informed by the emerging demand. In addition there will be opportunities for hotel providers outside the London Resort. LRCH is working closely with Visit Kent.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

TMBC 1.6	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	Consultation	<p>The SCI should retain some flexibility in order to respond to the changing guidelines associated with the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. This view is supported by recent updates to National Planning Policy Guidance which state that authorities should review their SCIs to reflect social distancing guidelines which may have an impact on face to face events and the providing of physical documents for inspection.</p> <p>Ongoing consultation will need to remain inclusive and accessible in response to the pandemic, the effects of which will likely remain for a number of months/years. Access to the internet and technology cannot be assumed, notwithstanding issues surrounding broadband capacity and speed implications for those able to access the internet. There are significant implications for traditional methods of consultation. There is now an even greater need to ensure that everyone can have their say, including those most vulnerable.</p>	<p>As set out in the Consultation Report(document ref 5.1), LRCH considers that consultation was robust and had an appropriate reach. Public health and safety remained the priority throughout consultation. Households, businesses and community groups were informed about the consultation through multiple methods, including direct mail, adverts in local newspapers and notifications online. A freepost phonenumber and postal address was available and widely advertised for anyone not comfortable with digital methods. LRCH is committed to ensuring the Resort works for the local community as well as Resort visitors. LRCH will continue to engage with local communities in the ongoing development of the proposals.</p>
TMBC 1.7	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity	<p>The area supports a large array of wildlife and habitats. It is noted that the proposal includes substantial landscaping works and habitat creation, including enhanced salt marsh, reed beds and scrub habitats. It is not clear if this equates to a net gain in biodiversity terms of 10% as measured against the baseline position using the Defra metric, as set out in the draft Environment Bill.</p>	<p>An assessment of habitat losses and gains has been calculated using the Defra Biodiversity Metric 2.0, a copy of which was submitted alongside the PEIR and a final version of which is included in Appendix 12.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Document Reference 6.2.12.2). This quantifies the full extent of existing (baseline) habitats across the DCO Order Limits, and quantifies the amount of habitat to be lost, retained, or retained and enhanced, culminating in an overall net biodiversity score.</p>
TMBC 1.8	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	Greenhouse gas and climate change	<p>The Consultation document touches upon sustainability and climate change. It would be useful to have more information in respect of sustainable construction, the types of materials to be used and whether there is any innovation to be incorporated in respect of the building design. It would be prudent to consider ‘whole life carbon’ which includes the construction stage, as part of the push towards net zero carbon buildings. TMBC have our own Climate Change Strategy as it is so important for large developments (like the London Resort) to embrace every opportunity.</p>	<p>We have assessed whole life carbon (including construction stage embodied carbon) within the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change ES Chapter (6.1.20). Once at the detailed design stage, a whole life carbon assessment will be undertaken for each building to identify opportunities to reduce embodied carbon through design, material specification and construction processes.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

TfL 1.1	Transport for London	Relevant law and policy	<p>The section on “relevant law, policy and guidance” (paragraphs 9.39 to 9.93) includes a limited list of best practice guidance. Since the withdrawal of the Department for Transport’s guidance on Transport Assessments (issued 2007, withdrawn in 2014), TfL’s guidance has been held up as an exemplar. This guidance¹ was recently (Spring 2019) updated to change the focus toward encouraging and supporting active and sustainable travel among users of new developments, with consequent benefits to the environment, road safety and healthy lifestyles. We recommend that the Transport Assessment follows this guidance to ensure that these issues are appropriately addressed. Similarly, while again acknowledging that the development is not within London (despite its name), we anticipate that many of the transport impacts will be within London and therefore it would be relevant to reference London policy in this section, including the Mayor’s Transport Strategy (2018), the draft London Plan (Intend to Publish version dated December 2019², to which the Secretary of State has afforded “substantial” weight), and supplementary documents such as the London Environment Strategy (2018).</p>	<p>The ES Chapter 9 (document ref 6.1.9) and accompanying Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) contain the relevant guidance. The Planning Statement references the London Plan.</p>
TfL 1.2	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>We are concerned that the you propose to assess a notional day with an 85th percentile attendance profile (paragraphs 9.107 onward) rather than the maximum potential attendance. The justification for this proposal – that the busiest days are more likely to occur at weekends or during holiday periods – is not relevant since the weekends and holiday periods lead to some of the biggest peaks on the road network, and often coincide with lower levels of public transport services thus reducing the attraction of public transport as a mitigation measure.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) is based on a detailed assessment of an 85th percentile day with Peak Days dealt with by the Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) Notwithstanding this, the modelling undertaken assumed a worst case full car park in operation.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

TfL 1.3	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>Similarly, paragraph 9.134 proposes just looking at the weekday AM, inter-peak and PM peak periods, when weekends and later evening weekday travel is likely to be of sufficient magnitude as to have an impact, potentially significant, on transport networks. Due to the nature of the proposed development, a number of peak impact scenarios are likely which would not necessarily fall into the traditional weekday assessment periods, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Autumn half-term Halloween-themed events with evening fireworks displays leading to a severe peak in traffic flows and public transport demand, this potentially coinciding with late-night shopping and the end of cinema screenings at Bluewater and Lakeside (anecdotally both are busier during half-term holidays than typical term-time periods) · Bank holiday weekend peak attendance at the proposed development coinciding with peaks of holiday travel on the road network and generally less public transport provision · Peak flows in both directions as customers leaving after attending the theme park in the day cross with those arriving for an evening concert or similar event at the park or another venue within the same (wide) travel area attracting large numbers of people in a short period · Late evening finishes when public transport is winding down especially if changes are required en route home 	<p>The transport modelling previously undertaken identified the weekday PM peak as the worst case and the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) includes detailed assessments of the weekday AM and PM peak hours. However, sensitivity tests are currently being undertaken for other time periods including weekends and maximum departures.</p>
TfL 1.4	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>Careful assessment and consideration of staff travel will be vital given the number of people involved, likely hours of work, and the current relative isolation of the site in public transport terms. It would not be sustainable if most staff had no viable option other than to drive to work.</p>	<p>Based on information provided by Volterra on staff origins, a detailed assessment of staff travel and mode share is included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

TfL 1.5	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>Paragraph 9.126 indicates the intention to create a spreadsheet model to assess the affected highway links (alongside a micro-simulation model of the A2 corridor in the Ebbsfleet area). The M25, the Dartford Crossings and other parts of the strategic road network in this area already suffer from high levels of congestion. Because of this, we anticipate that flows from the proposed development are likely to lead to diversion of traffic onto TfL's strategic road network, including alternative river crossings, in addition to traffic generated to/from London itself. As is noted in paragraph 9.165, a spreadsheet model will not allow assessment of this diversionary effect: diversionary effects can only be assessed through the use of strategic reassignment models. Additional congestion on London's roads would be unacceptable, and the assessment should demonstrate that the proposed development does not compromise London's ability to meet its legal obligations with respect to air quality. Consequently TfL considers it essential that the proposed method of assessment is rejected in favour of use of a strategic highway reassignment model.</p>	<p>The use of a strategic spreadsheet model based on output from the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet and Lower Thames Crossing models, supported by more localised micro-simulation modelling has been agreed with Highways England. The access strategy for the Resort has been designed to keep traffic off local roads, supported by a signing strategy. Detailed air quality assessments are included in the Environment Statement (document ref 6.1.16). The Travel Demand Management plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) sets out how modal choice will be targeted away from the private car, particularly for visitors travelling from within the M25.</p>
TfL 1.6	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>The IEMA guidelines cited in paragraph 9.129 would appear to be irrelevant where transport networks are close to capacity. For example it is clear that imposing an additional 10% of baseline flow to a road which is within 10% of its practical maximum capacity will have a significant impact on the operation of that road, with pollution and road safety impacts massively out of proportion with the flow increase, whereas the IEMA guidelines applied to the DMRB LA104 scale would assess this as "no change" (paragraph 9.138). Consequently we request that, while reporting according to the IEMA guidelines for comparison purposes, a more appropriate measure of impacts is developed for this project.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment based on the IEMA guidelines is included in the Land Transport Chapter of the Environment Statement (document ref 6.1.9)</p>
TfL 1.7	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>The PEIR implies a degree of reliance on the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) to mitigate some traffic issues. The DCO application for the LTC has not yet been submitted. For this reason, it would be appropriate for assessments to take account of the scenarios both with and without the LTC. Similar considerations may apply to improvements to M25 junctions 25 and 28, and the A12 widening.</p>	<p>The assessments contained in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) include with and without Lower Thames Crossing for 2029 and 2038.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

TfL 1.8	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>While acknowledging that the GLA’s policies on car parking do not apply here, it is worth noting that these policies were supported by Inspectors at the draft London Plan Examination in Public as necessary to meet sustainability goals, and with minor amendment have been supported by the Secretary of State. We believe that the proposed number of car parking spaces and the control/management of those spaces will have a significant impact on travel behaviour and affect how impacts are assessed. Reducing spaces and using control/management measures to change how they are used could lead to significant improvements in the development’s environmental performance. We would expect parking charges (either at the car park or through advanced ticketing) and/or discounts given for use of public transport such that there is a reduced financial incentive to drive. Charges must apply to staff as well as visitors. When considering car parking, the proposed 350 motorcycle parking spaces should be explicitly included given that the environmental performance of motorcycles is often no better than a car and with significantly lower passenger capacity.</p>	<p>Agreed - details are included in the Travel Demand Management plan.(document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC).</p>
TfL 1.9	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>Consideration also needs to be given to the impact of construction of the proposed development on London’s road network and communities, and explore the opportunities that are available to reduce the impacts arising from the movement of materials by road, including road safety and the impact on air quality, and how to make the most effective use of rail and the river. When considering this, the cumulative impact from other large construction projects, such as the Lower Thames Crossing and the Silvertown Tunnel, should be assessed.</p>	<p>Agreed - included within the Construction Method Statement (document ref 6.1.3.1), the Construction Traffic Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AD) and the Delivery and Servicing Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AE).</p>
TfL 1.10	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>Some improvements to local public transport are proposed and welcomed, but we believe that other improvements, increasing connectivity between London, the wider South East and the rest of the UK, may be required to mitigate the proposed development’s traffic impacts. It is essential that the impacts of proposals for such improvements are assessed and then developed with appropriate stakeholders, including TfL, to understand how journeys will be made from/to and through London, at an early stage to ensure they are appropriate both in terms of deliverability and in ensuring there is sufficient capacity.</p>	<p>Extensive liaison has been undertaken with transport providers and operators, including HS1, Network Rail, Southeastern Rail, Fastrack and local bus operators and preliminary bus and rail strategies are included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

TfL 1.11	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>However, given the peak visitor projection of 53,000, even a modest projection of rail service use will give rise to significant volumes of rail travel. If rail services are to provide part of the mitigation of traffic impacts, as indicated in the scoping report, then full consideration should be given to issues such as crowding at stations and on services at times of peak travel demand generated by the proposed development. There may be a case for securing revised service patterns with additional services to meet the peaks in visitor demand, and the demand for services at non-traditional peak times could impose constraints on other railway issues, for example precluding a bank holiday weekend shutdown for maintenance works or the reverse of exacerbating the impact of the development if there are works taking place.</p>	<p>An independent study on rail capacity (train and platform) is being jointly commissioned by LRCH, HS1, Network Rail and Southeastern.</p>
TfL 1.12	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>As for road traffic, rail passenger impacts can only be determined accurately through use of a strategic reassignment model. TfL can assist this assessment process by making our RailPlan model available. This would allow consideration of scenarios with and without connectivity improvements to Ebbsfleet. Conversely, assumptions over travel to and from the proposed development may have a bearing on the current MHCLG-funded study into improving connectivity to Ebbsfleet and so information should be shared by the applicant as soon as it is available, particularly as this extension would be to the applicant's advantage.</p>	<p>The offer to use the RailPlan model is appreciated. An audit of the model was undertaken in 2016 by WSP, which concluded: RailPlan only includes trips between the study area and the M25 internal area and excludes local trips. The trip matrix validation showed discrepancies between RailPlan and MOIRA data within, into and out of the study area. It was recommended that underlying trip levels in RailPlan are reviewed against available local data and adjusted if necessary. The use of RailPlan will be considered for the forthcoming independent capacity study being commissioned by LRCH, HS1, Network Rail and Southeastern.</p>
TfL 1.13	Transport for London	Land transport	<p>If rail services at Tilbury Town station are to be used, then a shuttle bus will be needed as the 1.5km route to the riverbus pier is not suitable for pedestrians and is, even with improvement, too far to walk especially given that many visitors will be children and others less capable of walking this distance.</p>	<p>Agreed, a shuttle bus service is being provided.</p>
TfL 1.14	Transport for London	River transport	<p>If, as set out in paragraph 4.53 of the EIA Scoping Report, 15% of all visitors travelling by river from central London, the potential impact of this on crowding at and onward travel from central London river piers would need to be assessed. However, notwithstanding any attraction the river trip itself will have, given the extended journey times from central London (or indeed even the closer piers such as Woolwich, itself one hour distant by riverbus from there), it is not clear how attractive this will be to the majority of visitors to the proposed development.</p>	<p>Thames Clipper based on their experience at the O2 consider a 15% mode share by river ferry to be an achievable target. Furthermore, the Travel Demand Management plan.(document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) will look to encourage the mode, especially as the resort moves closer to maturity and the international visitor profile increases.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from prescribed consultees

TfL 1.15	Transport for London	River transport	The proposal to deliver “the majority” of construction materials by river (paragraph 9.157, albeit reduced from 95% in paragraph 4.53 of the EIA SR) is supported. The suggestion that the river will also be used for operational waste (paragraph 5.72 of the EIA SR) appears to have been removed, which is disappointing.	Noted - it is still the intention to use the river for operational waste.
TfL 1.16	Transport for London	Land transport	Naturally it will be important that ticket costs incentivise coach travel. Priority measures for coaches should be considered on the proposed A2(T) link road so that the arrival and departure of coach parties is not delayed by queues of cars, and local bus services including Fastrack could also benefit from such bus priority measures. There may be scope for the extensive commuter coach/minibus network in the area to serve a role in staff and visitor travel. Depending on the outcome of trip generation, assignment and distribution, a review may be necessary into the capacity within London to serve coach travel, especially since existing coach stations and stops are already very busy. These impacts and opportunities should be fully assessed.	A bus strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-V) is included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and extensive liaison has been undertaken with Fastrack and National Express.
TH 1.1	Trinity House	Project description	Trinity House is primarily concerned with the works that are to take place below the high water mark. As these works lie within the jurisdiction of the Port of London Authority, I advise that all marine safety risk mitigation measures should be agreed with this authority in the first instance.	Noted

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

Organisation	Summary of response	Regard had to response
Broadness Cruising Club #00005263	A clearer river strategy is needed.	A S42 notice was sent to the respondent and the applicant also met with them 14 September 2020.
	The use of the river is supported but local boating communities have not been consulted and there is no information on boating routes and mitigation measures to Broadness Creek and its adjoining anchorage.	A clear strategy for use of the river and explanation of its effects are provided in ES Chapter 10: <i>River Transport</i> (document reference: 6.1.10). LRCH has also in conjunction with PoTL and PLA completed a <i>Preliminary Navigational Risk Assessment</i> (document reference 6.2.10.1)
	No objection to the traffic segregation but request for greater understanding and a clear commitment about how historic access to Broadness Creek will be maintained.	It is proposed to maintain access to Broadness Creek from Northfleet via Manorway & Lower Road across Broadness Marsh. This was discussed at a meeting of 14 September 2020.
	Neutral regarding the environmental proposals. The strategy for enhancing the saltmarsh is a long term ambition of the respondent, who referenced previous flytipping which reduced the length of the creeks by 90%. Calling for London Resort to restore parts of the original routes of the creeks to create saltmarsh and board walks. More details on how the saltmarshes are going to be restored and tidal waters given access to the marshes.	Whilst the respondent's desire to restore the saltmarshes is recognised LRCH believes the environmental impact of doing so given the nature of the overtipped cement kiln dust (CKD) material, would outweigh the benefit. Where possible LRCH will recreate wetlands and saltmarsh as set out in the ES Appendix 11.7: <i>Landscape Strategy</i> (document reference 6.2.11.7)
	Strongly support sustainability proposals.	LRCH notes and welcomes this response.
	Strongly support pedestrian and cycle route proposals.	LRCH notes and welcomes this response.
	Neutral regarding cultural heritage proposals. Would have welcomed more dialogue with existing users to see how the new development and landscaping will work around the historic maritime usage.	LRCH has met with the respondent on 14 September 2020. LRCH intends to allow the respondent to continue its activities uninterrupted. Further information on this approach is contained within the <i>Landscape Strategy</i> (document reference 6.2.11.7) and the Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	Overall believe the benefits outweigh potential problems. Believe that London Resort will help to attract investment and support growth / development of community asset.	LRCH notes and welcomes this response.
	Neutral on accessibility proposals.	LRCH notes this response.
	Neutral regarding masterplan. Not enough consideration to the benefits of recreational boating in an area that is ideally suited to such usage and has historic facilities that are an asset that could be made more accessible. Disappointment that further consideration hasn't been given to role and requirements of community asset(s) in the masterplan and hope this will be addressed.	LRCH is committed to allowing the continued use of Broadness Creek as was discussed at a meeting with the respondent of 14 September 2020. Access will be maintained and improved and the enhanced pedestrian and cycle links and improved surrounding landscape will provide opportunity for the future. For further information about enhanced transport links and landscape enhancements see Landscape Strategy (document reference 6.2.11.7) and the Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.1).
	It is a concern that London Resort are proposing to control river usage by introducing a bylaw into their Development Consent Order. Control of the river needs to be with experts that understand tidal rivers, suggested the Port of London Authority.	Whilst LRCH may seek to regulate or prohibit activities of divers, surfers, water skiers and other persons engaged in similar recreational pursuits within the river Thames adjacent to the authorised development, it does not intend to prohibit the use for navigation of vessels. Further information is provided within the <i>Draft Development Consent Order</i> (document reference 3.1)
Title K861297 Title K861295	Response sent by Agents instructed by landowner. This replaces the previous letter from the same respondent which was withdrawn.	LRCH notes this response.
	The Landowner objects to the proposed use of compulsory purchase powers, and indicates that developers of NSIPs are not required to use them. The promoter of an NSIP must demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest. The Development is entirely	The Planning Act 2008 allows applicants to as part of the DCO application to include the Compulsory Acquisition Powers. However LRCH only intends on using these powers in the event that a purchase cannot be agreed and has proposed an Enhanced Offer as set out in the <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>commercial and any public interest is circumstantial to the central profit motive.</p> <p>The Landowner questions the appropriateness of the use of compulsory purchase powers associated with NSIPs and questions whether this creates an unfair market advantage over other leisure developers by allowing London Resort to pay less than market value for land.</p> <p>Promoters of DCOs are required to seek to acquire land by agreement prior to submitting a DCO application. The Developer has not sought to or engaged with the Landowners to acquire the Land by agreement despite planning to submit the DCO application before the end of 2020.</p>	<p>The <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1) also sets out LRCH’s compelling case for its justification of acquiring all the land for the Proposed Development this is supported by the socio-economic benefits of the Proposed Development as assessed in ES Chapter 7: <i>Land use and socio-economic effects</i>.</p> <p>i. As set out above LRCH has extended an enhanced proposal to all PILs. LRCH is engaged with the respondent and their agents and looks forward to agreeing terms. LRCH’s application is in accordance with the guidelines provided within the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>ii. LRCH has been engaged for many years with PILs indeed correspondence with this respondent traces back to 2015.</p> <p>LRCH will continue to engage with PILs on the basis of the enhanced approach in the coming months and is aiming to have agreed substantially terms with the majority of PILs ahead of Compulsory Acquisition hearing.</p>
	<p>Little or no progress has been made towards a Development Consent Order (‘DCO’) application.</p>	<p>LRCH hopes that the application documents demonstrate the substantial progress made by the applicant prior to and subsequent to the Statutory Consultation in July, August and September 2020.</p>
	<p>The Development’s PEIR notes the potential impact on habitat and vulnerable species within the Development Boundary.</p> <p>The respondent notes the commitment to 10+ biodiversity net gain, but suggests that a binding commitment should be made regarding how it will be delivered, particularly regarding offsite land use.</p>	<p>LRCH is committed to delivering a net gain in biodiversity. LRCH has been undertaking environmental surveys and assessment since 2012. As a result, we know a great deal about the environmental conditions on the Project Site and the potential effects of the development on that environment.</p> <p>The peninsula suffers from extensive areas of historical waste disposal, contamination and former industrial structures. The area has been largely left unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

		<p>unmanaged, it will eventually turn to scrub and the precious habitats will be lost.</p> <p>We are therefore proposing a series of habitat enhancements and management interventions to ensure that these habitats can continue to support the rich bird, invertebrate, reptile and small mammal species that are currently using the Project Site including translocation of some 'lost habitat' and recreation of open mosaic habitat elsewhere.</p> <p>To achieve this, we will also be enhancing land offsite to improve habitat and biodiversity in areas where land management practices have reduced the value of that land for wildlife.</p> <p>The Resort presents an opportunity to initiate a long-term management strategy for the Project Site to benefit a greater diversity of species and habitats and improve overall environmental conditions. This is set out in the Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan at Appendix 12.3 to Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 6.1.12.3).</p> <p>Impact on habitats and species is assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 6.1.12).</p>
	<p>We would welcome hearing from the Developer to address these concerns.</p>	<p>LRCH is engaged with the respondent and their agents.</p>
<p>Trail Group</p>	<p>The Property is inside the London Resort Development Boundary and in accordance with the consultation documentation the Developer will apply for compulsory purchase powers in a Development Consent Order ('DCO') application.</p> <p>Businesses within the Kent Project area have faced challenges including lack of investment and reduced trading due to the uncertainty caused by potential compulsory purchase, which has been in place since 2014.</p>	<p>LRCH has assessed the effects of the Proposed Development in ES Chapter 7: <i>Land use and socio-economic effects</i> (document reference 6.1.7).</p> <p>As set out in the <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1) and the <i>Funding Statement</i> (document reference 4.2), LRCH acknowledges its responsibility to consider all blight notices although LRCH cannot commit to agreeing enhanced terms on any claims agreed following a blight notice.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>This issue has not be addressed within the PEIR.</p> <p>Little progress has been made towards the submission of a DCO application over the course of the six years.</p> <p>London Resort could and should, recognise and address the impact and voluntarily accept ‘blight notices’ for early acquisition of land and businesses.</p> <p>The respondent questioned the validity of compulsory purchase in the circumstance of London Resort, claiming purely commercial motives.</p>	<p>It is wrong to ascert that LRCH’s principle motive is profit, the remediation of large former brownfield site, delivery of a net gain in biodiversity, the creation of jobs and value to the economy are compelling. The proposed development also helps to deliver on previous major infrastructure development of the Channel Tunnel Rail link and station at Ebbsfleet International.</p>
	<p>The respondent outlined a range of challenges associated with relocation of commercial premises, including shortages of suitable, affordable and available sites in the vicinity of London and with good road and rail links.</p>	<p>LRCH will continue to work with PILs regarding their claims and assist with their relocation.</p> <p>LRCH is aiming to provide as much time as possible for relocation. The circumstances each individual claim will have a bearing.</p>
	<p>We note that the Developer is offering a premium of 30% over ‘Compensation Code’ levels and this initiative is welcomed.</p> <p>However, the Premium does not account for Loss Payments expressed within the Compensation Code and does not account for upward pressures on the value of commercial space resulting from London Resort, or the challenges / costs of relocating in a suitable timeframe.</p> <p>The respondent suggested that LRCH apply ‘London Resort Premium’ to statutory blight claims to enable the respondent and other affected businesses a timely and organised relocation.</p>	<p>The level 30% premium has not been offered by any other acquiring authority and was formulated in recognition of the difficulties that PILs will face in relocation of their businesses. It is very much LRCH’s hope that the PILs will be able to turn this into an opportunity.</p> <p>LRCH acknowledges the respondent’s response and will continue to work with PILs to allow as much time for relocation as possible.</p> <p>LRCH has set out very clearly the terms upon which acquisition will be made in the <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	We welcome engagement with the Developer to address the issues raised above.	LRCH continues to engage with the respondent and their
Tarmac	Response sent by Agents instructed to act on behalf of client.	LRCH notes this comment.
	The respondent notes the extent of required land as shown on drawing LR-DG-LRS-DCP-003.4. This shows that the entirety of the respondent’s freehold interest will be subject to temporary possession with permanent rights to be acquired. However, the ‘limit of deviation’ to ‘work no 11’ does not extend to the same degree. Whilst we accept that the two plans relate to different matters, we object to the extent to which the Order Limits and a limits of deviation for ‘work no 11’ are drawn.	LRCH met with the respondent on 17 September 2020 and then again on 19 November 2020 where the matters raised were discussed in detail. As a result of this engagement the works plans and land plans have been adjusted so that work No.11 has a reduced limit of deviation in order to accommodate any requirement for the People Mover Route or realignment to International Way to be located further west than the existing design. Additionally a new work, Work No. 29 has now been included to cover any works required to adapt the existing landfill infrastructure as a result of Work No. 11. This can be seen in the updated in Sheet 4 of <i>Land Plans</i> (document reference 2.2) and the <i>Works Plans</i> (document reference 2.5). As a consequence the land required under Work No. 29 would only be required temporarily and therefore LRCH has substantially reduced the area of land it would require to be acquired from the respondent.
	Whilst the respondent questions the need for the development and the justification for the location, we wish to draw attention to intended development by the client of their landholding. Earlier in 2020, representations were made to the Dartford Local Plan “Preferred Options Consultation”. An illustrative masterplan has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority which outlines the opportunity to deliver: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 9.2 hectares of residential development which, dependent upon density and scale could deliver around 500-750 dwellings; 	At the meeting on 19 November 2020, proposals were discussed in further detail and the changes to the the <i>Land Plans</i> (document reference 2.2) and the <i>Works Plans</i> (document reference 2.5) were additionally considered as a consequence of the respondent’s intended development.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 3.7 hectares of mixed-use development comprising residential, commercial and employment uses. Based upon four storey development being provided this could deliver some 90,000m² floorspace; and, • Other complementary development, including open space, footpath & highways connections and landscaping. <p>A copy of a schematic design and illustrative masterplan has been provided with the consultation response. The interaction between this and the London Resort Project requires further consideration on the part of LRCH.</p>	
	<p>On the basis of the information published and in the absence of sufficient clarification and engagement at this stage, the respondent objects to this project.</p>	<p>Whilst a formal response withdrawing the objection has not been received LRCH has altered the plans as agreed with the respondent at the meeting on 19 November 2020.</p>
<p>Cemex</p>	<p>Maintaining unaffected journey times and an unimpeded vehicular access is critical to the businesses at the Property. This is both in respect of the approach road (Manor Way) and local roads to the strategic road network via the A2.</p> <p>Any increase in journey times for customer collections and respondent's deliveries due to the Development would a significant impact as follows:</p> <p><i>Increased Costs</i></p> <p>Longer journey times for deliveries to customers causes increases employee (wage) costs. It also raises vehicle charge costs; the longer journey times, the more vehicles must be available to maintain equivalent capacity. Longer journey times also increase fuel costs.</p>	<p>LRCH met with the respondent and their agent on 27 August 2020.</p> <p>At this meeting LRCH explained in more detail the proposal for creation of permanent rights of access over Manorway which provides access to the respondent's property.</p> <p>LRCH do not believe their proposals will impede the respondent's business and actually in the longer term the local roads will likely become less busy with HGV traffic as the volumes of HGV traffic displaced as a result of the Proposed Development will not be replaced given LRCH's intention to supply more than 80% of the construction materials required and to service the operational supplies via the River Thames.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p><i>Loss of income</i> Customers face the same issues described above if journey times to and from the Property are increased. Faced with increasing in journey times to and from the Property, customers will correspondingly turn to other suppliers.</p> <p>Moreover certain products have a limited product life.</p>	
	<p>We note that part of the approach road to the Property (Lower Road leading into Manor Road) is included within the Development Boundary. The respondent currently benefits from full, unrestricted rights of way via the approach road to the Property.</p> <p>In discussion with the Developer we understand that the inclusion of Manor Way is intended only to provide vehicular access rights to the Developer in respect of a leachate treatment works, and also to provide access to mooring points on the Swanscombe Peninsula.</p> <p>These are anticipated to be intermittent uses which would not impact on the free-flow of commercial traffic to and from the Property. Currently a section to the south of Manor Way (Lower Road) is indicated to be required for permanent acquisition. We understand from discussions with the Developer that this is likely to change in the final Development Consent Order ('DCO') application.</p> <p>Respondent submits that there should be no modifications to Lower Road which could temporarily impede traffic to the Property.</p>	<p>It was explained that the access to be created would be restricted to vehicles maintaining habitat on Broadness Marsh and grassland and servicing existing an proposed water treatment plant. Additionally a new access route would be created to access the local community asset. Whilst this new access would permit private vehicles to use this route LRCH would not propose to reduce the size or effect of existing traffic calming measures given the users would likely require four wheel drive vehicles to onward access Broadness Creek.</p> <p>LRCH's application sets out in detail the rights that will be required.</p>
	<p>Existing commercial units and businesses accessed off Lower Road will be replaced by a 'Back of house area and</p>	<p>LRCH is happy to confirm the following:</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>service infrastructure’ under current proposals for the Development.</p> <p>Respondent requests the following commitments from the Developer to provide comfort that the Property will not be adversely affected by any of its proposals for Manor Way, Lower Road and the junction with the A226, specifically:</p> <p>i. Written confirmation that the rights sought over Manor Way will be limited to rights of way for intermittent use.</p> <p>ii. Confirmation that the Developer will contribute to the costs of maintaining the approach road commensurate with the use at ‘i’.</p> <p>iii Confirmation there will be no alterations or changes to the approach road (and junction with the A226) which could in any way disrupt the free-flow of traffic to the Property.</p> <p>iv. A commitment that traffic along Lower Road and Manor Way will not increase due to the Development; specifically that traffic numbers to the ‘Back of house area and service infrastructure’ will not exceed existing levels, and agreement to a planning condition in the DCO for the same.</p>	<p>i. as discussed when meeting with the respondent it was confirmed that LRCH is only seeking rights of access which by their nature will be intermittent</p> <p>ii. LRCH will agree to fair and proportionate costs associated with maintaining the non adopted parts of Manorway and Lower Road it seeks rights of access over.</p> <p>iii. LRCH is not intending to make alterations to the junction with A226 which might disrupt the free-flow of traffic to the property.</p> <p>LRCH does not foresee the traffic travelling along Lower Road or Manor Way to increase save for the limited vehicle movements associated with providing access to Broadness Cruising Club and Broadness Marsh. However, LRCH envisages a net decrease in vehicle movements in the longer term.</p>
	<p>Respondent is concerned that the Development will create congestion, thereby increasing journey times to and from the Property, during both construction and use.</p> <p><i>During construction</i></p> <p>We understand that the Developer is seeking to use the River Thames as much as possible (over 75%).</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Development will use local supplies of cement and aggregates - Land will be available for stock storage - Hotels will be of modular construction 	<p>LRCH notes this comment.</p> <p>LRCH has given careful consideration to the potential impact of construction traffic on local residents and businesses. The location of the London Resort has significant advantages to alleviate construction impacts. Firstly, the ability to organise materials at Tilbury and bring them to the site by barge minimises lorries on the strategic road network. In excess of 80% of materials will be transported by river. Secondly, utilising the river access allows construction compounds to be provided away from residential areas.</p> <p>The Construction Management Plan has been detailed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>Respondent believes that the DCO application should provide for planning conditions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A minimum 75% of construction materials must be delivered by river or sourced from the immediate area around the Development. ii. Use of the local road network during the construction period should be outside operational hours for our and other businesses (excepting local construction businesses supplying the Development). 	
	<p><i>During use</i></p> <p>We understand the Developer is currently conducting traffic modelling however the PEIR predicts the London Resort is likely to result in significant increases in volume of trips (visitors and staff) to the area.</p> <p>The Developer is seeking ways to mitigate the impact on the local and strategic road network through use of the Essex Project Site and boat access, however a significant number of visitors will reach the Development in Kent by car.</p> <p>We note the number of proposed parking spaces, and feel that this risks significant strain and creating congestion on the local and strategic road networks, and risks adversely impacting the Property by increasing journey times for deliveries and collections (described above).</p> <p>Respondent seeks further understanding and assurances from the Developer in this respect to ensure their businesses at the Property are at risk.</p>	<p>The proposal for a dedicated access road for Resort visitors has been part of the Proposed Development since the early stages of non-statutory consultation, which highlighted the importance of keeping Resort traffic separate from local roads and the Strategic Road Network. Equally in response to concerns raised at earlier rounds of public consultation LRCH took steps to reduce further the vehicle traffic accessing the Kent Project Site by developing the concept in conjunction with Port of Tilbury (London) Limited ‘Park and Glide’ whereby 25% of the car and coach borne traffic would park at Port of Tilbury and access the resort via a river ferry to the new London Resort jetty on the Swanscome Peninsula.</p> <p>Since the meeting LRCH has completed its worst case scenario traffic modelling. The outcome and effect of the Proposed Development are set out in ES Chapter 9: <i>Land Transport</i> (document reference 6.1.9) as a consequence LRCH has been able to confirm that only relatively modest adjustments to Highways England’s Bean to Ebbsfleet Junctions scheme will be required in order to accommodate the Resort at maturity. This will considerably decrease any disruption.</p> <p>The <i>Transport Assessment</i> (document ref 6.2.9.1) assumes a worst-case scenario with full occupation of the car park provision; however, this is not LRCH’s aim as we will be looking to promote public transport as the</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>Moreover we understand that the Developer anticipates the Development will operate in its initial phase prior to construction of the proposed dedicated dual carriageway from the Ebbsfleet Junction of the A2.</p> <p>During this phase it would rely instead on the improvements made by Highways England at the Bean junction on the A2. The respondent considers this risks congestion on the approach roads, risking congestion affecting local businesses, and (absence further re-assurance) considers the Development should not open until the dedicated dual carriageway link to the A2 is complete.</p>	<p>main travel option to The London Resort. The Travel Demand Management Plan (document ref 6.2.9.1 Appendix TA-AC) sets out how LRCH will incentivise active and sustainable modes of transport. In addition, the inclusion of 25% visitor parking north of the River significantly reduces the number of additional vehicles using M25 anti-clockwise to the A2. A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>For the Resort to operate efficiently at opening in order to deliver visitors safely and swiftly to the scheme the Resort Access Road must be in operation.</p> <p>The Access Road will be completed prior to Gate 1 opening.</p>
	<p><i>Property Use and Licence</i></p> <p>The Property is ideally located for the respondent's business use, being remote from any sensitive uses and requests commitment that sensitive receptors such as hotels are not located close to the property.</p> <p>Respondent seeks confirmation that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potentially sensitive receptors will be located to the west of the HS1 train line. - The Developer will not complain about or object to any of the respondent's uses of the Property. 	<p>LRCH has acknowledged this concern and does not believe that any sensitive receptors will be located close enough to the respondent's property to create a problem and the Proposed Development is developed in full knowledge of the existing neighbouring uses.</p>
	<p>We look forward to further discussions with the Developer to address the issues raised above.</p>	<p>LRCH will continue to engage with the respondent.</p>
<p>Company Director and member of Peninsula Management Group</p>	<p>Strongly opposes public transport proposals, believing that it is unlikely river transport will divert significant traffic from local roads, and suggesting that river transport may be dangerous.</p>	<p>LRCH has clearly assessed land and river transport modal split and effects in ES Chapter 9: <i>Land transport</i> (document reference 6.1.9) and Chapter 10: <i>River transport</i> (document reference 6.1.10). Equally a <i>Preliminary Navigational Risk Assessment</i> has been prepared (document reference 6.2.10.1). ES Chapter 11: <i>Marine ecology and</i></p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

		<p><i>biodiversity</i> (document reference 6.1.13) addresses the effects of the proposed development.</p>
	<p>Strongly opposes road access proposals, stating reasons for opposition as follows:</p> <p>(a) environmental grounds as concreting over rare surviving wildlife areas and open spaces,</p> <p>(b) Climate change as unnecessary expenditure of construction materials in a climate emergency for a 'fun' and non essential project.</p> <p>(c) Increasing noise and emissions pollution for nearby residents - particularly the local receptors which include thousands of new houses.</p> <p>(d) Disruption to area plans until this is completed (or not completed).</p> <p>(e) Harmful compulsory acquisition of land from others.</p>	<p>LRCH formulated mitigation strategies in order to protect and enhance large areas of the Swanscombe Peninsula and is committed to a net gain in biodiversity as assessed in ES Chapter 11: <i>Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity</i> (document reference 6.1.12) and ES Appendix 12.3 <i>Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework</i> (document reference 6.2.12.3)</p> <p>Climate change is considered at ES Chapter 20 – <i>Greenhouse gas and climate change</i> (document reference 6.1.20). In addition LRCH aspires to comply with all of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDGs) as set out in <i>Outline Sustainability Strategy</i> (document reference 7.7).</p> <p>The ES chapters 15: Noise and Vibration (document reference 6.1.15) and 16: Air quality assess the effects of the Proposed Development. LRCH's aim is to minimise the use of Compulsory Acquisition powers by offering enhanced terms for land acquisition.</p>
	<p>Strongly opposes biodiversity proposals, stating that concreting over areas of wildlife habitat cannot ever be classed as improving or enhancing the natural features of the area and biodiversity. These marshes are a rare and essential open wildlife space for people and wildlife. They are important in their own right and as part of a homogenous zone of wildlife stepping stones into London. Concerned that the underwater wildlife aspects have not been properly monitored and appreciated. Taking an existing part of the marshes and then putting pretty bridges and pathways around it to create even more people pressure on the wildlife that exists there at present might be pretty but if is actually causing harm to diverse wildlife.</p>	<p>Whilst the Proposed Development will require built form and hard standings where possible green and wild spaces will be accommodated within the Theme Park gates creating habitat corridors connected with the retained and enhanced landscapes on the peninsula. The <i>Landscape Strategy</i> (document reference 11.7) and <i>Design and Access Statement</i> (document reference 7.1) provide further detail and illustration. Offsite mitigation proposed in the Thames Estuary will also enhance the biodiversity of the wider area.</p> <p>By managing carefully access to existing areas by way of boardwalks it will reduce the impact by preventing visitors from disturbing areas off the designated routes.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>Strongly opposes sustainability proposals, particularly the approach to zero carbon and whether LRHC has the knowledge or experience to deliver this aspect of the project.</p> <p>This will be a massive carbon expenditure from every angle and a completely unnecessary one.</p>	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes these responses</p> <p>The challenges of sustainable development are well recognised, and the project is committed to achieving industry leading outcomes.</p> <p>Sustainability encompasses a variety of topics, and LRHC has expressed a range of commitments from the commitment to sustainable transport, net gain in biodiversity and commitments to low carbon development and operation.</p> <p>The London Resort has an aspiration to be carbon neutral as much as realistically possible. Active Travel and Public Transport Strategies have been developed to facilitate more sustainable travel and a Travel Demand Management Plan incentivises this travel. LRCH has a clearly stated target for the London Resort to be net carbon neutral in operation. Further information about the overarching approach to climate change mitigation and carbon reduction in the Greenhouse gas and climate change chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.20) and information about the approach to sustainable transport is included in the land and river chapters of the ES (document refs 6.1.9 and 6.1.10).</p> <p>Please refer to the Outline Sustainability Strategy (document ref 7.7) for more information, which considers both construction and operational phases of the Resort, including sustainable design and construction materials</p> <p>Senior management of LRCH also have direct experience of sustainable operational requirements.</p>
--	--	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>Support pedestrian and cycle path proposals, stating that more access to the marshes is very desirable but not if it requires the sacrifice of vast areas of wildlife habitat and a project of this size with all of the damage it will cause to businesses and people to do so</p>	<p>LRCH's proposals will be carefully managed in order to mitigate impact and have been formulated with regard to the Ebbsfleet Development Corporation's Implementation Framework (2017).</p>
	<p>Strongly opposes cultural heritage proposals, stating that there is little to show that any real interest has been taken to preserve or support cultural heritage. The entire peninsula is a cultural heritage and these proposals intend to utterly change this rare bit of open space and any rare archaeology that almost certainly lies under it. Cultural heritage does not mean architectural buildings alone.</p>	<p>LRCH has assessed the effects of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage and its effects have been assessed in ES Chapter 14: <i>Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</i> (document reference 6.1.14).</p> <p>Whilst some marshland habitat will be removed in order to deliver the Proposed Development LRCH is committed to protecting and enhancing the remaining marshes, namely Black Duck Marsh, Botany Marsh (east) and Broadness Marsh and grasslands in conjunction with the creation of new habitats offsite in order to deliver a Net Biodiversity Gain. LRCH has assessed this impact in ES Chapter 12: Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity (document reference 6.1.12) and in the appendix to this chapter <i>Landscape Strategy</i> (document reference 6.2.11.7).</p>
	<p>States that the Resort will create problems from every aspect.</p>	<p>LRCH has scoped the Environmental Impact Assessment, undertaken Statutory Consultation on its proposals and has now prepared a detailed Development Consent Order application including an Environmental Statement which has assessed the effects of the Proposed Development and where necessary has formulated mitigation strategies to respond to any adverse effects identified. Please see ES Chapter 22: <i>Conclusion and mitigation commitments</i> (document reference 6.1.22)</p>
	<p>Strongly opposes accessibility and inclusivity proposals. Believes that the project has been overwhelmingly negative and consultation has been poor or non-existent.</p>	<p>LRCH is very clear about its accessibility and inclusivity proposals for design and operation of the Resort.</p> <p>Whilst LRCH accepts that existing businesses will be displaced by the Proposed Development substantial job and career creation will</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>Inclusion is a joke. It has never been other than self interested and even now seeks to destroy thousands of jobs and block the main arterial roadway from London to the coast.</p>	<p>generated as a result of the Proposed Development as is assessed in ES Chapter: 7 <i>Land use and socio-economic effects</i> (document reference 6.2.7)</p> <p>ES Chapter 9: <i>Land Transport</i> (document reference 6.2.9) assesses the effects of the proposed development and modest additional mitigation required in addition to the evolved design of the Proposed Development’s transport strategy.</p>
	<p>Strongly opposed the Masterplan for the reasons previously provided. Challenged the wording of this section, stating that there has never been a masterplan and there still isn't, and is opposed to people are being asked to comment on vague ideas, given the seriousness of the proposal.</p>	<p>The current masterplan, <i>Illustrative Masterplan</i> (document reference 2.21) is the culmination of a number of years of work initially by Farrells and completed by Apt alongside various core resort designers. The <i>Design and Access Statement</i> (document reference 7.1) further details LRCH’s proposal.</p>
	<p>The respondent raised a number of additional issues: Concerns regarding the social cohesion of the area and wildlife interests</p> <p>Open space being available for people to quietly enjoy - not with a theme park in the middle of it</p> <p>Highway use and access unimpeded locally and regionally.</p> <p>The destruction of 50 acres of industrial estates and the jobs that go with them</p> <p>The safety of people using the river with commercial traffic and often wild weather conditions during the winter months</p>	<p>LRCH believes that the DCO application addresses these concerns in various ES chapters.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7: <i>Land use and socio-economic</i> (document reference 6.1.7) affects address the impacts of the Proposed Development which LRCH believes will have a positive effect on social cohesion and the effects of displacement of existing businesses and the socio-economic dividend of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>ES Chapters 11: <i>Landscape and visual effects</i> (document reference 6.1.11); 12: <i>Terrestrial and freshwater ecology and biodiversity</i> (document reference 6.1.12); and 13: <i>Marine ecology and biodiversity</i> (document reference 6.1.13) in addition to ES Chapter 15: <i>Noise and air quality</i> (document reference 6.1.15) assess wildlife interests and open space being continued to be available for quiet enjoyment.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

		<p>ES Chapter 7: Land transport (document reference 6.1.7) addresses traffic and transport effects and sets out how LRCH intends to minimise the impacts on local and regional road network.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10: <i>River transport</i> (document reference 6.1.10) and the <i>Preliminary Navigational Risk Assessment</i> (document reference 6.2.10.1) address effects and risk of utilising the river with mitigation and emergency strategies proposed.</p>
	<p>Objections relating to the lack of clear information or facts in relation to the proposals and the potential impacts that it could have.</p>	<p>LRCH has now completed a substantial assessment of the effects of the proposed development and is submitting as part of its application all the documents and evidence required to support this serious proposal which will provide a substantial economic boost to local, regional and national economies. The application and scope of the Proposed Development as proposed aims to compliment existing settlements and developments such as Bluewater.</p>
Gap Group	<p>The respondent objects to the Tilbury element of the proposal in principle.</p> <p>It is unfortunate and unwelcome not to have been consulted previously and hope that the respondent's views will not be overlooked as a result.</p>	<p>Savills on behalf of LRCH conversed with Gap Group on 11 November 2020 and also on 25 November 2020 with detailed answers to queries raised explaining why LRCH had included land owned by Gap Group in the Order Limits. As indicated in the Works Plans (document reference 2.5 and the Land Plans (document reference 2.2) the works required on the respondent's land are likely to be minimal and it is unlikely they will significantly affect the respondent's occupation of the land.</p>
	<p>Provided overview of the company and explained the importance of easy and rapid access, along with significant outdoor storage in a suitable location, to the success of the business.</p> <p>The company requires all of its site and will not be in a position to release any land would strongly resist any land claimed by the project.</p>	<p>This is noted by LRCH.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>GAP Group cannot support any scheme that creates any further traffic or congestion in the Tilbury area, due to potential impacts on their facility which has recently received £9m of investment, and the Port of Tilbury, especially the introduction of tourism and leisure related uses.</p>	<p>As the Resort will not open until 10am the majority of visitors arriving via Tilbury will be travelling through the Asda roundabout after the morning peak hour. Visitors leaving the Resort via Tilbury will do so mid-late evening after the evening peak hour.</p> <p>The travel demand management plan will include measures to influence when visitors travel to the Resort to avoid the busy periods at the Asda roundabout, for example time slot allocations for access to the car park. A detailed capacity assessment of the Asda roundabout will be undertaken as part of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Peak Resort flows will occur during weekends in the summer, when there is less HGV traffic on the network.</p>
	<p>The respondent reiterated that Tilbury represents a important part of a network of depots, which in turn support 1,800 jobs.</p>	<p>LRCH notes this response.</p>
	<p>Would welcome engaging with the Developer further to address these concerns.</p>	<p>Correspondence was sent on 25 November 2020 responding to queries raised about traffic. LRCH has advised that the scale of works likely required at the Asda Roundabout may possibly avoid the acquisition of any land or rights outside of the Order Limits.</p>
<p>Freeths for: MTD Coln Industrial LimitedPoL</p>	<p>The respondent questioned the rationale for recent expansion of the Project to include Kent Kraft Industrial Estate.</p>	<p>LRCH and Savills met with the Respondent on 23 November 2020 following notification that MTD Coln Industrial Limited were the new owners of the Kent Kraft Industrial Estate.</p> <p>The respondent at that meeting questioned why this property had been recently included in the Order Limits. They were informed that the property had been included within the Order Limits since at least 2014 and LRCH has therefore undertaken various rounds of statutory</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

		consultation. The predecessor in title to the respondent is well known to LRCH.
	Status	
	The respondent queried why they had not been consulted in June 2020 when the fourth consultation took place having acquired the property in January 2020.	<p>The Statutory Consultation ran from 27 July to 21 September 2020. When the list of S42 was prepared the respondent’s predecessor in title was still registered as owner of the property, LRCH suspects that delays at Land Registry because of the COVID-19 pandemic delayed the registration.</p> <p>As soon as LRCH was made aware of the respondent’s interest they arranged a meeting to present the proposals and also served S42 notice allowing for a formal consultation period that has resulted in the respondent’s response.</p>
	Policy	
	Chapter 7 of LRCH’s Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (LR PEIR) appears not to address any of the impacts of the expanded Project scope on the existing KKI, Manor Way or Northfleet employment areas. Nor does it appear to have been updated to reflect tightening of industrial supply and logistics/industrial demand.	<p>The PEIR did not specifically address expanding the project into these land holdings as they had long been included within the Order Limits.</p> <p>ES Chapter Seven – <i>Land use and socio-economic effects</i> (document reference 6.1.7) assesses in detail the effects of the Proposed Development on existing landowners and businesses which will be displaced.</p>
	The respondent reflected that Project will rely on almost exclusively on its benefit case at Examination and that the examination will need to look at the proportionality and necessity of land take in light of the detailed evidence and options analysis and the viability and deliverability of the Project.	It is true that LRCH does not have the benefit of a National Policy Statement to support the proposed development but was designated a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project by the Secretary of State in 2014. ES Chapter Seven – <i>Land use and socio-economic effects</i> (document 6.1.7) assesses in detail the significant benefits of the Proposed Development. The <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1) sets out in detail approach to land acquisition.
	Stated no evidence to establish that the impacts of approving the Project are likely to be outweighed by its benefits.	ES Chapter Seven – <i>Land use and socio-economic effects</i> (document reference 6.1.7) clearly evidences the significant net benefits of the Proposed Development.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>Land take</p>	
	<p>Recognised that the Project as presented in the Scoping Report and other consultation documents shows the removal and redevelopment of the existing employment land.</p>	<p>This was confirmed at the meeting of 23 November 2020 and the fact this has been the case since 2014.</p>
	<p>Acquisition of the respondent and their tenant's interests in the land will have significant effects on employment generating interests and short to medium term letting potential.</p>	<p>ES Chapter Seven – <i>Land use and socio-economic effects</i> (document reference 6.1.7) compares existing uses with those proposed by the Proposed Development and the substantial net gain in employment prospects.</p>
	<p>The respondent noted in earlier iterations of the proposed masterplan that their land was not included which demonstrates that reasonable alternatives have been considered and are available. A return to an earlier version of the proposed development is urged to ensure that the land-take is proportionate and can be justified. During our discussion on 23rd November 2020 you advised there is limited scope for the removal of our Client's Site from the Order Limits. LRHC (sic) has not provided any information on this with which our client can engage.</p>	<p>The very earliest iterations of the masterplan might not have included this land however since 2014 and the statutory consultation that followed in 2015 the land has clearly been within the Order Limits. Indeed since this time LRCH has had to widen the Order Limits in order to accommodate all the development required for the Proposed Development.</p>
	<p>The respondent referred to the PEIR (Chapter 4, 4.25) and having "<i>tested a range of development options and confirmed the area of land required to deliver a viable and globally-attractive resort. This requirement was then reconciled with site constraints and the land-take of associated development</i>" They could not comment properly and effectively in way that can influence the Project without sight of that analysis</p>	<p>This chapter of the PEIR referred to a wider site identification exercise which resulted in choosing the Project Site. Further commentary and analysis is provided in ES Chapter Four: <i>Project development and alternatives</i> (document reference 6.1.4) and also in detailed at ES Appendix 4.1 <i>Assessment reports for the eleven site options considered by LRCH prior to the selection of Swanscombe Peninsula</i> (document reference 6.2.4.1).</p>
	<p>They further noted that LRHC (sic) intends to promote compulsory purchase [acquisition] on the basis of a speculative land-take requirement driven by hypothetical</p>	<p>LRCH sets out clearly the requirement for Compulsory Acquisition powers within the <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1) which clearly discusses why all the land within the Order Limits is</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>expansion beyond the currently required development envelope. This does not satisfy the legal requirements for inclusion of this land. Again, without sight of the options analysis, our client is not able to comment on how far beyond the required level of land-take the current CPO boundary extends.</p>	<p>required this is also clearly illustrated in the <i>Works Plans</i> (document reference 2.5) and the <i>Land Plans</i> (document reference 2.2).</p>
	<p>Blight and Relocation Strategy</p>	
	<p>The respondent stated there was no coherent strategy for blight and relocation.</p>	<p>LRCH has set out clearly in documentation and on five webinars the approach to relocation. The Statement of Reasons (document reference 4.1) sets out in detail LRCH’s approach to Blight.</p>
	<p>Whilst they are aware that discussions are taking place with land owners there are few references to what will happen to local businesses, where they will go and how the decant will be managed within the confines of the market for industrial space. They expect further information to be available in your Statement of Community Involvement / Consultation once the application is submitted, which we will review when it is available on the Planning Inspectorate website.</p>	<p>Discussions are ongoing with landowners and businesses and LRCH will continue to engage with these PILs.</p>
	<p>Blight and Relocation Strategy does not form part of the Project at submission, it is a fundamental failing of the compulsory purchase [acquisition] framework for the Project.</p>	<p>The <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1) sets out LRCH’s approach to land acquisition and the London Resort Premium</p>
	<p>To the extent that an (as yet unconsulted on) Blight and Relocation strategy is subsequently included, we note that our clients have not had a meaningful opportunity to contribute to it to ensure that it is effective. The respondent invited LRCH to remedy this before submission and engage with our client on the reasons for the extended land take and the measures for blight and tenant relocation to ensure that LRCH can demonstrate to the Planning Inspectorate that consultation has been</p>	<p>The respondent is possibly not aware of the considerable engagement which has resulted in the approach to land acquisition particularly following engagement with Peninsula Management Group which resulted in the 30% London Resort Premium. Further information is found in the <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1). As the Book of Reference (document reference 4.3) sets out LRCH has identified and notified PILs of the Statutory Consultation inviting them to have their say and LRCH also as part of that exercise held five webinars dedicated solely to land acquisition matters.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	effective in line with the statutory duty and relevant guidance.	
	The respondent questioned the financial status of LRCH and stated that the scale of the Project requires LRCH to provide detailed evidence at submission to support the application.	LRCH has prepared the <i>Funding Statement</i> (document reference 4.2) which addresses matters required.
	The respondent has now appointed a Compulsory Purchase Surveyor (Stephen Walker of CBRE) and we understand introductory discussions have been held between you. Given the significant blighting effect of the Project, it is of concern that no offer has been made by LRCH to acquire the property by agreement, nor is one likely to be made until after a Development Consent Order has been granted.	Savills acting on behalf of LRCH has been in contact with Mr Walker and has invited him to confirm his basis of charge so that a fee indemnity can be provided in line with similar indemnities provided to any claimant wishing to engage at this stage of the process. LRCH will continue to engage. LRCH aims to agree terms with PILs in advance of a DCO being granted.
	The potential for non-statutory blight is under these circumstances high and should be addressed in your property policies.	LRCH's approach to Statutory Blight is set out in the <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1)
Crossways Recycling Limited	Were not contacted regarding statutory consultation ended 21 September 2020.	The respondent was identified as a S42 consultee after the consultation had ended and was therefore notified and provided 28 days to provide consultation feedback.
	In principle the respondent is not against development such as the London Resort with the regeneration and employment it could bring area.	LRCH notes this response.
	The respondent stated they are very concerned at the likely impact it will have on its company, which it considers significant. The business operates a waste transfer and waste materials recovery facility and services its vehicles in another unit affected. The activities of the business are licensed by the Environment Agency. They employ 59 locally.	LRCH notes this response. LRCH has recognised that occupiers such as the respondent where operating under Environment Agency licence will require additional assistance and possibly time to relocate permanently. LRCH continues to investigate how this can be achieved and is in dialogue with a number of similar businesses.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	Environmental Permitting Regulations are stringent concerning all aspects of waste collection, transport, processing and recovery / delivery.	LRCH notes this response and is aware that relocation of these types of operations is complex and will continue to
	Significant obstacles to be overcome:	
	1. Relocated business will likely have to be within a building. 12m clear operating height will be required. The respondent was aware of a suitable site to the east of HS1 however it falls within the boundary of land required for the Resort.	LRCH notes this response. Land east of HS1 has been included within the Order Limits since 2014.
	2. Enclosing operations within a building aids compliance with noise and air quality however requires substantial fire resistance and also sufficient water supply for fire fighting.	LRCH notes this response.
	3. Possibility of finding suitable facility extremely remote in the respondent's opinion and they are aware of four competitors looking for similar facilities east of London.	LRCH notes this response and will work with the respondent to mitigate the issues arising from the requirement to relocate.
	4. The respondent highlighted that an alternative site must be within reasonable distance of the current facility in order to maintain client base and for their staff.	LRCH notes this response and will work with the respondent to mitigate the issues arising from the requirement to relocate.
	5. Any site identified would have to be subject to initial consultation with the Environment Agency and agreement reached in principle with the planning authority before they could commit to purchase or lease.	LRCH notes this response and will work with the respondent to mitigate the issues arising from the requirement to relocate.
	6. Planning consent will be difficult to achieve in the respondent's opinion and Environment agency will only issue a licence when planning permission has been achieved.	LRCH has recognised that occupiers such as the respondent where operating under Environment Agency licence will require additional assistance and possibly time to relocate permanently.
	7. The respondent noted that they estimate it will take two to three years if not longer to relocate.	LRCH has recognised that occupiers such as the respondent where operating under Environment Agency licence will require additional assistance and possibly time to relocate permanently.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>8. It will be essential to that any new facility be complete and ready to accept and process waste before their existing site is closed.</p>	LRCH notes this response.
	The respondent expects compensation to support the time and effort required of its management in order to relocate and will also require assistance of the local planning authorities and the Environment Agency	LRCH notes the response and refers to LRCH's land acquisition process and enhanced compensation offer as set out in the <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1).
Michael's Bridal Fabrics	The development shouldn't have affected businesses as our building lies outside the redline boundary accepted when the NSIP Direction Letter was issued by the Secretary of State originally in 2014. And is some significant way outside of that original proposal.	The original NSIP direction was not based on specific order limits. The Order Limits for LRCH's application which has included the respondent's property has been consulted on during multiple stages of consultation,
	LRCH seems to have changed this boundary over the years without any due consultation with any parties since the issue of the original Direction Letter back in 2014.	The Order Limits for LRCH's application has been consulted on. The Order Limits have changed over time in order to accommodate the Proposed Development and where additional land has been required the owners have served notice.
	The respondent is dissatisfied with the level of engagement and consultation having made it clear three years ago he would like to be first in line to be purchased. The respondent is dissatisfied at the time it is taking. He has appointed Keith Murray Associates to act on his behalf who has informed the respondent he has no update to provide him at present.	It is correct LRCH has been engaged with the respondent for a number of years both privately and also as part of engagement with Peninsula Management Group in 2017. LRCH is also aware that Keith Murray Associates are engaged by the respondent and Savills has been in regular contact with Mr Murray. Both the respondent and Mr Murray have been party to the statutory consultation events and have been made aware of the enhanced offer being proposed by LRCH.
	The respondent has been disappointed at the lack of a one-to-one meeting since emailing in May / June 2020 and states he is 65 and must move his business now.	LRCH has appointed Savills to act on its behalf and Savills is liaising with the respondent's agent.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.30 – Summary Table of Issues from Persons with an Interest in Land (PILs)

	<p>The respondent stated that LRCH has made no effort to discuss relocation and compensation for disturbance and also stated lack of available property citing his requirement for a freehold property as it is core to his pension fund.</p>	<p>Savills has been engaged with the claimant's agent and will continue to engage on the basis of LRCH's approach to land acquisition as set out in the <i>Statement of Reasons</i> (document reference 4.1)</p>
	<p>In summary, the entire consultation/engagement process has been very disappointing and many of the Swanscombe businesses are still not sure if they will be 'kicked out' or their sites are not required.</p>	<p>LRCH is confident that it has taken sufficient steps in order to consult with PILs affected by the proposed development and has served notice on each one in accordance with requirements of the Planning Act 2008. Additionally specific consultation events were aimed at PILs with five webinars being held between July and September 2020.</p>