

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

5.1 Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 (13 of 14)

**THE LONDON RESORT
DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER**

CONSULTATION REPORT APPENDICES

Reference: BC080001

Appendix 5.31

Summary of responses under Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008

Order of summary tables (starts at page)

Transport – general comments (1)

Transport – public transport (25)

Transport – road access (88)

Environment (119)

Cultural heritage (195)

Socio economics (210)

Benefits - jobs and skills (230)

Accessibility (243)

Emerging Masterplan (263)

General (280)

Consultation (298)

Responses from organisations (314)

Topic	Issue summary	Tally	Sub-issue (if relevant)	User IDs	Change to application (y/n)	Regard had to response
Transport - General		563				
	General comments on transport	108	82 respondents generally supported the transport plans, including enhanced rail links and use of the river and stated that there was a broad range of options available.	#00002715 #00002716 #00002724 #00002731 #00002733 #00002740 #00002743 #00002750 #00002774 #00002784 #00002808 #00002813 #00002822 #00002832 #00002844 #00002857 #00002873 #00002887 #00002888 #00002891 #00002895 #00002900 #00002920 #00002939 #00002943 #00002986 #00002987	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

				#00002991 #00002996 #00003005 #00003048 #00003070 #00003102 #00003118 #00003143 #00003144 #00003154 #00003155 #00003188 #00003207 #00003225 #00003250 #00003262 #00003286 #00003289 #00003292 #00003329 #00003340 #00003369 #00003403 #00003405 #00003406 #00003423 #00003424 #00003444 #00003510 #00003541 #00003542 #00003553 #00003567		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			#00003570 #00003572 #00003581 #00003588 #00003590 #00003622 #00004632 #00004678 #00004708 #00004710 #00004762 #00004797 #00004840 #00004859 #00004985 #00004995 #00005070 #00005093 #00005152 #00005216 #00005231 #00006263		
		8 respondents provided conditional support but suggested more information on a range of issues was required.	#00002789 #00003171 #00003429 #00003622 #00004749 #00004935 #00004936 #00004985	N	The Transport Assessment (Document reference 6.2.9.1) includes separate Chapters to detail the Active Travel Assessment (walking/cycling) and Public Transport Assessment (Rail (Existing Rail Provision (document ref 6.3.9.7) and Bus (Existing Bus Provision document ref 6.3.9.8). An Off-Site Parking Assessment has also been written to detail the management of local unrestricted parking and is included as part of the Transport Assessment. Where respondents have raised specific issues, these are addressed in the corresponding topic area of the relevant table.

			18 respondents believe that the proposals were positive for coping with traffic to the Resort.	#00002808 #00002883 #00002996 #00003038 #00003114 #00003194 #00003252 #00003277 #00003386 #00003405 #00003406 #00003444 #00003571 #00004762 #00004935 #00004974 #00004986 #00004995	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Incorporation of and use of existing infrastructure	4	4 respondents suggested the addition of a direct link on the Elizabeth Line and a connection to London Southend Airport, or a new airport.	#00002900 #00002714 #00003544 #00002826	N	The existing rail network (Existing Rail Provision (document ref 6.3.9.7)) links major London Airports to central London and onwards to the Resort. The expected demand from airports direct to The London Resort is not significant. The Transport Assessment (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. The extension of Crossrail is not within the DCO limits.
	Improvements to the local area	46	46 respondents generally supported the transport proposals. The following comments were received:	#00002717 #00002737 #00002839 #00002854 #00002887 #00002939	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the idea that the proposed changes would enhance the area and minimise residential disruption. • The plans would promote environmental enhancements. • The improvement would promote regeneration in the surrounding area. 	#00002951 #00003000 #00003029 #00003030 #00003079 #00003102 #00003143 #00003154 #00003188 #00003191 #00003194 #00003197 #00003215 #00003223 #00003235 #00003273 #00003329 #00003368 #00003386 #00003405 #00003424 #00003433 #00003532 #00003535 #00003567 #00003572 #00003574 #00003588 #00003623 #00004632 #00004683 #00004687 #00004757	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				#00004797 #00004985 #00004995 #00005039 #00005104 #00005216 #00005255		
Plans not detailed enough	16	16 respondents expressed concerns that the plans were not detailed enough with regard to transport solutions, traffic management and measurements of success.	#00002989 #00003177 #00003524 #00003529 #00003568 #00003585 #00004789 #00004905 #00004945 #00004952 #00004957 #00005176 #00005265 #00006272 #00006280 #00006282	N	The 2020 PEIR reflected the available information at the time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail for consultation. A review and monitoring element forms part of the Travel Demand Management Plan and Delivery and Servicing Plan. For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).	
General opposition	34	18 respondents generally opposed construction of the Resort and the associated transport plan either because	#00002758 #00002802 #00003148 #00003177 #00003189	N	LRCH notes the respondent's feedback. LRCH has fully considered the transport aspects of the scheme and this is included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). LRCH believes the plans are fully achievable.	

		they did not like the proposals or said the plans are not achievable.	#00003230 #00003231 #00003302 #00003323 #00003360 #00003371 #00003487 #00003569 #00004724 #00004778 #00005027 #00005043 #00005095		
		6 respondents objected generally to the transport plans as they are not sustainable or carbon neutral.	#00003177 #00002943 #00004669 #00005281 #00004789 #00006271	N	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. For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).
		3 respondents believe transport plans will increase social disparities between London, the South East and the rest of the country.	#00005271 #00002846 #00005136	N	Our Transport Assessment encourages a UK-wide 'day of travel' distribution and access to sustainable modes. On-site hotels will be available for those travelling longer distances. The Resort will be accessible by multiple modes of travel, which will allow connections from major transport hubs around the UK. For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).
		1 respondent believes that all transport should be confined to the Kent side of the River.	#00005229	N	The Transport Assessment (ref 6.2.9.1) is a comprehensive and systematic process that sets out transport issues relating to a proposed development. It identifies what measures will be taken to deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the scheme and to improve accessibility

					and safety for all modes of travel. As a result, it considers all transport issues regardless of geographical location. As such, as is required, both sides of the River Thames have been considered as part of the Transport Assessment.	
			1 respondent argues that road construction is 'destroying' the local area.	#00005141	N	LRCH is committed to maximising public transport access to the site, but acknowledges that car travel remains a key mode for a number of people and so the assessments take this into account. A comprehensive multi-modal Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed that seeks to create the best package from walking, cycling and public transport options. In reality, LRCH and The Resort will promote sustainable travel above car travel wherever possible and will seek to reduce the amount of car movements at the site.
			1 respondent is concerned the project has failed to include options such as Hyperloop.	#00003140	N	The Transport Assessment (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. Hyperloop would not be feasible.
			1 respondent said area already has large shopping centres, Dartford Tunnel and QE2 bridge nearby so an accident would create standstill traffic everywhere.	#00004905	N	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) reviews the highway impact of the proposed development. This ensures that wider trips as well as local impacts are reviewed and assessed.
			3 respondents raised concerns about the Resort's impact on travel within the local area.	#00003373 #00005255 #00005039	N	LRCH's conclusion is that the transport network can cope, underpinned by modal shift strategies. For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).

	<p>High volumes of traffic in the local area, causing issues for local residents and commuters</p>	73	<p>56 respondents raised opposition because the local transport infrastructure will not be able to cope.</p>	<p>#00002714 #00002784 #00002800 #00002847 #00002866 #00002887 #00002936 #00003091 #00003118 #00003214 #00003255 #00003317 #00003343 #00003350 #00003355 #00003386 #00003440 #00003452 #00003494 #00003506 #00003585 #00003589 #00003592 #00004657 #00004751 #00004786 #00004789 #00004829 #00004831 #00004832 #00004841 #00004851 #00004896</p>	N	<p>The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) reviews the highway impact of the proposed development. This ensures that wider trips as well as local impacts are reviewed and assessed.</p> <p>LRCH’s conclusion is that the transport network can cope, underpinned by modal shift strategies. For more information, please refer to LRCH’s Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).</p>
--	---	----	--	--	---	--

				#00004929 #00004935 #00004956 #00004957 #00004978 #00005010 #00005040 #00005044 #00005088 #00005095 #00005116 #00005128 #00005136 #00005165 #00005174 #00005176 #00005200 #00005240 #00005241 #00006263 #00006264 #00006280 #00006282 #00004948		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			17 respondents state that existing crossings (including the Dartford Tunnel) across the River Thames are not adequate to meet existing and anticipated demand.	#00002758 #00002801 #00003283 #00003295 #00003320 #00003506 #00004631 #00004644 #00004695 #00004758 #00004829 #00004841 #00005121 #00005128 #00006272 #00006280 #00006282	N	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) reviews the highway impact of the proposed development. This ensures that wider trips as well as local impacts are reviewed and assessed. LRCH's conclusion is that the transport network can cope, underpinned by modal shift strategies. For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).
			2 respondents expressed concerns over road functionality.	#00002854 #00005166	N	
			1 respondent expressed a desire to keep visitors away from residential areas.	#00004674	N	A people mover route is proposed between the Resort travel interchange located to the west of Ebbsfleet International Station and the ferry terminal on the Swanscombe Peninsula. A shuttle will then take visitors to Tilbury. Many of the visitors will not have any reason to go to the residential areas.
	Poor and unreliable transport links in the area and	21	10 respondents specifically mention general poor road, rail and public transport connectivity within the area.	#00002778 #00005142 #00005049 #00005037 #00005028	N	Delivery of London Resort will enhance transport infrastructure in the area. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New transport interchanges and supporting infrastructure within the London Resort and at Ebbsfleet

	cost of travel is too high		#00002800 #00004935 #00004896 #00003589 #00005174		<p>International station to support travel by river, rail, bus, coach and taxis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Park and Glide facility within the Port of Tilbury, with parking facilities, to provide access to the London Resort from north of the river - reducing traffic impacts on the Dartford Crossing and the A2 • Floating jetty and ferry terminal on the Peninsula, enabling use of the river both for construction, and for visitors and staff during operation - reducing traffic impacts on local roads and the wider road network • A new Thames Clipper service from central London, providing a ferry service to the London Resort • A dedicated people mover route running between Ebbsfleet International station to the London Resort and the new ferry terminal on the Peninsula • Working closely with the Fastrack team to develop proposals for a bus service to provide access to the London Resort • Improved local walkways and cycle paths • Access provision for disabled people • Improvement to the local road network (for example the Asda roundabout in Tilbury) and access to the site via A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction (over and above improvements currently being delivered by Highways England) <p>For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).</p>
		10 respondents stated that discounts or free travel should be provided for people travelling via sustainable methods.	#00003361 #00004899 #00005047 #00005135 #00003091	N	The Travel Demand Management Plan seeks to incentivise travel by sustainable modes. However, it is not feasible to offer free travel; this is discussed more within the Travel Demand Management Plan chapter of the Transport

				#00005077 #00004679 #00005029 #00006266 #00003544		Assessment. For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent stated that it is important that the London Resort and the facilities are accessible and affordable to local residents in the Swanscombe area and that regeneration is collaborative, suggesting discounted fares for local residents.	#00004799	N	
			1 respondent stated that a discount should be provided for those travelling via the Dartford Crossing toll road.	#00003108	N	The proposals include implementation of a car park in Tilbury, north of the River, for 25% of private vehicles and coaches, meaning that people travelling clockwise around the M25 will have the opportunity to Park & Glide via the Port of Tilbury thus avoiding the Dartford Crossing toll.
	Transport and health/ environment impacts	63	40 respondents stated that the plans are not sustainable as the increase in traffic would lead to more air pollution and negate carbon savings.	#00002936 #00003219 #00003269 #00003386 #00003402 #00003414 #00003422 #00003473 #00003474 #00003592 #00003604 #00003616 #00004657 #00004713 #00004732	N	<p>The Resort is promoting sustainable travel throughout its design, with dedicated connections to Ebbsfleet (HS1) and local services. This Assessment will minimise the impacts on Air Quality.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (ES) has specific chapters on Air Quality (Chapter 16, document ref 6.1.16) and the associated impacts from the Site.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) seeks to use the strategic road network (SRN) for those visitors and staff travelling by car. This is the most appropriate network and removes interaction with local streets and residents. The highway impact assessment considers the worst-case scenario, but it is expected that the Travel Demand</p>

			#00004748 #00004768 #00004778 #00004829 #00004983 #00005028 #00005040 #00005054 #00005081 #00005106 #00005136 #00005145 #00005151 #00005158 #00005159 #00005165 #00005184 #00005200 #00005229 #00006262 #00006263 #00006271 #00006272 #00006280 #00006282		Management Plan, public Transport Assessment and active travel Assessment will encourage and enable travel away from reliance on private vehicles in order to minimise increases in air pollution. The Air Quality impacts (document ref 6.1.16) are set out in the Environmental Statement (ES). For more information, please refer to LRCH’s Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).
		7 respondents believe that construction vehicles using local roads will emit pollution meaning the Resort is not carbon neutral.	#00003585 #00005200 #00005174 #00005141 #00004731 #00003572 #00004789	N	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. In addition, an Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP document ref 6.2.3.2) has been prepared for the application which is designed to manage and mitigate potential impacts. At this

					<p>stage mitigation measures include providing a consolidation centre for vehicle traffic and an expectation that 80% of construction materials will arrive via the River.</p> <p>Together these activities will help LRCH reach its clearly stated target for the London Resort to be net carbon neutral in operation. For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).</p>
		<p>11 respondents believe an increase in traffic could result in high levels of noise pollution.</p>	<p>#00005145 #00005054 #00002847 #00004897 #00004832 #00003113 #00005174 #00005158 #00005040 #00004768 #00006271</p>	N	<p>The highway impact assessment considers the worst-case scenario, but it is expected that the Travel Demand Management Plan, public Transport Assessment and active travel Assessment will encourage and enable travel away from reliance on private vehicles in order to minimise increases in air pollution. The noise pollution impacts are set out in the Environmental Statement (ES) (document ref 6.1.15). Overall, LRCH concludes that the benefits are expected to far outweigh any adverse impacts.</p>
		<p>1 respondent made a general comment that the vehicles used by the public would not be electric.</p>	<p>#00005049</p>	N	<p>The London Resort will monitor trends and uptake in future emerging technologies and will respond to incorporate into the Transport Strategy. This includes the use of electric vehicles (EV's) as part of the options at the Site. The Resort will look to be able to future proof and adapt to technology as it gets built out and operates. This will include a review of the best vehicles for use for all aspects of the site. The Transport Assessment already includes use of internal electric delivery and servicing vehicles for the site, which could be expanded further. For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).</p>

			4 respondents believe the transport plans will not negate environmental damage and the Marshes should be protected.	#00004849 #00005141 #00004948 #00005040		Detailed within the ES, as part of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) there is an allocation of leisure walks and green areas around the Site, as much as possible.
	Sustainable methods of travel	61	28 respondents supported the broad range of sustainable transport options available including the suggested inclusion of solar powered or electric buses and ferries.	#00002832 #00002872 #00002903 #00002906 #00002944 #00002958 #00002997 #00003039 #00003139 #00003140 #00003159 #00003165 #00003166 #00003171 #00003188 #00003215 #00003379 #00003537 #00003567 #00003572 #00003594 #00003601 #00004683 #00004762 #00004995 #00005008 #00005101 #00005184	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

			1 respondent supported the plans for sustainable travel but called for more information on the phasing of multi-modal delivery.	#00004995	N	The Travel Demand Management Plan developed for the site sets out the monitoring methodology over time and how the Resort can react to demand and areas of focus. This includes being able to scale up measures or the Travel Demand Management Plan to minimise impacts on the local and wider network. For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent supported the proposals for sustainable travel but objected to the Resort.	#00005043	N	LRCH notes support for the transport plan and the respondent's objection to the London Resort.
			1 respondent opposed the transport proposals, stating they believe the London Resort sustainability policy needs further development and more information provided to the public.	#00006271	N	LRCH believes that adequate information was provided at consultation for respondents to make an informed response.
Sustainability and road-usership	25		3 respondents stated that sustainability should be balanced with driving and adequate car parking spaces provided.	#00002903 #00003108 #00004910	N	The number of spaces has been calculated using a worst-case scenario based on mode shares, assuming full use of the car parks at all times. LRCH will promote sustainable travel above car travel wherever possible and will seek to reduce the amount of car movements at the Site. A comprehensive multi-modal Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed that seeks to make the best package from walking, cycling and public transport options. It is however, acknowledged that car travel remains a key mode for a number of people and so the assessments take this into account.
			10 respondents stated that more information was needed on how proposals would account for the shift to electric vehicle use.	#00003156 #00003395 #00004854 #00003317	N	LRCH will monitor trends and uptake in future emerging technologies and will respond to incorporate into the Transport Strategy. This includes the use of electric vehicles (EV's) as part of the options at the Site. The Resort will look

			#00003054 #00003537 #00002930 #00004840 #00004731 #00005200		to be able to future proof and adapt to technology as it gets built out and operates. This will include a review of the best vehicles for use for all aspects of the site. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) already includes the use of internal electric delivery and servicing vehicles for the site, which could be expanded further. Detail is provided in Technical Note 4: Future Mobility.	
			4 respondents stated that providing car parking would counter the benefits of sustainable travel offerings.	#00003177 #00003162 #00005200 #00005090	N	The number of spaces has been calculated using a worst-case scenario based on mode shares, assuming full use of the car parks at all times. In reality, LRCH will promote sustainable travel above car travel wherever possible and will seek to reduce the amount of car movements at the Site. A comprehensive multi-modal Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed that seeks to make the best package from walking, cycling and public transport options. It is however, acknowledged that car travel remains a key mode for a number of people and so the assessments take this into account.
			7 respondents believe that parking charges should be used in car parks to disincentivise their use and encourage public transport use.	#00003156 #00003139 #00004914 #00002948 #00006264 #00006263 #00003118	N	There will be parking charges to use the Resort car parks. LRCH recognises that free parking could encourage use by private vehicle, which could have knock on effects and minimise uptake of sustainable modes. Further information is available in the Travel Demand Management Plan. And the Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent said no car parks should be provided except for disabled parking.	#00003086	N	LRCH acknowledge that car travel remains a key mode for a number of people and so the assessments and allocation of parking takes this into account.
	Impact on the local community	5	5 respondents stated that the sustainable transport measures were not enough to prevent a	#00002784 #00003219 #00003473	N	The Transport Assessment submitted with the application concludes that the existing transport network in the area can accommodate the Resort as well as bringing a number of

			negative impact on the local community.	#00005095 #00004768		benefits to travel in the local area for local communities. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
Future methods of transport	40		1 respondent states that the transport proposals are not suitable as most people will use their cars owing to poor local transport connectivity, a dedicated road for an electric shuttle bus is suggested.	#00002948	N	A full review of the existing accessibility of the Essex and Kent Project Sites has been undertaken as part of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and demonstrates a comprehensive and cohesive river, rail and bus network within the vicinity of The London Resort.
			2 respondents state that further consideration should be given to the interaction of electric vehicles with the resort in the future, including the introduction of EV charging.	#00003280 #00004688	N	The London Resort will monitor trends and uptake in future emerging technologies and will respond to incorporate into the Transport Strategy. This includes the use of electric vehicles (EV's) as part of the options at the Site. The Resort will look to be able to future proof and adapt to technology as it gets built out and operates. This will include a review of the best vehicles for use for all aspects of the site. The Transport Assessment already includes the use of internal electric delivery and servicing vehicles for the site, which could be expanded further, with further detail in Transport Technical Note 4: Future Mobility
			1 respondent called for the introduction of seated escalators to get around the Resort.	#00003544	N	The Resort is being designed so all users can safely access the Resort, including mobility impaired visitors and staff.
			27 respondents believe that despite the range of options, the majority of people would continue to drive.	#00002821 #00002906 #00002948 #00003050 #00003221 #00003434 #00003443	N	It is acknowledged that car travel remains a key mode for a number of people and so the assessments take this into account. A comprehensive multi-modal Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed that seeks to create the best package from walking, cycling and public transport options. In reality, LRCH and The Resort will promote sustainable travel above car travel wherever

				#00003452 #00003592 #00003619 #00003622 #00004657 #00004751 #00004758 #00004831 #00004854 #00004861 #00004866 #00004885 #00004931 #00004937 #00004949 #00004956 #00005049 #00005118 #00005190 #00005193		possible and will seek to reduce the amount of car movements at the site.
			9 respondents generally stated that car travel should be discouraged or banned.	#00003186 #00003369 #00003386 #00003548 #00003616 #00004885 #00003101 #00004797 #00002936	N	It is acknowledged that car travel remains a key mode for a number of people and so the assessments take this into account. A comprehensive multi-modal Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed that seeks to create the best package from walking, cycling and public transport options. In reality, LRCH and The Resort will promote sustainable travel above car travel wherever possible and will seek to reduce the amount of car movements at the site.
		56	33 respondents stated that a wide variety of transport options	#00002716 #00002717	N	The Transport Assessment details the existing accessibility of the Kent and Essex Project Site's via a number of modes. It is

	Range of transport options		should be available to visitors of the Resort.	#00002724 #00002727 #00002737 #00002749 #00002774 #00002783 #00002794 #00002813 #00002822 #00002826 #00002844 #00002857 #00002944 #00002964 #00003050 #00003098 #00003099 #00003155 #00003213 #00003369 #00003510 #00003541 #00003542 #00003567 #00004710 #00004797 #00004885 #00004923 #00004949 #00005234 #00005240		acknowledged that car travel remains a key mode for a number of people and so the assessments take this into account. A comprehensive multi-modal Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed that seeks to create the best package from walking, cycling and public transport options. In reality, LRCH and The Resort will promote sustainable travel above car travel wherever possible and will seek to reduce the amount of car movements at the site.
--	-----------------------------------	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>11 respondents stated that all existing local transport infrastructure would need upgrading or enhancing.</p>	<p>#00003358 #00003337 #00003154 #00004949 #00004919 #00006263 #00005190 #00003622 #00004851 #00004841 #00005054</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Delivery of London Resort will enhance transport infrastructure in the area. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New transport interchanges and supporting infrastructure within the London Resort and at Ebbsfleet International station to support travel by river, rail, bus, coach and taxis. • New Park and Glide facility within the Port of Tilbury, with parking facilities, to provide access to the London Resort from north of the river - reducing traffic impacts on the Dartford Crossing and the A2. • Floating jetty and ferry terminal on the Peninsula, enabling use of the river both for construction, and for visitors and staff during operation - reducing traffic impacts on local roads and the wider road network. • A new Thames Clipper service from central London, providing a ferry service to the London Resort. • A dedicated people mover route running between Ebbsfleet International station to the London Resort and the new ferry terminal on the Peninsula. • Working closely with the Fastrack team to develop proposals for a bus service to provide access to the London Resort. • Improved local walkways and cycle paths. • Access provision for disabled people. • Improvement to the local road network (for example the Asda roundabout in Tilbury) and access to the site via A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction (over and above improvements currently being delivered by Highways England). <p>For more information, please refer to LRCH's Transport Assessment (document reference 6.2.9.1).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	----------	--

			4 respondents called for additional lanes for e-scooters.	#00003384 #00003544 #00004688 #00004797	N	Private E-scooters cannot currently be ridden on a UK public road, cycle lane or pavement and anyone who does so is committing an offence. The only place an e-scooter can be used is on private land and as such no consideration has been given to the incorporation of facilities or dedicated infrastructure for e-scooters. Whilst rental scooters can be used, a review of demand and uptake will need to be undertaken before infrastructure is provided. If legislation changes, then the Resort will be able to review connections and parking etc to accommodate users as part of its monitoring strategy.
			8 respondents stated that too much emphasis has been placed on supporting car travel in London Resort's plans.	#00003019 #00004657 #00004971 #00002948 #00002872 #00003585 #00004789 #00006271	N	The Transport Assessment details the existing accessibility of the Kent and Essex Project Site's via a number of modes. It is acknowledged that car travel remains a key mode for a number of people and so the assessments take this into account. A comprehensive multi-modal Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed that seeks to create the best package from walking, cycling and public transport options. In reality, LRCH and The Resort will promote sustainable travel above car travel wherever possible and will seek to reduce the amount of car movements at the site.
	New modes of travel	8	8 respondents called for the introduction of a monorail system linking Ebbsfleet International, Gravesend, the Resort and the pier.	#00002898 #00003171 #00002888 #00003118 #00003156 #00003464 #00005267 #00003464	N	A people mover is proposed to connect the pier, The London Resort and Ebbsfleet International. A dedicated new walk and cycle way is also proposed between the same points.
	Increased accessibility	3	3 respondents stated that visiting the Resort would be more	#00003224 #00003601 #00005008	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

	to/from the Resort		accessible owing to the options available.			
	Surrounding areas	2	2 respondents stated that transport (road and rail) access to Kent had not been considered.	#00005193 #00004832	N	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) details the existing accessibility of the Kent and Essex Project Site's via a number of modes. The impacts on the highway network have been assessed in detail within strategic, microsimulation and local junction models. The impacts on Public Transport have been assessed within the Public Transport Strategy, supported by ongoing conversations with local operators of buses, trains and ferries.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Topic	Issue summary	Tally	Sub-issue (if relevant)	User IDs	Change to application (y/n)	Regard had to response
Public Transport		1,245				
	Broad range of options	27	8 respondents supported the range of options available.	#00002717 #00002894 #00003171 #00003213 #00003224 #00003271 #00003446 #00004866		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			19 respondents stated that visitors and local people would benefit from more travel options and greater connectivity.	#00002733 #00002888 #00003118 #00003224 #00003229 #00003233 #00003253 #00003271 #00003281 #00003285 #00003358 #00003363 #00003429 #00003433 #00003575 #00003622 #00003623 #00004797 #00005108		LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	General public	27	26 respondents generally supported the inclusion of public	#00002731 #00002749		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

	transport support		transport into the plans; some commented it would improve public transport in the area.	#00002813 #00002832 #00002939 #00003038 #00003118 #00003139 #00003155 #00003186 #00003250 #00003311 #00003405 #00003444 #00004632 #00004751 #00004794 #00004797 #00004833 #00004866 #00004919 #00004943 #00005070 #00005131 #00005281 #00006263 #00003026		
			1 respondent supported the plans but stated that the government should hold LRCH to account on public transport promises.	#00002731		Should LRCH's DCO application be successful, comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will then be in place, which LRCH must adhere to.
	General opposition	26	9 respondents objected to the public transport plans. Comments included the plans are overambitious, would not come to	#00002746 #00002948 #00003231 #00003353		LRCH notes these responses. LRCH has fully considered the transport aspects of the scheme and this is included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). LRCH believes the plans are fully achievable.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

		<p>fruition, would not encourage the use of public transport, disruption to existing users, existing capacity issues, previous spend has not resolved existing issues, on the basis Kent is not in London and does not use London transportation.</p>	<p>#00003455 #00003473 #00003478 #00004737 #00004789</p>		<p>A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
		<p>15 respondents stated that people will not use public transport but will continue to use the car.</p>	<p>#00002758 #00002807 #00002862 #00003393 #00003569 #00004657 #00004679 #00004885 #00004930 #00004931 #00004937 #00004973 #00004994 #00005168 #00006272</p>		<p>A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
		<p>1 respondent stated the public transport plans do not accommodate those travelling from all over the UK and Europe to visit the Resort.</p>	<p>#00004994</p>		<p>Domestically, London is the hub of the national rail and road networks. London is also the most popular destination for international visitors. The Project site is just 17 minutes to central London by train and offers excellent links to the rest of the country, and mainland Europe. The Project’s unique location presents the opportunity to maximise the use of river and rail, and the site is already connected to excellent public transport links.</p>
		<p>1 respondent stated there needs to be a focus on cars; do not just</p>	<p>#00002821</p>		<p>LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			assume the majority will use public transport.			
	Impact on local infrastructure	63	2 respondents stated that pressure on public transport would be reduced.	#00003034 #00003098		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			60 respondents expressed concerns that the local infrastructure network is currently inadequate. Comment included capacity issues with trains and buses, as well as an increased pressure on public transport.	#00002778 #00003487 #00002801 #00002816 #00002847 #00002866 #00002924 #00002971 #00003060 #00003255 #00003298 #00003306 #00003317 #00003323 #00003324 #00003344 #00003371 #00003375 #00003439 #00003447 #00003472 #00003490 #00003524 #00003553 #00003568 #00003585 #00003589 #00003622		LRCH is in discussion with local authorities and local transport operators to 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. In cooperation with the above we developing upgrades for the local network as well as investigating ways to reduce impacts on the local transport network. The Transport Strategy 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.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00004644		
				#00004744		
				#00004758		
				#00004763		
				#00004802		
				#00004847		
				#00004894		
				#00004896		
				#00004898		
				#00004902		
				#00004913		
				#00004920		
				#00004930		
				#00004935		
				#00004937		
				#00004948		
				#00004949		
				#00004957		
				#00005037		
				#00005042		
				#00005044		
				#00005047		
				#00005077		
				#00005091		
				#00005095		
				#00005120		
				#00005128		
				#00005158		
				#00005174		
				#00005241		
				#00006263		
				#00006272		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent highlighted that locals should get priority on public transport.	#00004798		
Improved public transport	6		4 respondents stated that the plans would improve public transport.	#00002951 #00002740 #00003421 #00004919		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			2 respondents stated that all public transport in the area would need to be upgraded; one commented preferably before the Resort opens.	#00003358 #00003623		LRCH is in discussion with local authorities and local transport operators to determine the impacts of visitors/staff demand the London Resort. In cooperation with the above we developing upgrades for the local network as well as investigating ways to reduce impacts on the local transport network. Details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information.
Improved connectivity	15		5 respondents supported the enhanced connectivity provided by public transport.	#00003446 #00003571 #00004679 #00004797 #00004897		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			2 respondents stated that public transport links to and from London would be improved.	#00004994 #00005101		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			1 respondent supported improved local public transport connectivity but not the development of the park.	#00005281		LRCH notes and welcomes this response.
			7 respondents stated they would like to see improved public transport to the Resort. Comments included from Kent, London and from Bluewater.	#00005193 #00005038 #00005101 #00002988 #00002749 #00003311		LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00003171		
	Reliability	4	4 respondents stated that existing public transport is unreliable.	#0000362 #0000493 #0000347 #0000357		Existing public transport services are being reviewed. This will include further discussions with operators regarding improvements to bus routes and services and additional rail capacity where required to meet visitor demand. This includes working closely with the Fastrack team at Kent County Council to potentially develop proposals for a Fastrack service to the London Resort. However, LRCH is not accountable for existing public transport.
	Congestion	39	11 respondents stated that the use of public transport can reduce congestion.	#00002731 #00002733 #00002911 #00002996 #00003162 #00003194 #00003369 #00003424 #00004793 #00005008 #00005070		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			28 respondents stated that the public transport options would increase/ not decrease local congestion.	#00002749 #00002801 #00002807 #00003060 #00003317 #00003330 #00003389 #00003393 #00003443 #00003453 #00003478 #00003524 #00003569 #00003579		The Traffic Flows (document ref 6.2.9.2) 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 (document ref 6.2.9.1) 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. 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 London Resort so that the increased travel demand can be safely accommodated by the local transport network.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00003589 #00003618 #00004679 #00004758 #00004885 #00004965 #00004973 #00004998 #00005077 #00005091 #00005142 #00005174 #00005238 #00006272		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. The Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.
	Journey time	6	5 respondents stated that journey times on public transport are too high to make this a feasible option (both locally, regionally and nationally).	#00002802 #00003228 #00003537 #00003569 #00004688		<p>The Project Site's unique location presents the opportunity to maximise the use of river and rail, and the site is already connected to excellent public transport links.</p> <p>Domestically, London is the hub of the national rail and road networks. London is also the most popular destination for international visitors. The Project site is just 17 minutes to central London by train and offers excellent links to the rest of the country, and mainland Europe. The Project's unique location presents the opportunity to maximise the use of river and rail, and the site is already connected to excellent public transport links.</p> <p>A Travel Demand Management Plan has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
			1 respondent stated that commute times should not be impacted by public transport plans.	#00004670		LRCH is in discussion with local transport operators to 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.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

	Sustainability	19	3 respondents generally supported the sustainable travel plans.	#00003422 #00003574 #00005008		LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
			9 respondents stated that public transport should be environmentally positive and sustainable.	#00002908 #00002878 #00002832 #00002717 #00003194 #00005044 #00005008 #00002827 #00002872		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 Demand Management Plan incentivises this travel. LRCH has a clearly stated target for the London Resort to be net carbon neutral in operation. Details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information.
			3 respondents stated that more work needs to be done on improving the sustainability of public transport options.	#00003280 #00004657 #00003319		
			3 respondents stated that public transport plans are not environmentally sustainable owing to increased emissions.	#00003320 #00004751 #00004789		
			1 respondent stated that public transport should be carbon negative.	#00002900		
	Additional information	2	1 respondent wished to see more detailed public transport plans.	#00003171		LRCH's Transport Assessments are based on operational days for 2025 (first full year of operation), 2029 (opening of Gate 2) and 2038 (Maturity), covering different times of day, including peak travel (am and pm) and peak arrival times. The 2020 PEIR reflected the available information at the time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail for consultation. Further detail is now available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information.
		1 respondent requested additional information on public transport access from the north of the Thames.	#00006272			

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Questioning of figures	1	1 respondent questioned the passenger numbers quoted who would use public transport.	#00005065		<p>The Public Transport Strategy sets out the baseline mode shares and distribution of visitors and staff and is summarised in the table below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Mode</th> <th>Gate 1 (2024)</th> <th>Gate 2 (2029)</th> <th>Maturity (2038)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Car</td> <td>55-60%</td> <td>45-50%</td> <td>35-40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rail</td> <td>25-30%</td> <td>28-33%</td> <td>30-35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>River</td> <td>10%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coach</td> <td>5%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Mode	Gate 1 (2024)	Gate 2 (2029)	Maturity (2038)	Car	55-60%	45-50%	35-40%	Rail	25-30%	28-33%	30-35%	River	10%	12%	15%	Coach	5%	9%	12%				
Mode	Gate 1 (2024)	Gate 2 (2029)	Maturity (2038)																										
Car	55-60%	45-50%	35-40%																										
Rail	25-30%	28-33%	30-35%																										
River	10%	12%	15%																										
Coach	5%	9%	12%																										
COVID-19	1	1 respondent stated that due to COVID-19 people will not use public transport.	#00005112		<p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) acknowledges that COVID-19 has the potential to impact a variety of health, social, economic and demographic indicators. This notes that 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 opening year of Gate One).</p>																								
Incentives to use public transport	16	15 respondents stated that incentives should be provided to encourage the use public transport, walking or cycling to the Resort.	#00002714 #00002898 #00002943 #00003035 #00003162 #00003330 #00003373 #00003395 #00004646 #00004905 #00004943 #00005047 #00005135		<p>A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>																								

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00005199 #00005238		
			1 respondent complained that Kent does not offer incentives and free travel like London does.	#00003455		
Fares - general	27	8 respondents stated that they would like to see transport fares subsidised for those visiting the park.	#00003339 #00004899 #00005273 #00005238 #00005018 #00003300 #00005135 #00006266			A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). However, it is not feasible to offer free travel; this is discussed more within the Travel Demand Management Plan chapter of the Transport Assessment.
		13 respondents stated that public transport as it is too expensive, and so people will not use.	#00002936 #00003228 #00005168 #00005158 #00003478 #00004990 #00005049 #00005047 #00003091 #00002948 #00004965 #00005190 #00004799			
		1 respondent was concern about the Resort’s impact on public transport prices for locals.	#00003231			
		1 respondent stated that local workers should be provided free travel.	#00006266			LRCH has identified potential options for staff to use existing bus services, including the provision of staff shuttle buses. Staff travel is under consideration as part of the Travel Demand Management

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

						Strategy. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			4 respondents stated that the Oyster card should be introduced in the area.	#00003571 #00005101 #00005069 #00003553		The Oyster card is a payment scheme for public transport in London, operated by Transport for London. This is outside the scope of the London Resort.
Fares - river	7	4 respondents stated that fares for the river services should be free or highly discounted.	#00003300 #00005057 #00004948 #00006266		A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
		2 respondents stated that ferry fares needed to be competitive to discourage car use.	#00003300 #00003623			
		1 respondent states that local people and visitors will not use the river ferries.	#00004998			
Fares - rail	23	12 respondents stated that rail travel costs are too prohibitive to make this a feasible option.	#00002936 #00003005 #00003083 #00003361 #00003477 #00003619 #00003622 #00004905 #00004973 #00005056 #00005077 #00005190			
		3 respondents stated that rail options should be affordable.	#00003623 #00005273 #00003091			

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			3 respondents stated that rail travel should be subsidised by London Resort. #00003300 #00003361 #00003108		
			1 respondent stated that visitors would use Greenhithe station to arrive owing to cost. #00004902		
			1 respondent called for the introduction of a ticket which would connect C2C rail travel with Tilbury Town. #00003351		
			3 respondents stated discussions should take place with TFL over fares. #00003344 #00005135 #00003311		LRCH is not responsible for cost of travel on Transport for London. That is outside the remit of the Proposed Development and is a decision for Tfl.
	Fares - buses	3	2 respondents stated that fares on buses should be affordable. #00003623 #00004990		A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent called for London Resort to scrap the use of buses and electric buses owing to their pollution (including rubber pollution). #00003171		A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The London Resort will monitor trends and uptake in future emerging technologies and will respond to incorporate into the Transport Strategy. This will include a review of the best vehicles for use for all aspects of the site.
	Fares - people mover	4	4 respondents stated that the people mover should be free of charge. #00003156 #00003237 #00003384 #00006266		A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). However, it is not feasible to offer free travel; this is discussed more within the Travel Demand Management Plan chapter of the Transport Assessment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

	Fares - tram	1	1 respondent stated that tram fares are considerably cheaper than rail and so this should be taken into consideration.	#00005077		KenEx is proposing a tram service in the area. LRCH is liaising with the KenEx tram service promoters to understand how their proposals could link to the London Resort. However, London Resort's transport proposals are not reliant on KenEx.
	General support for inclusion of the River in transport plans	82	59 respondents generally supported the use of the river in transport plans, including the proposed 'Park and Glide'.	#00002718 #00002725 #00002733 #00002773 #00002803 #00002891 #00002900 #00002919 #00002943 #00002986 #00002987 #00003070 #00003095 #00003154 #00003155 #00003202 #00003225 #00003229 #00003231 #00003250 #00003254 #00003255 #00003263 #00003268 #00003271 #00003285 #00003319 #00003329 #00003337		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00003339 #00003379 #00003406 #00003421 #00003423 #00003510 #00003523 #00003567 #00003571 #00003601 #00003622 #00004632 #00004678 #00004701 #00004762 #00004869 #00004877 #00004979 #00004995 #00005047 #00005059 #00005070 #00005093 #00005096 #00005101 #00005138 #00005194 #00005199 #00005216 #00006263		
			22 respondents stated that river access would reduce the need for a car and local congestion.	#00002733 #00002749 #00002808		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00002884 #00002910 #00003141 #00003229 #00003250 #00003399 #00003406 #00003441 #00003453 #00003567 #00003615 #00004669 #00004708 #00004762 #00004797 #00004847 #00004995 #00005070 #00005093		
			1 respondent supported the use of river connections as opposed to the construction of new roads.	#00004788		LRCH notes and welcomes this response.
General opposition for inclusion of the River in transport plans	20	3 respondents stated that poor weather would force people to use their cars as opposed to the ferries.	#00002758 #00005166 #00002781			Thames Clipper operational statistics show it was only not operational 4 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).
		8 respondents stated that people would not utilise the river to get to the Resort.	#00003619 #00004631 #00004751 #00004905 #00005049			The River Strategy has been developed to accommodate up to 15% of total people arriving and departing by River. The Travel Demand Management Plan seeks to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			#00005063 #00005166 #00005190		
		3 respondents stated that there would be a marginal impact on traffic with the introduction of Thames Clippers.	#00005122 #00005173 #00005091		LRCH has undertaken a worst-case Highway Impact Assessment using mode shares based on full car parking occupancy. The Travel Demand Management Plan seeks to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes. More detail can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
		1 respondent stated that the river access to the area is already over-crowded.	#00005071		LRCH has been in dialogue with the Port of London Authority and existing river operators who have indicated the ability to serve the resort by both barge for construction / operation and passenger service vehicles. A Navigational 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.
		1 respondent disputed the need to use the A1089 to access the ferry terminal given existing congestion in the area.	#00003305		A Highway Impact Assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
		1 respondent stated that the plans for a park and glide would result in increased traffic in Tilbury.	#00005145		
		2 respondents stated that the ferry terminal in Tilbury would lead to increased traffic congestion in the Thurrock area.	#00003456 #00006272		
		1 respondent stated that development would destroy the history of the river.	#00005071		
					The proposed masterplan is rooted in and informed by the rich and diverse history of the area, embracing and enhancing the industrial landscape created by the former cement industry. This history is greatly respected and will be celebrated in a variety of ways including within the Visitors Centre through permanent exhibitions together with opportunities to inform the public using the peninsula through

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

						wayfinding and points of interest and information across the peninsula. The ambition is to celebrate the history of the peninsula helping to create a unique sense of identity for the London Resort, a sense of belonging, a good neighbour.
Additional information required - river	8	2 respondents generally stated that more information was required on river use.	#00003529 #00005241		River Strategy and impacts have been included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
		1 respondent stated that additional information is required on how the development will impact current users of the River.	#00006280			
		1 respondent questioned whether Tilbury Docks will be able to cope with their estimate of 152 sailings per day.	#00005065		Discussions with the Port of Tilbury, who have confirmed they don't expect an increase in sailings due to the Resort and the existing Port can accommodate additional demand associated with The London Resort park and glide.	
		1 respondent asked how private car owners would be discouraged from parking locally and then using the Thames Clipper.	#00004945		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).	
		2 respondents requested more information on the number of passengers arriving by River.	#00002988 #00005241		The River Strategy has been developed to accommodate up to 15% of total people arriving and departing by River. The Travel Demand Management Plan seeks to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
		1 respondent questioned the need for a haul road if all materials are to be transported via the River.	#00004789		There is a construction management plan to manage the impacts, a consolidation centre will be located, and it is expected that 90-95% 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).	

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

River safety	4	1 respondent raised concerns about existing RNLI infrastructure and their ability to respond to an incident.	#00005241		River Strategy has looked at all existing services and this will be monitored in the detailed design stage.
		1 respondent stated that an additional assessment is required on navigational safety in the Thames.	#00005241		River Strategy and impacts have been included within the Transport Assessment. A Navigational Risk Assessment (document ref 6.2.10.1) has been undertaken and is referenced in the River chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.10).
		1 respondent stated that there would be a negative impact on local sailing clubs who would face increased risk and difficulty navigating the Thames with the introduction of additional ferries.	#00004999		
		1 respondent stated that people would not use the river as it is dangerous (tidal, commercial shipping).	#00005166		The River Strategy has been developed to accommodate up to 15% of total people arriving and departing by River. The Travel Demand Management Plan seeks to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
Environment and sustainability - river	20	4 respondents stated that the river transport plans are sustainable.	#00002997 #00003406 #00003601 #00004847		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
		1 respondent stated that the Thames option was preferable as it does not harm the environment.	#00004687		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
		1 respondent wanted more information on the type of fuel the boats would use.	#00002918		Discussion with the selected operators at a later stage will include fuel type. The site will look to incorporate EV technology wherever and whenever possible.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			2 respondents state that the diesel-powered boats would negate any environmental benefits.	#00005200 #00005081		
			1 respondent stated that the ferries should be all-electric with rapid charging.	#00003537		
			1 respondent stated that the river services should be powered by hydrogen.	#00002900		
			2 respondents stated that boats should be considered only if they are sustainable.	#00002808 #00003578		
			7 respondents stated that the river transport plans are not sustainable or would have a negative impact on the environment.	#00002784 #00005166 #00005142 #00005081 #00003305 #00004957 #00005106		
			1 respondent stated that pollution filters should be added to the water to mitigate the impact of the ferries.	#00003035		
	Marine and wildlife	2	2 respondents stated that wildlife/marine welfare needed to be considered with the introduction of the ferries.	#00003309 #00005081		A specific river chapter in the ES (chapter 10 document ref 6.1.10) looks at impacts of river use and the impact of the ferries. Further chapters (12 and 13) ecology look at the impacts of local wildlife (document references: 6.1.12 and 6.1.13).
		8	1 respondent stated that it would enhance the area and bring river	#00002888		LRCH notes and welcomes this response.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Enhanced use of the river		use in line with other rivers in the country.			
		2 respondents stated that the site of the park lends itself to the use of river access.	#00003392 #00004706		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
		2 respondents stated that it would enhance the use of Tilbury Dock.	#00003385 #00003548		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
		1 respondent stated that the work of Thames Water to improve the area around the Thames would be of great benefit to local people.	#00003215		LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
		2 respondents state that the river is currently underused.	#00003384 #00004847		The River Strategy has been developed to accommodate up to 15% of total people arriving and departing by River.
River use during construction	8	8 respondents stated that construction materials should be transported via the river.	#00005238 #00004833 #00005093 #00002997 #00003382 #00003486 #00004847 #00005101		<p>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 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>
Additional or alternative connections	17	1 respondent stated that a cycle track between the ferry terminal and the park would not be built.	#00003353		The proposals include a new dedicated walking and cycle walk between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier.
		1 respondent proposed additional ferry stops in Purfleet and Erith.	#00003309		The River Strategy 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).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent proposed a direct ferry link from London City Airport to the Park.	#00004688		
			1 respondent stated that they would like to see Tilbury connected by ferry to Woolwich.	#00003367		
			1 respondent stated that direct links should be provided to central London along the river to the Resort.	#00003477		
			1 respondent stated that a direct ferry link should be introduced between Swanscombe and Grays in Thurrock.	#00005241		
			1 respondent asked that London Resort offered additional River services during key commuter hours.	#00003045		
			1 respondent stated that there should be a commuter network from Gravesend Dock to North Greenwich.	#00003367		Gravesend Dock doesn't form part of the development proposals or wider strategy, a new commuter link will be provided between Swanscombe pier and central London, as detailed within the River Strategy in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent stated that London Resort should be obliged to support the continuation of the Gravesend-Tilbury ferry.	#00003537		The River Access Strategy looks to maintain existing services wherever possible plus include additional services and connections. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent stated that car parks should be at a distance and people transported via boat.	#00004900		A new Park and Glide facility is proposed at Tilbury. It is forecast that up to 15% of visitors could arrive using the river. This will reduce impacts on the road network around the Peninsula and the Dartford Crossing.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

		1 respondent stated that only river services should be considered for visitors.	#00005057		The River Strategy allows 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). This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
		1 respondent stated that more direct bus links to the ferry terminals would be required.	#00003351		An existing bus route connects Tilbury Town station and town centre to the Port of Tilbury. The existing bus connections and Public Transport Strategy are discussed in detail within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
		1 respondent stated that a monorail should be built along the River Thames.	#00003118		A people mover is proposed to connect the pier, The London Resort and Ebbsfleet International. A dedicated new walk and cycle way is also proposed between the same points.
		1 respondent stated that an additional road river crossing was required in the area.	#00003523		The proposed Lower Thames Crossing will provide a tunnel crossing under the River Thames east of Gravesend and Tilbury.
		1 respondent stated that Whites Jetty should be converted into an International Cruise Ship Terminal.	#00003567		Tilbury Docks has an international Cruise ship terminal that can be utilised for the Resort.
		1 respondent stated that the existing jetty lies with a MCZ and should be relocated to the opposite side of the Peninsula.	#00005241		ES Chapter 13 Marine Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.13) looks at the impacts of river and ecology; the Access Strategy determines the best possible location for new jetty or adaptations to existing.
		1 respondent stated that the current plans to access the Thames do not go far enough.	#00004899		Within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), the River Strategy details proposals to provide a link between Swanscombe and Tilbury and Swanscombe to central London. The proposals outline the ability to accommodate up to 15% of total people arrivals, if the demand is there.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Local impact of public transport proposals	13	10 respondents supported and stated the river proposals would provide benefits, for local residents, commuters and one stating it would provide local employment opportunities.	#00003250 #00005039 #00002919 #00003588 #00003309 #00003578 #00005216 #00003000 #00003581 #00003578		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
		2 respondents stated that communities and the local economy of Thurrock would not benefit.	#00003392 #00006272		The Resort will be a world-renowned destination that will encourage visitation to Thurrock. Economic benefits include jobs, increased footfall and hotels; as well as additional spending from people staying longer, tourism and investment in the local area.
		1 respondent claimed that the ferry terminals would be unattractive for local residents to look at.	#00005142		The landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development at the Kent and Essex Project sites are considered within Chapter 11 (document ref 6.1.11) of the ES 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 Strateweathergy (document ref 6.2.11.7) and Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (document ref 6.2.11.8) provide the details of mitigation measures.
Commercial river activity	7	2 respondents raised concerns about the impact of the ferries on cruise ships and commercial cargo ships in the area.	#00003437 #00006280		LRCH is in discussions with Tilbury, who have confirmed they don't expect an increase in sailings due to the Resort and the existing Port can accommodate additional demand associated with The London Resort park and glide.
		4 respondents stated that the Thames could not be used owing to	#00005168 #00005142		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			the number of commercial vessels using the river.	#00005166 #00006280			
			1 respondent questioned the impact on the existing Tilbury Ferry and whether it would cope with increased demand.	#00003412		ES Chapter 10 River Transport (document ref 6.1.10) has been developed to accommodate up to 15% of total people arriving and departing by River. The Travel Demand Management Plan seeks to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes. The River Strategy includes a link between Tilbury and Swanscombe and does not use existing link between Tilbury and Gravesend. These documents are included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
Noise impacts	1		1 respondent states that the new ferry terminal is likely to cause a noise nuisance to neighbours.	#00005253		The noise pollution impacts have been assessed and are set out in ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (document ref 6.1.15).	
Cycling access by river	16		4 respondents stated that they would like to see the Thames clippers/ferries providing space for cyclists.	#00003353 #00004688 #00003185 #00003309		Cyclists will be able to use the Park and Glide service - this is not limited to Resort visitors/staff only, local public can also utilise this service.	
			6 respondents stated that there should be access to the river for cyclists.	#00002912 #00003309 #00003367 #00003575 #00004688 #00006266			
			3 respondents stated that provisions for cycling should be upgraded and enhanced along the river.	#00003231 #00004905 #00005196			The Active Travel Strategy sets out proposals to provide a cohesive and connected network between the existing and proposed routes. This can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			2 respondents stated that visitors to the park by river would not come by bike.	#00004688 #00004644			

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent stated there should be improved riverfront access, enhanced landscaping and an ability to moor pleasure craft.	#00004653		The River Access Strategy looks to maintain existing services wherever possible plus include additional services and connections. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	COVID-19	1	1 respondent states that COVID-19 makes the ferries less feasible.	#00003273		The River Strategy has been developed to accommodate up to 15% of total people arriving and departing by River. The Travel Demand Management Plan seeks to incentivise active and sustainable transport modes. These are included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). LRCH does not believe COVID-19 will have an impact on transport plans.
	General support for use of rail	23	14 respondents generally supported the use of rail.	#00002715 #00002743 #00002813 #00002892 #00003118 #00003281 #00003329 #00003392 #00003421 #00003567 #00003567 #00003571 #00004762 #00004869		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			9 respondents generally supported the inclusion of Ebbsfleet Station.	#00002986 #00002943 #00003263 #00003254 #00002997 #00004678 #00004632 #00004799 #00004985		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

General capacity concerns on rail network / additional services	49	7 respondents called for the introduction of a new station / tube line to serve the Park.	#00002990 #00002942 #00002867 #00003323 #00005241 #00004832 #00005101		<p>The Transport Strategy 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>London Underground stations lie beyond the scope of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) for The London Resort.</p>
		11 respondents wished to see additional services. Comments included additional services from Kent, St Pancras, Grays, all London airports, between Chafford Hundred and Swanscombe, from London via Dartford, to Bluewater.	#00002884 #00003045 #00003316 #00004679 #00004700 #00004814 #00004833 #00005038 #00005193 #00005258 #00003311 #00004688		
		3 respondents asked how passenger congestion on trains would be mitigated.	#00004949 #00005253 #00005158		
		2 respondents stated that additional information was required for passenger numbers on local rail services.	#00004789 #00005230		
		1 respondent stated that LRCH should liaise with TfL over first/last services for public transport,	#00003311		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent stated that rail user congestion needs to be monitored,	#00005018		
			1 respondent requested information on how LRCH would work with rail providers,	#00003589		
			1 respondent has requested information as to whether Ebbsfleet Station (domestic and international) will be upgraded,	#00005065		
			1 respondent stated that community goodwill could be encouraged by upgrading local rail stations.	#00005047		
			4 respondents requested more information on the people mover from Ebbsfleet Station.	#00004985 #00005060 #00004782 #00003537		A people mover will be provided between Ebbsfleet International Station, The London Resort and Swanscombe pier. Detailed information is included within the Bus Strategy of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent called for a direct walkway from Ebbsfleet International to the Resort.	#00004650		
			13 respondents expressed support for onsite and inter-site transport/people mover, including between the resort and Ebbsfleet International which could include a cable car, light-rail or monorail.	#00002919 #00003054 #00003118 #00003118 #00003156 #00003171 #00003379 #00003464 #00003537 #00003544 #00004985 #00005267		A people mover is proposed to connect the pier, The London Resort and Ebbsfleet International. A dedicated new walk and cycle way is also proposed between the same points.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00005267		
			1 respondent states that if there is a modal shift to rail then the implications need to be understood and modelled.	#00005241		LRCH has assessed a worst-case rail mode share to determine the impacts of the demand on existing services.
			1 respondent objected on the grounds that Swanscombe and Northfleet Stations had been ignored.	#00006263		Discussions with network rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe.
			1 respondent has stated that visitors would be encouraged to use rail over car if stations were more attractive.	#00005047		A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel, and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
Sustainability (rail)	3		1 respondent claimed that rail development in the area has had a detrimental impact on the local environment.	#00002936		That is outside the remit of the Proposed Development.
			1 respondent stated that hydrogen should be used to power the trains.	#00002900		LRCH is not responsible for the fuel used to power trains. That is outside the remit of the Proposed Development and is a decision for train operators.
			1 respondent stated that sustainability can only be delivered with the introduction of a new rail line.	#00004829		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.
Eurostar	2		1 respondent states that the London Resort will negatively impact Eurostar services.	#00005137		It is unclear how the Resort would negatively impact these services.
			1 respondent stated that international services should be protected.	#00002750		It is expected that international services will have resumed prior to the opening of The London Resort.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

	Incentivisation / modal split	23	18 respondents stated that people would continue to drive despite public rail options.	#00002948 #00003393 #00003434 #00003452 #00003569 #00003619 #00004657 #00004751 #00004758 #00004802 #00004832 #00004905 #00004984 #00005028 #00005037 #00005049 #00005168 #00005190		The Travel Demand Management Strategy seeks to incentivise travel by sustainable modes. However, it is not feasible to offer free travel; this is discussed more within the Demand Management chapter of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			4 respondents stated that people should be encouraged to use rail services with the introduction of free shuttle services from nearby rail stations.	#00003384 #00003379 #00004683 #00003237		
			1 respondent stated that additional rail services would encourage people to leave the car at home.	#00003567		
	Local impact	14	5 respondents stated that it would enhance access to/from London.	#00003285 #00003155 #00003510 #00003367 #00003579		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

		4 respondents stated that local people would be negatively impacted by visitors using Swanscombe station.	#00005037 #00004802 #00005241 #00003442		Ebbsfleet International is being promoted as the primary rail access however the Rail Strategy considers the impact of demand on all local stations. Details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information.
		2 respondents compared LRCH to HS1 which has not delivered a benefit to local people.	#00005040 #00004861		ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and supporting documentation details the many ways in which locals would benefit, including: thousands of direct and indirect jobs created during construction and operation, spending in the local area, catalyst for investment in the area, new infrastructure, green networks, supply chain opportunities and access to high-quality retail and entertainment outside the pay line.
		1 respondent raised concerns about people parking around Ebbsfleet Station on local roads.	#00004983		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).
		1 respondent stated that Ebbsfleet Station has caused greater congestion in the area.	#00005088		This comment is not related to London Resort.
		1 respondent stated that LRCH needs to consider how the Kent Lorry Park / Customs Point at Ebbsfleet Station will impact local infrastructure.	#00005258		This comment is not related to London Resort.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Cycle provision	4	1 respondent stated that adequate cycle access should be provided on all trains and surrounding stations.	#00004688	Folding bikes are allowed on all services, by all operators, at all times. Restrictions for non-folding bikes vary by operator although most operators allow all bikes during off-peak hours.
		1 respondent questioned the ability to take a bike on to HS1.	#00003353	
		2 respondents would like to see cycle facilities on trains connecting to the Resort.	#00003185 #00003309	
General support for cycling and walking	46	<p>44 respondents supported the transport plans. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans would encourage active lifestyles. The plans would encourage greater local emphasis on cycling infrastructure. Cycling would reduce congestion in the area. Cycling would result in environmental benefits. 	<p>#00002750 #00002778 #00002827 #00002857 #00002948 #00002951 #00003035 #00003070 #00003098 #00003099 #00003101 #00003102 #00003114 #00003127 #00003139 #00003144 #00003156 #00003209 #00003251</p>	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00003256 #00003273 #00003277 #00003316 #00003337 #00003345 #00003359 #00003424 #00003532 #00003570 #00003594 #00004670 #00004688 #00004762 #00004797 #00004799 #00004830 #00004943 #00004956 #00005008 #00005109 #00005119 #00005241 #00005265 #00002887 #00002774 #00003159 #00005008 #00003098		
			1 respondent commented that enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes will allow for nearby areas to integrate better.	#00003567		LRCH notes and welcomes this response.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent commented that visibility of the Resort in pedestrian and cycle routes will be a reminder of benefits of the whole project.	#00003567		LRCH notes and welcomes this response.
			1 respondent supported the development of the pathways so long as access to Broadness Cruising Club was maintained.	#00005093		The River Strategy seeks to review impact to existing creeks and marshes (such as the Broadness Creek, which has been largely filled in). Where possible improvements will be made if deemed necessary. Dependent on final access and pier arrangements, impacts may occur - however these will be mitigated as appropriate. The River Strategy is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent supported the plans but stated that more needed to be done to make walking and cycling plans sustainable.	#00005174		The Development Proposals include dedicated walking and cycle ways and are detailed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Active Travel Strategy reviews the opportunities and recommendations for proposed walking and cycling improvements.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

General objection / concerns to cycling plans	51	<p>51 respondents generally objected to cycling plans; comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycling/pedestrian proposals will not compensate for overcrowding in the area. • There are already too many people and cyclists in the area. • Visitors using pedestrian and cycle routes will add to overcrowding in area • The current walking and cycling plans do not go far enough. • The walking and cycling proposals don't offset 'a bad plan'. • They would prefer to see money spent on improving the local area as opposed to walking and cycling. • The construction and use of pathways would disrupt 	<p>#00002778 #00002806 #00002862 #00002866 #00002948 #00002988 #00003089 #00003099 #00003256 #00003323 #00003353 #00003360 #00003377 #00003383 #00003384 #00003431 #00003439 #00003441 #00003452 #00003544 #00003569 #00003600 #00003618 #00004644 #00004731 #00004758 #00004831 #00004861 #00004866 #00004894 #00004895 #00004896 #00004905</p>	<p>An Activity Travel Strategy has been developed to help reduce reliance on private vehicle and to create a cohesive network of existing and proposed walking and cycling routes. Increase uptake in active or sustainable travel will help to mitigate the impacts on the highway network. A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The development proposals include plans to provide a dedicated off-road, walking and cycle way between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier. Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>Cycle and pedestrian routes are proposed to create a cohesive network between the existing and proposed routes, in order to facilitate increased active travel - benefiting visitors and staff to The London Resort, and the local area.</p> <p>The DCO and associated planning materials do not set out any indication that paths will be destroyed. Where possible all routes will be included within the proposals, and suitable diversions / alternatives placed if required.</p>
---	----	--	--	---

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			<p>local businesses, people and walks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unofficial paths by the Thames would be destroyed. 	<p>#00004915 #00004948 #00004965 #00005028 #00005035 #00005049 #00005065 #00005141 #00005142 #00005168 #00005274 #00006266 #00006272 #00005077 #00003569 #00003439 #00003431 #00003408 #00005028 #00005035 #00005120 #00003431 #00003408 #00004673 #00004915 #00004912 #00004831 #00004895 #00005035 #00004895</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Safety impact of cycling	16	2 respondents commented that cycling and walking plans would improve safety in the area.	#00004825 #00005059		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
		9 respondents stated that all cycling and walking routes should be safe.	#00002912 #00003026 #00003270 #00003329 #00003544 #00004632 #00004687 #00004813 #00005184		An Activity Travel Strategy has been developed to create a cohesive network of existing and proposed walking and cycling routes, detailing the opportunities and recommendations as a result of a site audit and outlines proposals that could be incorporated. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
		2 respondents stated that cycling is not safe in the area currently.	#00003306 #00003585		
		2 respondents stated that the lanes should be properly segregated to ensure safety and prevent the use of mopeds on paths.	#00005273 #00005138		
		1 respondent stated that criminals could make use of the pathways.	#00003435		
		Questioning of proposals around walking and cycling	10	4 persons stated that more could be done to encourage walking and cycling and linking in to the local active travel network.	#00002849 #00006263 #00004774 #00005236
		4 respondents questioned whether the new cycle lanes and walkways would be used.	#00003255 #00005281 #00003477 #00002910		The London Resort will actively encourage cyclists, with a range of routes available including signage and wayfinding. Wherever possible they will be segregated routes to help ensure safety and ease of use.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

						The Future Mobility tool has been developed to determine the baseline mode shares for all modes and incorporates cost of travel, distance, journey time - the methodology is detailed within the Future Mobility Technical Note. The Active Travel Strategy uses the Propensity to Cycle Tool and the Cycle Infrastructure Prioritisation Toolkit to determine key links where opportunities to improve cycling links have been identified and ensure synergy between the proposed improvements and the routes outlined in the tools.
			2 respondents stated that private business should not be delivering pathways and cycle routes but rather the council should and the government.	#00004930 #00004918		The Active Travel Strategy uses the Propensity to Cycle Tool and the Cycle Infrastructure Prioritisation Toolkit to determine key links where opportunities to improve cycling links have been identified and ensure synergy between the proposed improvements and the routes outlined in the tools.
Additional information for cycling and walking	3	1 respondent stated that more information was needed on user data for cycling and walking pathways.	#00005281		The Active Travel Strategy uses the Propensity to Cycle Tool and the Cycle Infrastructure Prioritisation Toolkit to determine key links where opportunities to improve cycling links have been identified and ensure synergy between the proposed improvements and the routes outlined in the tools.	
		1 respondent questioned cycling and walking access if there was only one entrance provided from the A2.	#00004990		A detailed plan showing the walking and cycling access points at The London Resort is shown in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
		1 respondent stated that insufficient information has been provided on the A2 Ebbsfleet Junction with regard to cycling and walking.	#00004657		An Access Note has been compiled to detail the proposed junction improvements and access along the dedicated resort road.	
Environment	36	17 respondents stated that the plans would benefit the environment as a sustainable form of travel.	#00002763 #00002774 #00002832 #00003048 #00003098		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.	

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00003140 #00003144 #00003156 #00003159 #00003188 #00003195 #00003572 #00003594 #00004670 #00004762 #00004794 #00005138		
			1 respondent wished to see solar powered lighting along all pathways.	#00003143		This will be considered as the Proposals reach the detailed stage. The use of solar powered lighting will be a key consideration in our target to be net carbon neutral in operation and ensuring public safety. This will need careful consideration in the marsh areas to avoid disturbing the wildlife habitat, flora and fauna during the hours of darkness.
			2 respondents stated that bins should be placed in picnic areas and along pathways.	#00003045 #00005054		LRCH will provide bins.
			9 respondents stated that the pathways would be detrimental to natural habitats.	#00003408 #00003414 #00003616 #00005043 #00005142 #00005166 #00005190 #00005200 #00006285		The Environmental Statement (ES) reviews the impacts of the site, and proposed walkways / paths, on the local habit. This ensures that where impacts are raised that appropriate mitigation is then planned and accounted for. For more information, please refer to Chapter 11 – Landscape and Visual Effects (document reference 6.1.11).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent stated that environmentally friendly construction materials should be used for path/ cycleways.	#00003389		The Outline Sustainability Report (document ref 7.7) considers both construction and operational phases of the Resort, including sustainable design and construction materials.
			1 respondent supported the plans but questioned who will cycle in polluted air.	#00004780		The emissions from the proposed development and baseline existing pollution are assessed within ES Chapter 16 Air Quality (document ref 6.1.16).
			3 respondents stated that all pathways should be segregated to protect the local environment.	#00003574 #00004948 #00004752		The Active Travel Strategy reviews the opportunities and recommendations for walking and cycling links and addresses whether they can or will be implemented. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			2 respondents raised concerns about the impact of opening up Black Duck Marsh.	#00004948 #00006285		The opening of Black Duck Marsh near to Ingress Park will be of benefit. The Resort is seeking to provide leisure walks, including along the Thames which users will also be able to access.
General comments around cycling	3		1 respondent stated that some of the CIL levy could be used on reducing barriers to cycling for local people in the area.	#00003353		The Active Travel Strategy reviews the opportunities, recommendations and barriers to increasing walking and cycling connectivity within the vicinity of the site. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent stated that other areas of the Thames had been improved, the same could happen here.	#00004660		The Development Proposals include dedicated walking and cycle ways and are detailed within the Transport Assessment. The Active Travel Strategy reviews the opportunities and recommendations for proposed walking and cycling improvements. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
General support for cycling	76		74 respondents stated they generally supported the inclusion of cycling by LRCH.	#00002717 #00002743 #00002758 #00002773 #00002778 #00002783 #00002822 #00002827 #00002859		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00002872		
				#00002878		
				#00002883		
				#00002887		
				#00002895		
				#00002919		
				#00002944		
				#00002997		
				#00003039		
				#00003050		
				#00003102		
				#00003127		
				#00003139		
				#00003141		
				#00003197		
				#00003202		
				#00003207		
				#00003209		
				#00003214		
				#00003237		
				#00003254		
				#00003256		
				#00003263		
				#00003277		
				#00003292		
				#00003295		
				#00003298		
				#00003300		
				#00003310		
				#00003340		
				#00003384		
				#00003417		
				#00003443		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00003444		
				#00003447		
				#00003530		
				#00003534		
				#00003544		
				#00003590		
				#00003618		
				#00004632		
				#00004683		
				#00004710		
				#00004758		
				#00004774		
				#00004793		
				#00004797		
				#00004799		
				#00004809		
				#00004877		
				#00004972		
				#00004981		
				#00004984		
				#00004998		
				#00005036		
				#00005057		
				#00005069		
				#00005114		
				#00005121		
				#00005131		
				#00005152		
				#00005216		
				#00005258		
				#00006263		
				#00006266		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			2 respondents supported the introduction of e-scooter measures.	#00003384 #00004731		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
Concern over cycling proposals	5		4 respondents stated that vehicle use should be prioritised over cycling.	#00003350 #00003268 #00003440 #00004974		Cycle and pedestrian routes are proposed to create a cohesive network between the existing and proposed routes, in order to facilitate increased active travel - benefiting visitors and staff to The London Resort, and the local area.
			1 respondent stated that more people should be encouraged to cycle as opposed to taking the bus.	#00004809		
Cycle network	43		4 respondents generally supported the inclusion of new cycle lanes.	#00003277 #00003209 #00003144 #00003548		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			1 respondent supported the work of LRCH in responding to the damage caused to the cycle network by LTC.	#00003422		LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
			9 respondents stated that all cycle lanes should be segregated.	#00002900 #00002964 #00003143 #00003269 #00003406 #00003428 #00003537 #00003578 #00005018		The masterplan has been designed to allow for segregated cycle lanes on main routes. The Walking and Cycling Strategy presents the intended strategy at this stage, which also aligns with LTN 1/20 where feasible. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent requested the cycle routes are well designed.	#00003185		
			3 respondents stated that cycle paths in the local area are needed to connect local communities.	#00002808 #00002731 #00003363		The development proposals include plans to provide a dedicated off-road, walking and cycle way between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier. Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent stated that the cycle network needs to be increased in size.	#00003310		
			3 respondents stated that they would like to see a new cycle network created incorporating Dartford & Gravesham.	#00003399 #00003541 #00003564		
			2 respondents expressed concern that pre-existing pedestrian routes are inadequate to sustain more visitors.	#00005035 #00005028		
			4 respondents would like to see subways and/or bridges constructed to provide cyclists a means of crossing the A2 and surrounding roads.	#00003544 #00003589 #00004774 #00003380		The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) reviews the demand for such features and set out if they are necessary as part of the mitigation or Walking and Cycling Strategy.
			2 respondents requested direct cycle lanes from London to the Resort.	#00002930 #00002939		A detailed plan showing the walking and cycling access points at The London Resort is shown in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Walking and cycling improvements proposed in the Active Travel Strategy are focussed on locations where increased demand is forecast. Walking and cycling are proposed to primarily be within the vicinity of the site.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent called for additional connectivity to towns around the Resort.	#00003310		<p>The Active Travel Strategy seeks to provide a cohesive and connected network of existing and proposed walking and cycling routes. The Public Transport Strategy reviews the baseline mode shares and distribution of visitors/staff to ensure connectivity to key local destinations.</p> <p>We will reach out and integrate our public footpath and cycle network with surrounding communities where possible. This will include existing towns and emerging residential areas. We will work closely with Ebbsfleet Development Corporation to ensure that we can connect to their emerging pedestrian and cycle network with the Ebbsfleet Garden City masterplan and Ebbsfleet Central through a new dedicated route between Ebbsfleet International Station, The London Resort and the London Resort Ferry Terminal on the River Thames.</p>
			1 respondent stated that they would like to see cycle paths reaching Grays.	#00003030		The existing cycle accessibility has been reviewed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) details the provision of a shared use cycle pathway between the Port of Tilbury and Marshfoot Road (Grays)
			1 respondent wished to see NCN1 connected with the Resort.	#00003251		The London Resort will incorporate, where possible, existing and proposed leisure routes and paths. It may be necessary to provide diversions; this is set out in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and associated Walking and Cycling Access Study.
			2 respondents stated that cycle lanes should be destination to destination.	#00003406 #00003548		The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) looks at key travel destinations, or origins and promotes connectivity (either through new paths or use of existing) to and from them.
			1 respondent requested additional off-road cycle tracks.	#00003251		The development proposals include plans to provide a dedicated off-road, walking and cycle way between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier. Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent stated that cycle lanes should not encroach on local roads.	#00005010		Sustainable travel should be prioritised over vehicular where possible, and this should be safe, clear and convenient. This could mean that road space is re-prioritised to users other than private cars. This will be carefully considered and balanced out between accessibility and feasibility, however. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and associated Walking and Cycling Strategy set out where improvements may be needed.
			2 respondents stated that cyclists would not use cycle lanes.	#00003305 #00003524		Any proposals considered as part of the Active Travel Strategy seek to provide a safe, connected and cohesive walking and cycling network and will benefits both visitors and staff travelling to The London Resort and the local public
			1 respondent stated that there is no room in Tilbury for additional cycle lanes.	#00005145		
			2 respondents stated that all cycle parks in the area should be improved.	#00003231 #00003632		The Walking and Cycling Strategy reviews the areas of demand and where improvements could be warranted. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			3 respondents called for the inclusion of a cycle track between the Thames Clipper and the Resort.	#00003353 #00004688 #00004797		Development proposals include the implementation of a dedicated cycle and walkway between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier.
	Design	1	1 respondent stated that the topography of the area does not support cycling as an option.	#00005037		<p>The new dedicated cycle route that connects Ebbsfleet International Station to the London Resort and London Resort Ferry Terminal and wider peninsula runs along broadly level ground and is ideally suited to use by cyclists of varying ability.</p> <p>Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Additional information - cycling	6	4 respondents wished to see further information on proposed cycle lanes in the area.	#00003570 #00004666 #00004657 #00004966		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.
		1 respondent stated that no cycle lanes were noted on the transport plans.	#00004952		The development proposals include plans to provide a dedicated off-road, walking and cycle way between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier. Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
		1 respondent wished to see additional information on cycling options from Gravesend.	#00004749		The Active Travel Strategy reviews the opportunities and recommendations for proposed walking and cycling improvements.
Additional services – cycling	12	1 respondent requested cycling tours of the park and surrounding areas	#00002849		This comment is noted. At present it is too early to consider this proposal.
		4 respondents urged LRCH to provide cycle hire opportunities.	#00002930 #00002741 #00003019 #00003599		Cycle hire opportunities are considered within the masterplan design with main hire stations proposed to be conveniently located within the main transport interchanges.
		5 respondents requested cycle storage facilities on site to encourage cycling to the Resort.	#00002930 #00003139 #00002898 #00003143 #00003035		Secure cycle parking will be provided at a range of locations within the Resort to encourage cyclists. This will be in line with Local policy guidance and standards.
		1 respondent requested luggage transport options for those cycling to the Resort.	#00002930		This could be reviewed as part of the on-going measures / management at the site.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent stated that cycle parks should be created for use by employees and customers.	#00002827		<p>The London Resort will provide dedicated cycle parking facilities for its staff, with separate secure cycle parking facilities for visitors.</p> <p>The cycle parking provided on-site is likely to exceed policy guidance; cyclists will be able to take bikes on the Ride and Glide ferry provision to enable accessibility from north of River; a new cycle route is proposed between Ebbsfleet International.</p>
General support for walking and additional footpaths	82	69 respondents stated generally they supported the inclusion of walking and additional footpaths by LRCH.	#00002717 #00002741 #00002758 #00002783 #00002827 #00002859 #00002872 #00002883 #00002887 #00002919 #00002944 #00003039 #00003050 #00003102 #00003144 #00003197 #00003202 #00003207 #00003209 #00003214 #00003237 #00003254 #00003256 #00003263 #00003277			LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00003295		
				#00003298		
				#00003300		
				#00003316		
				#00003337		
				#00003403		
				#00003405		
				#00003417		
				#00003443		
				#00003444		
				#00003447		
				#00003530		
				#00003590		
				#00003618		
				#00004653		
				#00004683		
				#00004710		
				#00004752		
				#00004774		
				#00004793		
				#00004797		
				#00004799		
				#00004809		
				#00004877		
				#00004935		
				#00004956		
				#00004972		
				#00004981		
				#00004984		
				#00004986		
				#00004998		
				#00005036		
				#00005057		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

				#00005069 #00005114 #00005120 #00005121 #00005131 #00005152 #00005196 #00005216 #00005216 #00005258 #00006263		
			13 respondents supported plans to incorporate walking into the plans but said any development should be sympathetic to the environment and local people.	#00003361 #00003493 #00003525 #00003525 #00003590 #00004673 #00004731 #00004752 #00004919 #00004948 #00004972 #00004992 #00004994		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. Where respondents have raised specific issues, these are addressed in the corresponding topic area of the relevant table.
	Support for pathways but not the Project	6	6 respondents supported building pathways but not the Resort.	#00004755 #00004737 #00005227 #00005063 #00005054 #00005081		LRCH notes responses in favour of pathways and general objections to the Resort.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

	Concerns around walking pathways	60	25 respondents stated that additional walking routes might encourage people to park on residential streets and then walk to the Resort.	#00002781 #00003054 #00004673 #00004713 #00004902 #00004905 #00004907 #00004912 #00004913 #00004923 #00004929 #00004937 #00004941 #00004942 #00004948 #00004949 #00004956 #00004973 #00004979 #00004983 #00004994 #00005047 #00005116 #00005199 #00005258		An Off-Site Parking Strategy has been developed and included as part of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) to detail the management strategy to limit visitor or staff parking locally and walking to the Resort.
			23 respondents were concerned about additional footpaths. Concerns included increased footfall, noise in local areas and maintenance.	#00003017 #00003334 #00003393 #00003484 #00004669 #00004673 #00004713 #00004726		Improvement to the existing footpaths and cycle ways, together with the introduction of new routes, will increase the capacity of the network. More robust but sensitive finishes will also help to ensure that they can handle any increase in footfall without degrading. The London Resort will incorporate, where possible, existing and proposed leisure routes and paths. It may be necessary to provide

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			<p>#00004808 #00004824 #00004831 #00004861 #00004868 #00004905 #00004912 #00004915 #00004962 #00004979 #00005090 #00005095 #00005106 #00005120 #00005269</p>		<p>diversions; this is set out in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and associated Walking and Cycling Access Study.</p>
		<p>5 respondents stated that the area should be retained for improved access for local people to wildlife trails.</p>	<p>#00003369 #00003534 #00004673 #00005040 #00004748</p>		<p>Access to wildlife trails for local residents will be improved.</p> <p>The London Resort will incorporate, where possible, existing and proposed leisure routes and paths. It may be necessary to provide diversions; this is set out in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and associated Walking and Cycling Access Study.</p>
		<p>3 respondents stated that enhanced wildlife access should be maintained.</p>	<p>#00003339 #00003330 #00004679</p>		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent objected on the grounds that the public right of way DS1 would be rerouted, no reason for the rerouting has been provided.	#00004920		
			1 respondent stated that the development would destroy the Pilgrims Path that runs North to South on the Peninsula.	#00005081 #00005037		Pilgrims Way, the pedestrian route that runs along the chalk spine from the top of Swanscombe High Street to the centre of the peninsula, will be a key feature in the masterplan, not only connecting Swanscombe to the London Resort and Ferry Terminal Beyond, but also connecting the Visitor Centre, Staff Training Facility and the London Resort Academy to the London Resort. It will become a significantly improved and much valued pedestrian route.
			1 respondent stated that footpaths in Tilbury cannot be created without an additional connection over the Thames.	#00004829		The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) seeks to improve connectivity between Swanscombe and Tilbury with the provision of a ferry crossing.
			1 respondent stated that it was unclear how the Resort and open spaces can be shared.	#00004657		Detailed within ES Chapter 9 Land Transport (document reference 6.1.9), as part of the Transport Strategy there is an allocation of leisure walks and green areas around the site, as much as possible. The design of the masterplan is configured so that the extensive arrangement of interconnected spaces and places and the facilities that they offer, which sit outside the pay line for the two theme parks, will be available for the public to enjoy.
	Aesthetics & maintenance of pathways	5	5 respondents stated that all pathways should be well maintained.	#00003421 #00003546 #00003583 #00004645 #00004948		These comments have been noted.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Additional footpath considerations	1	1 respondent stated that there should be more paths added than those removed	#00004732 #00004758		Details of Development Proposals, as well as additional proposals as part of the Active Travel Strategy, are detailed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
Additional walking routes	21	2 respondents supported the upgrades to the Pilgrims Way.	#00004995 #00004683		LRCH notes and welcomes these comments.
		4 respondents stated they would like to see additional walking trails around the park.	#00005131 #00005109 #00003331 #00004985		The London Resort has reviewed the walking trails and paths as part of the Walking and Cycling Strategy. Where possible, improvements will be undertaken.
		3 respondents stated that there should be a walkway from Ingress Park and the Resort for use by residents.	#00003334 #00002983 #00005238		Ingress Park residents would be able to walk to the resort through the river path in Black Duck Marsh and connecting to the 'Pilgrims Way' boardwalk to the Resort. A detailed plan showing the walking and cycling access points at The London Resort is shown in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
		1 respondent stated that any pathways should account for the coastal path project being delivered by Natural England.	#00005273		The London Resort incorporate, where possible, existing and proposed leisure routes and paths. It may be necessary to provide diversions; this is set out in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and associated Walking and Cycling Access Study.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent urged LRCH to consider the long-distance Thames path which is being extended to the sea.	#00004877		
			2 respondents stated that walkways should be created away from residents parking in Ingress Park to prevent visitors using car parks.	#00003590 #00004674		An Off-Site Parking Strategy has been developed and included as part of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) to detail the management strategy to limit visitor or staff parking locally and walking to the Resort.
			2 respondents stated that local people should be provided with walking and cycling options direct to the Resort.	#00002911 #00004985		The masterplan has sought to connect the Resort to surrounding communities through a number of pedestrian and cycle routes. A detailed plan showing the walking and cycling access points at The London Resort is shown in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
			1 respondent stated they would like to see direct walking routes from London to the Park.	#00002741		A detailed plan showing the walking and cycling access points at The London Resort is shown in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Walking and cycling improvements proposed in the Active Travel Strategy are focussed on locations where increased demand is forecast. Walking and cycling are proposed to primarily be within the vicinity of the site
			1 respondent stated that more attention should be placed on pedestrians.	#00002740		Pedestrians will have priority within the Resort to help ensure public safety. The development proposals include plans to provide a dedicated off-road, walking and cycle way between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier. Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent stated that walkways are required to allow use of the marsh in the rain.	#00003252		The proposed masterplan increases the number of pedestrian routes through the marshes, using sensitive interventions such as boardwalks. Any new paths / routes will be reviewed in terms of useability.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent wished to see covered walkways.	#00003186		The London Resort will have covered walkways where appropriate.
			1 respondent stated that walking access should be opened up from the south east (direct access from Ebbsfleet or Northfleet).	#00004985		There are a number of pedestrian routes into the resort from the south east; One is via Galley Hill Road and down Pilgrims Way. Another is a proposed new connection to the Resort pedestrian route from the existing pedestrian footpath which runs from Northfleet to Swanscombe to the south of Bamber Pit. The development proposals include plans to provide a dedicated off-road, walking and cycle way between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier. Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
			1 respondent stated that pathways should be connected to Thurrock to make visiting simpler.	#00003588		An Activity Travel Strategy has been developed to create a cohesive network of existing and proposed walking and cycling routes. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
Additional information around public pathways	6		2 respondents requested additional information on improvements to public footpaths.	#00005077 #00006266		The Development Proposals include dedicated walking and cycle ways and are detailed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Active Travel Strategy reviews the opportunities and recommendations for proposed walking and cycling improvements.
			1 respondent stated that they would like to know whether the land used to create pathways would be green belt land or taken from residential streets.	#00004966		
			1 respondent has requested additional information on upgrade works to the London Road and pedestrianisation in the area.	#00005230		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			1 respondent requested additional information on the upgrades to Pilgrims Way.	#00004995		Significant improvement works to the route from the top of Galley Hill to bottom of chalk spine are proposed. A dedicated pedestrian route is to be introduced from bottom of chalk spine to the new river terminal, including sections of boardwalk through Black Duck Marsh and dedicated cycle routes.	
			1 respondent stated that not enough information has been provided on when the pathways would be constructed.	#00005178		The DCO sets out the phasing plan for the site, including indicative timelines for delivery. The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has analysis various future years, including construction, Gate One build and full maturity. The need for off-site improvements, including upgrades to walking and cycling links is set out in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
Walking route concerns	8		1 respondent stated that no walking entrance should be provided along the London Road.	#00003054		A detailed plan showing the walking and cycling access points at The London Resort is shown in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)	
			1 respondent stated that there doesn't appear to be any riverside walks proposed.	#00003317		The development proposals include plans to provide a dedicated off-road, walking and cycle way between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier. Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
			1 respondent stated that all public footpaths should be maintained or diverted where possible.	#00002813		The London Resort will incorporate, where possible, existing and proposed leisure routes and paths. It may be necessary to provide diversions; this is set out in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and associated Walking and Cycling Access Study.	
			1 respondent stated that removing footpaths is not good.	#00004758			
			3 respondents were concerned about access to public rights of way and whether these would be free to access.	#00002948 #00003414 #00004861			
				1 respondent objected to visitors having walking access to local towns.	#00004674		It is unclear why access to local towns would be a negative. If inappropriate parking is a concern then this is covered in the Off-Site Parking Strategy, although the site and access should be promoted for all modes of travel.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Construction impacting pedestrian access	4	1 respondent stated that there is likely to be an impact on pedestrian access to Castle Hill during construction works.	#00005258		Construction activity will be carefully managed and where required diversions or alternatives will be available.
		3 respondents raised concerns about a lack of public access to the marshes during construction.	#00005174 #00003338 #00002997		
Existing bus routes	7	7 respondents referenced existing bus routes. Comments included issues with capacity, reliability and congestion.	#00003306 #00003537 #00003623 #00003473 #00004985 #00003118 #00003255		Existing public transport services are being reviewed. This will include further discussions with operators regarding improvements to bus routes and services and additional rail capacity where required to meet visitor demand. This includes working closely with the Fastrack team at Kent County Council to potentially develop proposals for a Fastrack service to the London Resort. However, LRCH is not accountable for existing public transport services.
Additional information around bus routes	2	2 respondents stated that not enough information has been provided about the use of buses or passenger numbers.	#00003226 #00003171		The 2020 PEIR reflected the available information at the time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail for consultation. More detailed information on bus travel is now provided in the Chapter 9 – Land Transport of the ES (document reference 6.1.9).
Proposed bus routes	1	1 respondent stated that local people should be provided direct bus access to the Resort.	#00003281		Existing public transport services are being reviewed. This will include further discussions with operators regarding improvements to bus routes and services and additional rail capacity where required to meet visitor demand. This includes working closely with the v team at Kent County Council to potentially develop proposals for a Fastrack service to the London Resort. A people mover will be provided between Ebbsfleet International Station, The London Resort and Swanscombe pier. Detailed information
Additional bus routes	13	8 respondents made specific suggestions for additional bus routes – these are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through Ingress Park from Greenhithe. • From London to the Resort. 	#00002781 #00003339 #00003228 #00005101 #00004683 #00003404 #00003171		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Gatwick to the Resort • From Bluewater • From Ingress Park and Greenhithe to the ferry terminal • From Kent 	#00003175		is included within the Bus Strategy of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			5 respondents called for the introduction of a dedicated bus from the local train stations to the Resort.	#00003339 #00003384 #00004683 #00005174 #00004985		
Shuttle bus/ monorail	6		4 respondents suggested a shuttle bus or monorail. Some suggested specifically from Ebbsfleet and Gravesend.	#00005241 #00003054 #00002823 #00003118		
			1 respondent stated the bus lane should remain in the plans for buses and coaches to serve the site.	#00003171		Existing public transport services are being reviewed. This will include further discussions with operators regarding improvements to bus routes and services and additional rail capacity where required to meet visitor demand. This includes working closely with the Fastrack team at Kent County Council to potentially develop proposals for a Fastrack service to the London Resort. A people mover will be provided between Ebbsfleet International Station, The London Resort and Swanscombe pier. Detailed information is included within the Bus Strategy of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent believes that public transport is already at capacity around the site of the London	#00003280		Existing public transport services are being reviewed. This will include further discussions with operators regarding improvements to bus routes and services and additional rail capacity where required to meet

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			Resort and no consideration has been given to increasing capacity following the construction of the park to future-proof the area.			<p>visitor demand. This includes working closely with the Fastrack team at Kent County Council to potentially develop proposals for a Fastrack service to the London Resort.</p> <p>A people mover will be provided between Ebbsfleet International Station, The London Resort and Swanscombe pier. Detailed information is included within the Bus Strategy of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)</p>
Challenged viability of buses	3	1 respondent stated that tourists will not use the local buses.	#00004751		LRCH has proposed a comprehensive Transport Strategy, for visitors and local communities, incorporating multiple modes of transport, recognising that a proportion of visitors will travel from outside the area and from outside the UK. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
		1 respondent states that a bus lane in Greenhithe was recently built and remains unused.	#00003473		LRCH has noted this comment.	
		1 respondent stated that buses should be replaced by electric rail or trams.	#00003156 #00005077		KenEx is proposing a tram service in the area. LRCH is liaising with the KenEx tram service promoters to understand how their proposals could link to the London Resort. However, London Resort's transport proposals are not reliant on KenEx.	
Extension of Crossrail	21	9 respondents called for the extension of the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) to London Resort.	#00002714 #00002900 #00003047 #00003122 #00003168 #00003251 #00003544 #00004679 #00005258		The extension of Crossrail is not within the DCO limits. London Resort's transport proposals are not reliant on the extension of Crossrail.	
		11 respondents called for the extension of Crossrail to other locations including Dartford,	#00003037 #00003088 #00003251 #00003323			

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

			Swanscombe, Ebbsfleet and Gravesend.	#00003347 #00003544 #00003548 #00004850 #00005097 #00005108 #00005230		
			1 respondent questioned whether Crossrail had been incorporated into LR's plans.	#00005258		
	Crossrail comparisons	1	1 respondent stated that Crossrail has received bad press and is behind schedule and raised concerns about similar issues on London Resort.	#00003379		LRCH can only comment on its own delivery programme.
	Tram/light rail	9	5 respondents state that the plans should incorporate a tram or light rail.	#00005265 #00005077 #00005029 #00003548 #00006266		KenEx is proposing a tram service in the area. LRCH is liaising with the KenEx tram service promoters to understand how their proposals could link to the London Resort. However, London Resort's transport proposals are not reliant on KenEx.
			1 respondent stated that mention of KenEx is unnecessary in LRCH's consultation documentation.	#00004789		
			2 respondents state that LR should explore the potential for inclusion of the Thames Gateway Link in the project.	#00003422 #00003568		
			1 respondent believes a light rail option connecting Ebbsfleet with the Resort, Bluewater and Lakeside would be of benefit to the area.	#00003548		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Support for accessibility of plans	6	2 respondents stated that the additional connectivity is positive and inclusive.	#00003577 #00003570		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
		4 respondents stated that the plans for walking and cycling will improve accessibility in the local area.	#00002987 #00002803 #00003376 #00003375		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
General comments around accessibility	9	5 respondents wished to see public transport made family-friendly e.g., will accommodate baby/toddler equipment.	#00002948 #00002862 #00003139 #00003083 #00003619		All Resort transport systems, such as the people mover, will be fully accessible, and where appropriate we will direct visitors and staff to the best location for accessibility. Other services are outside of LRCH's remit and all transport providers are responsible for ensuring their services and vehicles meet relevant disability legislation. Discussions with network rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe and Ebbsfleet International is fully accessible.
		4 respondents wanted to see public transport options made accessible to those with disabilities.	#00003143 #00003273 #00002948 #00003623		
Accessibility - rail	11	8 respondents stated that Swanscombe Station should be improved to make it accessible for Park visitors.	#00004799 #00006263 #00005273 #00005047 #00004983 #00004898 #00005241		
		3 respondents stated that all local rail stations should be made wheelchair accessible.	#00003623 #00004898 #00005241		
Accessibility - buses	1	1 respondent stated that any additional bus services should be wheelchair accessible.	#00003623		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues relating to Public Transport

Accessibility - walking	11	5 respondents stated that all pathways should be accessible by pram and those with disabilities.	#00003235 #00004835 #00004833 #00004713 #00004877		<p>All users have been considered in the Transport Strategy and design of the park. The widths of footways / cycleways and access routes have taken this into consideration. Further design for these users will be considered at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Gradients on newly formed circulation routes are preferably to be less than a 1:21 gradient (e.g., slopes). Where this cannot be achieved, ramps (e.g., gradients steeper than 1:20) should ideally be as shallow as possible but not exceed 1:12. Note that existing site constraints such as the gradients that form the Chalk Spine cannot be ameliorated to meet this criterion: however, where this is the case, alternative step-free and stepped routes will be investigated to give the widest possible opportunity of access to users.</p>
		3 respondents stated that there should be adequate seating along all pathways.	#00003334 #00003143 #00005054		This will be considered at the detailed stage. The Design Codes (document ref 7.2) require resting places located at suitable intervals on main pedestrian routes.
		2 respondents stated that there needed to be clear signage along pathways.	#00003143 #00004645		Appropriate wayfinding and signage information will be implemented to guide visitors and staff to The London Resort.
		1 respondent stated that London Resort has closed off access to the walking paths.	#00003060		Whilst it has been necessary to divert some of the existing public rights of way and footpaths, the proposed masterplan actually increases the extent of pedestrian routes through the marshes including sensitive interventions such as boardwalks. In addition, new routes through the Resort provide a new network of footpaths, greatly improving accessibility and permeability overall.
Accessibility - river access	1	1 respondent stated that more information was required on river access for those with disabilities.	#00002941		The Access Strategy looks to incorporate movement for all users.

Topic	Issue summary	Tally	Sub-issue (if relevant)	User IDs	Change (y/n)	Regard had to response																								
Road access		832																												
	Traffic, congestion and use of the Strategic Road Network (SRN)	480	263 respondents responded that plans would affect traffic, congestion and accidents on the SRN.	#00004943 #00004657 #00002729 #00002744 #00002748 #00002752 #00002781 #00002784 #00002801 #00002847 #00002866 #00002898 #00002906 #00002909 #00002936 #00002948 #00002974 #00002983 #00003035 #00003054 #00003060 #00003088 #00003089 #00003091 #00003099 #00003148 #00003170 #00003221 #00003231 #00003239 #00003249	N	<p>A robust assessment of traffic volumes has been assessed based on scenarios with and without the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC). Traffic modelling has been agreed with the local highway authorities and Highways England and a comprehensive Transport Assessment undertaken (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (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 they will be looking to promote public transport as the main travel option to The London Resort.</p> <p>The Traffic Flows (document ref 6.2.9.2) associated with the London Resort have been fully considered as part of the Transport Assessment. As can be seen in this document, it is considered that most traffic generated by the scheme would be generally outside of the conventional network peak hours. However, there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks. The Table below provides a breakdown on the numbers of vehicles expected into the London Resort on the Kent side.</p> <p>Table 9-7: The London Resort, Trip Generation (Kent Project Site)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Assessment Year</th> <th colspan="2">AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)</th> <th colspan="2">PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2025</td> <td>107</td> <td>20</td> <td>199</td> <td>499</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2029</td> <td>111</td> <td>26</td> <td>288</td> <td>679</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2038</td> <td>112</td> <td>26</td> <td>347</td> <td>978</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>To take account of these figures the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to</p>	Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)		Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	2025	107	20	199	499	2029	111	26	288	679	2038	112	26	347	978
Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)																											
	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures																										
2025	107	20	199	499																										
2029	111	26	288	679																										
2038	112	26	347	978																										

				#00003267 #00003269 #00003270 #00003271 #00003283 #00003288 #00003298 #00003300 #00003306 #00003307 #00003317 #00003320 #00003321 #00003327 #00003330 #00003338 #00003339 #00003341 #00003343 #00003344 #00003355 #00003358 #00003359 #00003360 #00003363 #00003372 #00003373 #00003377 #00003383 #00003384 #00003386 #00003389 #00003390 #00003392 #00003399 #00003406	<p>accommodate Resort traffic. In addition, the Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.</p> <p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00003409 #00003412 #00003421 #00003425 #00003429 #00003431 #00003434 #00003437 #00003439 #00003440 #00003441 #00003442 #00003453 #00003456 #00003461 #00003470 #00003471 #00003474 #00003477 #00003484 #00003490 #00003499 #00003504 #00003506 #00003507 #00003524 #00003546 #00003552 #00003569 #00003578 #00003579 #00003584 #00003585 #00003589 #00003590 #00003592		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00003599 #00003619 #00003622 #00003625 #00004631 #00004643 #00004644 #00004645 #00004663 #00004664 #00004666 #00004673 #00004675 #00004679 #00004696 #00004708 #00004713 #00004732 #00004735 #00004737 #00004751 #00004758 #00004763 #00004768 #00004784 #00004786 #00004789 #00004791 #00004803 #00004807 #00004809 #00004815 #00004817 #00004821 #00004829 #00004831		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00004832 #00004841 #00004844 #00004851 #00004866 #00004867 #00004868 #00004869 #00004895 #00004896 #00004902 #00004905 #00004907 #00004910 #00004912 #00004913 #00004914 #00004915 #00004917 #00004918 #00004920 #00004923 #00004924 #00004925 #00004928 #00004929 #00004930 #00004931 #00004935 #00004937 #00004939 #00004942 #00004945 #00004948 #00004949 #00004950		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00004956 #00004962 #00004965 #00004972 #00004973 #00004974 #00004978 #00004979 #00004984 #00004986 #00004991 #00004994 #00004998 #00005013 #00005026 #00005028 #00005032 #00005040 #00005042 #00005044 #00005047 #00005049 #00005053 #00005056 #00005065 #00005067 #00005068 #00005077 #00005081 #00005088 #00005090 #00005091 #00005093 #00005095 #00005097 #00005106		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00005109 #00005112 #00005116 #00005118 #00005120 #00005126 #00005128 #00005136 #00005137 #00005138 #00005141 #00005142 #00005145 #00005149 #00005156 #00005158 #00005159 #00005166 #00005168 #00005173 #00005174 #00005175 #00005176 #00005177 #00005178 #00005182 #00005184 #00005190 #00005193 #00005200 #00005222 #00005230 #00005234 #00005238 #00005240 #00005248		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00005253 #00005256 #00005258 #00005260 #00005265 #00005269 #00005271 #00005274 #00005279 #00005281 #00006269 #00006272 #00006279 #00005268 #00003569 #00005116		
			31 respondents stated that the proposed changes would reduce traffic and vehicle use in the area.	#00002724 #00002731 #00002801 #00002808 #00002827 #00002857 #00002887 #00002895 #00002910 #00002942 #00002987 #00002997 #00003026 #00003030 #00003041 #00003143 #00003162 #00003191 #00003270 #00003289	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

				#00003337 #00003386 #00003532 #00003541 #00003567 #00003594 #00004762 #00004794 #00004797 #00004995 #00005255																					
			61 respondents expressed general, pre-existing dissatisfaction with congestion on the SRN, including the M25 and A13.	#00002781 #00002801 #00002983 #00003050 #00003083 #00003122 #00003219 #00003255 #00003267 #00003273 #00003283 #00003377 #00003383 #00003409 #00003412 #00003425 #00003435 #00003441 #00003453 #00003490 #00003494 #00003581 #00003592 #00003619 #00003623	N	<p>A robust assessment of traffic volumes has been assessed based on scenarios with and without the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC). Traffic modelling has been agreed with the local highway authorities and Highways England and a comprehensive Transport Assessment undertaken (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (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 they will be looking to promote public transport as the main travel option to The London Resort.</p> <p>The Traffic Flows (document ref 6.2.9.2) associated with the London Resort have been fully considered as part of the Transport Assessment. As can be seen in this document, it is considered that most traffic generated by the scheme would be generally outside of the conventional network peak hours. However, there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks. The Table below provides a breakdown on the numbers of vehicles expected into the London Resort on the Kent side.</p> <p>Table 9-7: The London Resort, Trip Generation (Kent Project Site)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Assessment Year</th> <th colspan="2">AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)</th> <th colspan="2">PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2025</td> <td>107</td> <td>20</td> <td>199</td> <td>499</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2029</td> <td>111</td> <td>26</td> <td>288</td> <td>679</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)		Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	2025	107	20	199	499	2029	111	26	288	679
Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)																						
	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures																					
2025	107	20	199	499																					
2029	111	26	288	679																					

				#00004631 #00004675 #00004708 #00004751 #00004758 #00004791 #00004829 #00004851 #00004902 #00004928 #00004935 #00004962 #00004973 #00004984 #00004986 #00004992 #00005036 #00005040 #00005047 #00005058 #00005067 #00005068 #00005091 #00005106 #00005114 #00005136 #00005142 #00005156 #00005158 #00005166 #00005234 #00005240 #00005253 #00005269 #00005271 #00006279	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2038</td> <td>112</td> <td>26</td> <td>347</td> <td>978</td> </tr> </table> <p>To take account of these figures the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. In addition, the Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.</p> <p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p>	2038	112	26	347	978
2038	112	26	347	978						

			<p>117 respondents concerned because of high traffic volumes in the Greenhithe, Swanscombe, Thurrock, Tilbury and surrounding areas.</p> <p>#00002744 #00002752 #00002800 #00002801 #00002816 #00002866 #00002985 #00002988 #00003017 #00003054 #00003060 #00003099 #00003118 #00003214 #00003258 #00003306 #00003316 #00003350 #00003355 #00003371 #00003380 #00003402 #00003429 #00003431 #00003434 #00003437 #00003440 #00003443 #00003449 #00003453 #00003470 #00003471 #00003472 #00003477 #00003484 #00003487</p>	N	<p>A robust assessment of traffic volumes has been assessed based on scenarios with and without the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC). Traffic modelling has been agreed with the local highway authorities and Highways England and a comprehensive Transport Assessment undertaken (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (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 they will be looking to promote public transport as the main travel option to The London Resort.</p> <p>The Traffic Flows (document ref 6.2.9.2) associated with the London Resort have been fully considered as part of the Transport Assessment. As can be seen in this document, it is considered that most traffic generated by the scheme would be generally outside of the conventional network peak hours. However, there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks. The Table below provides a breakdown on the numbers of vehicles expected into the London Resort on the Kent side.</p> <p>Table 9-7: The London Resort, Trip Generation (Kent Project Site)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Assessment Year</th> <th colspan="2">AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)</th> <th colspan="2">PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2025</td> <td>107</td> <td>20</td> <td>199</td> <td>499</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2029</td> <td>111</td> <td>26</td> <td>288</td> <td>679</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2038</td> <td>112</td> <td>26</td> <td>347</td> <td>978</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>To take account of these figures the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. In addition, the Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.</p> <p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p>	Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)		Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	2025	107	20	199	499	2029	111	26	288	679	2038	112	26	347	978
Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)																										
	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures																									
2025	107	20	199	499																									
2029	111	26	288	679																									
2038	112	26	347	978																									

				#00003490 #00003494 #00003499 #00003506 #00003507 #00003525 #00003546 #00003552 #00003553 #00003579 #00003589 #00003619 #00004644 #00004645 #00004663 #00004669 #00004675 #00004695 #00004732 #00004737 #00004758 #00004768 #00004803 #00004819 #00004821 #00004841 #00004867 #00004868 #00004872 #00004896 #00004897 #00004899 #00004902 #00004905 #00004911 #00004913		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00004919 #00004920 #00004925 #00004930 #00004935 #00004937 #00004948 #00004978 #00004984 #00004994 #00004998 #00004999 #00005042 #00005044 #00005047 #00005048 #00005077 #00005091 #00005116 #00005120 #00005121 #00005128 #00005137 #00005145 #00005156 #00005159 #00005165 #00005177 #00005184 #00005227 #00005241 #00005269 #00005274 #00006272 #00003331 #00003297		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			#00004998 #00003484 #00004695 #00004867 #00004841 #00004913 #00005137 #00004992 #00004983		
		7 respondents said that the proposed modal split and other transport measures, such as public transport, use of the River Thames and active travel plans, would reduce the use of and impact on the SRN, including a reduction in congestion.	#00002733 #00003229 #00003399 #00003619 #00003141 #00004644 #00005234	N	These responses are consistent with the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). As identified in the Assessment, LRCH has undertaken a worst-case private vehicle assessment using a mode share calculated from car parking accumulation. The Travel Demand Management Plan therefore incentivises transport by active and sustainable modes.
		6 respondents stated that resort traffic should not have an impact on the SRN or expressed a desire to keep resort traffic away from the SRN and local roads.	#00003118 #00004869 #00004675 #00004902 #00004937 #00003592	N	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models.
		6 respondents stated that extra traffic from Resort's visitors will negatively impact local businesses.	#00004821 #00004768 #00004817 #00004984 #00003478 #00003453	N	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models. ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) consider both the negative and positive impacts of the regeneration associated with the London Resort. Overall, it concludes that the benefits in terms of creating new jobs, providing business

						opportunities to local firms, and local spending (among others) are expected to outweigh adverse impacts.
Wider SRN infrastructure	13	1 respondent supported the plans but only if the ease of joining the major roads was considered.	#00004688	N	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models	
		8 stated a belief that the London Resort could result in increased traffic on the SRN resulting in a need for wider changes to manage the additional network traffic.	#00003337 #00003050 #00003585 #00004957 #00004829 #00002801 #00003219 #00003480	N	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models	
		3 respondents expressed support for the inclusion of a new bridge or river crossing in as part of the proposals.	#00003267 #00003581 #00004631	N	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) does not identify a requirement for a new crossing of the River Thames is required to accommodate the London Resort. Notwithstanding this, LRCH have been in dialogue with Highways England about the Lower Thames Crossing scheme about its potential implications for London Resort and will continue to do so throughout the Development Consent Order process.	
		1 respondent asked for further details on plans relating to Junctions 31.	#00005067	N	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) shows a full highway impact assessment and details proposed improvements as required.	
Bluewater	10	8 respondents specifically state that the traffic from Bluewater will pose the greatest problem to an increase in traffic in the area.	#00003306 #00004737 #00005028 #00005116 #00004919 #00004867 #00004789 #00004782	N	LRCH are not promoting the use of Bluewater or Ebbsfleet International as parking destinations. Existing Fastrack routes serve Bluewater and The London Resort. Additional demand has been assessed within the Public Transport Strategy and mitigation options (if required) discussed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
		2 respondents stated that they would like minimal impact on the	#00003382 #00004774	N	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	

			SRN, in particular the M25, during construction.			<p>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>
A2 Bean Ebbsfleet Junction improvements	83	9 respondents expressed support for the A2 Bean Ebbsfleet Junction improvements.	#00003487 #00003424 #00002750 #00003510 #00003118 #00003567 #00003308 #00004935 #00003367	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.	
		3 respondents claimed that upgrades to the A2 would be detrimental to the idea of getting people to use other means of travel.	#00003386 #00004851 #00005240	N	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has reviewed the access scheme, alongside the recent submissions made by Highways England with the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet scheme. The Resort does not encourage vehicle use but acknowledges that it remains a large mode choice for visitors and staff. Therefore, as part of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), a worst-case assessment, using the highest car mode shares, has been undertaken. LRCH are committed to promoting sustainable based travel ahead of car use and have set out strategies in the Travel Demand Management Plan.	
		1 respondent questioned if Highways England agreed to the omission of A2 Bean Ebbsfleet Junction works as part of the Resort's plans.	#00004782	N	This assumption is not correct, proposed improvements are detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).	
		6 respondents do not believe that improvements to the junction will be enough to minimise the impact of pre-existing and	#00004984 #00005281 #00003269 #00004999 #00003221 #00003443	N	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models	

			resort traffic and additional improvement works may be required to account for extra traffic coming from the north.			<p>To take account of these figures the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. In addition, the Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.</p> <p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p>
			2 respondents questioned if the resort had taken into account the improvement works at the A2 Bean Ebbsfleet Junction and if not, requested that LRCH consider improvements being undertaken at the junction when modelling traffic data.	#00005273 #00004883	N	<p>LRCH has included modelling from Highways England in our proposals. The A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. More details can be found in the Transport Assessment (document 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>Our revised layout takes into account the recent approval for the Highways England A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement works.</p> <p>This new access road and revised junction layout will reduce impacts on local communities and accommodate future traffic flows associated with Ebbsfleet Garden City. It will also ensure existing roads would continue to provide access to Swanscombe and Northfleet, unimpeded by visitor traffic to the London Resort.</p>
			1 respondent expressed general opposition to the resort on the basis of the ongoing development of the A2 Been Ebbsfleet Junction.	#00005071	N	<p>A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models.</p>
			1 respondent expressed concern that Highways England did not include the resort as part of their modelling and planning for the junction improvement works.	#00004789	N	<p>This answer is in relation to modelling provided by Highways England. LRCH are consulting on the London Resort and we're including modelling from Highways England in our proposals. Notwithstanding this, we can confirm that the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. More details can be found in the Transport Assessment (document 6.2.9.1).</p>

			1 respondent stated that they had been informed previously that no access to the resort would come from the A2.	#00002983	N	The proposal for a dedicated access road from the A2 has been part of proposals since the early stages of the project. We can confirm that the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. More details can be found in the Transport Assessment (document 6.2.9.1).
			59 respondents concerned about the high levels of traffic on the A2 and the impact on surrounding areas including the M25.	#00002784 #00002807 #00002936 #00003219 #00003237 #00003259 #00003331 #00003360 #00003480 #00003487 #00003494 #00003506 #00003599 #00004631 #00004675 #00004695 #00004713 #00004758 #00004768 #00004789 #00004832 #00004851 #00004867 #00004902 #00004905 #00004928 #00004935 #00004962 #00004973 #00004984	N	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

				#00004986 #00004992 #00005036 #00005040 #00005047 #00005058 #00005061 #00005067 #00005068 #00005091 #00005106 #00005114 #00005128 #00005136 #00005136 #00005142 #00005156 #00005158 #00005166 #00005174 #00005234 #00005240 #00005253 #00005269 #00005271 #00006279 #00006282 #00002918 #00004935		
	Improvements to the M25	4	1 responded that works should be carried out to improve the access junction from the M25 anti-clockwise to the A2.	#00003334	N	This issue has been considered as part of the development of plans for London Resort. As a result, 25% of visitor parking will be north of the River which significantly reduces the number of additional vehicles using M25 anti-clockwise to the A2. More details can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

			3 respondents suggested that direct access should be provided between the M25 and the A2.	#00005200 #00005240 #00003477	N	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). As identified in the Transport Assessment, two specific improvements will be made to accommodate traffic: improvements to the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme; and at the Asda roundabout at Tilbury. It is not considered that any further improvements are required to the SRN to accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.
	Road network to the north of the river	52	42 respondents expressed pre-existing dissatisfaction with traffic and congestion issues north of the river and the need to reduce congestion, with particular concern about the impact of vehicle numbers on the A1089.	#00002784 #00003258 #00003279 #00003296 #00003305 #00003355 #00003383 #00003392 #00003425 #00003456 #00003552 #00004708 #00004732 #00004768 #00004780 #00004817 #00004819 #00004821 #00005067 #00005145 #00005155 #00005156 #00005158 #00005166 #00005184 #00005189 #00005196 #00005227 #00005234	N	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models

			#00005240 #00005253 #00005256 #00005266 #00005268 #00005269 #00005271 #00005274 #00006269 #00006272 #00006279 #00006280 #00004829		
		4 respondents expressed a concern that the road infrastructure north of the river may be negatively impacted by resort traffic.	#00005274 #00005227 #00004821 #00005013	N	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models.
		4 respondents expressed pre-existing dissatisfaction with the existing infrastructure close to the Asda Roundabout and the need to make improvements to areas such as St Andrew's Road and the impact of traffic on the roundabout.	#00005227 #00003454 #00003279 #00003355	Y	A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Following further assessment work, and as identified in the Transport Assessment, improvements are proposed to the Asda roundabout at Tilbury to improve access to the Resort.
		2 respondents questioned what impact the resort will have on pedestrian and traffic	#00003099 #00004732		A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Following further assessment work, and as identified in the Transport Assessment, improvements are proposed to the Asda

			access to the Port of Tilbury and how traffic can be mitigated in and around the Port of Tilbury.			roundabout at Tilbury to improve access to the Resort car park located on land at the Port of Tilbury. Consideration of pedestrian routes north of the river is available at Figure 10.3 of the Transport Assessment.
Lower Thames Crossing (LTC)	67	8 respondents expressed general support for LTC and the potential for reducing pre-existing traffic issues.	#00003339 #00003041 #00002951 #00003273 #00005093 #00003592 #00002801 #00002758	N	LRCH believe this is a comment in relation to the LTC modelling assessment and not The London Resort.	
		1 respondent expressed support for a river crossing for London City Airport to accommodate increased passenger numbers as a result of the Resort.	#00003199	N	The expected demand from airports direct to The London Resort is not significant. However, the River strategy includes a link between Swanscombe and central London to accommodate visitors accessing the Resort from this location. This is in addition to the Tilbury Ride and Glide ferry link.	
		10 respondents expressed concern that the proposed LTC would result in increased traffic and congestion on the local and strategic road networks, impacting local communities.	#00003425 #00005200 #00003456 #00005137 #00005240 #00003474 #00003402 #00003221 #00003523 #00003331	N	LRCH believe this is a comment in relation to the LTC modelling assessment and not The London Resort.	
		1 respondent expressed support for the use of LTC as resort access in	#00003305	N	LRCH are assessing the impacts of The London Resort and not LTC. The proposed development has been assessed using models that include LTC.	

			order to minimise the impact on local roads.			
			1 respondent expressed concern that the Resort would negate the impact of traffic reduction created by LTC.	#00004973	N	Traffic modelling has been undertaken in forecast scenarios with and without the LTC and LTC is included in the model coverage
			1 respondent asked if the Resort transport plan would mean that LTC is not required.	#00003288	N	LRCH believe this is a comment in relation to the LTC modelling assessment and not The London Resort
			12 respondents expressed general dissatisfaction with the proposed LTC.	#00003258 #00004832 #00004829 #00003552 #00002778 #00003099 #00003472 #00003461 #00003456 #00005056 #00003422 #00004818	N	LRCH believe this is a comment in relation to the LTC modelling assessment and not The London Resort. LRCH are assessing the impacts of The London Resort and not LTC. The proposed development has been assessed using models that include LTC.
			10 respondents expressed concern about the overlapping construction timelines of the Resort and LTC.	#00003338 #00003331 #00005141 #00003622 #00005200 #00005137 #00003392 #00003319 #00003221 #00004768	N	LRCH have been discussing with LTC and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process.

			4 respondents expressed support for the idea of building, and completing, the proposed LTC before the resort.	#00003440 #00003350 #00003478 #00003421	N	LRCH have been in dialogue with Highways England about the Lower Thames Crossing scheme about its potential implications for London Resort and will continue to do so throughout the Development Consent Order process.
			3 respondents questioned the assumption that LTC would be operational by 2027.	#00004782 #00004751 #00003108	N	Traffic modelling has been undertaken in forecast scenarios with and without the LTC and LTC is included in the model coverage. LRCH are assessing the impacts of The London Resort and not LTC.
			2 respondents questioned why Highways England and LRCH had not worked together to come up with a linked development.	#00004832 #00004818	N	LRCH have been in dialogue with Highways England about the Lower Thames Crossing scheme about its potential implications for London Resort and will continue to do so throughout the Development Consent Order process.
			1 respondent expressed concerns about the proposed plans for LTC and the impact this would have on access to the Essex site and the park and glide facility.	#00003422	N	Traffic modelling has been undertaken in forecast scenarios in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) with and without the LTC and LTC is included in the model coverage.
			2 respondents expressed a preference for using the proposed LTC as access to the Essex Site instead of other parts of the SRN.	#00004780 #00006272	N	
			3 respondents expressed concern that LTC traffic modelling does not include estimated resort traffic.	#00004829 #00004818 #00005241	N	LRCH believe this is a comment in relation to the LTC modelling assessment and not The London Resort.

			1 respondent questioned why LTC was not included as part of the Resort traffic plan.	#00004818	N	Traffic modelling has been undertaken in forecast scenarios with and without the LTC and LTC is included in the model coverage.
			1 respondent questions why the resort plan includes LTC.	#00004829	N	
			1 respondent expressed concern that the Resort does not take into account increased traffic as a result of LTC.	#00004732	N	
			4 respondents expressed concern that LTC would result in increased traffic related pollution and reduce pedestrian and cycle access.	#00002936 #00004999 #00004993 #00003422	N	LRCH are assessing the impacts of The London Resort and not LTC. The proposed development has been assessed using models that include LTC.
			2 respondents expressed opposition to the site location on the basis that they believe it should be used for LTC or that the site is too close to the proposed LTC.	#00005275 #00005248	N	LRCH are assessing the impacts of The London Resort and not LTC. The proposed development has been assessed using models that include LTC.
	Access for blue light services	4	4 respondents raised concerns regarding blue light services access to the roads and the risk of congestion delaying emergency responses – concerns raised about child safety.	#00004937 #00003599 #00003306 #00004983	N	The London Resort has been designed with multiple access points to allow for quick access for emergency response vehicles at all times. The transport proposals for the Resort have 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. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).

	Parking proposals	68	5 respondents supported proposed parking plans.	#00002743 #00003030 #00003574 #00003572 #00002854	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			50 respondents expressed concerns over parking proposals and how they will lead to congested parking in local areas.	#00002781 #00003330 #00004669 #00004643 #00005106 #00004958 #00004956 #00005281 #00004950 #00004948 #00004936 #00004929 #00004905 #00004896 #00004895 #00005269 #00005258 #00005230 #00005141 #00005137 #00005107 #00005047 #00005040 #00005028 #00005011 #00004994 #00004988 #00003402 #00003341 #00003453 #00003484	N	<p>The Transport Assessment (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 main travel option to The London Resort.</p> <p>The Travel Demand Management Plan 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>An off-site parking strategy has been developed 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> <p>LRCH is confident that the Travel Demand Management Plan will incentivise transport by active and sustainable modes and reduce travel to the Resort by car. LRCH will monitor parking on an ongoing basis and work with Local Authorities.</p>

				#00004696 #00004953 #00004945 #00004941 #00004922 #00004919 #00004917 #00004902 #00004829 #00005234 #00005216 #00005207 #00005178 #00005149 #00005072 #00005032 #00006272 #00006266 #00004713		
			13 respondents expressed concerns that allowing walk ins to the Resort will lead to a lot of visitors parking on side streets in nearby areas.	#00003054 #00004956 #00004949 #00004947 #00004945 #00004937 #00004929 #00004923 #00004905 #00004895 #00004974 #00005047 #00004973	N	<p>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.</p> <p>We understand there are concerns that Resort visitors may use local residential streets for parking, rather than the dedicated car parking. An off-site parking strategy has been developed 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> <p>LRCH is confident that the Travel Demand Management Plan will incentivise transport by active and sustainable modes and reduce travel to the Resort by car. We are speaking with the Local Authorities about this specific issue and have</p>

						committed to monitoring the impact of any off-site parking generated by the London Resort.
Controlled parking zones (CPZ)	33	4 respondents questioned if a CPZ would be required and that this should be included in the DCO.	#00003529 #00004991 #00004782 #00005241		LRCH is confident that the Travel Demand Management Plan will incentivise transport by active and sustainable modes and reduce travel to the Resort by car. An off-site parking strategy has been developed 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). We are speaking with the Local Authorities about this specific issue and have committed to monitoring the impact of any off-site parking generated by the London Resort.	
		2 respondents expressed concern that parking restrictions may be introduced for local residents and whether this would result in potential costs incurred by local residents if a CPZ is introduced.	#00004953 #00003524			
		1 respondent supported the plans so long as no parking charges were implemented for residents in the area.	#00004760			
		1 respondent commented that a CPZ should be funded by the resort.	#00005241			
		3 respondents expressed opposition to use of a CPZ or parking restrictions.	#00002781 #00004941 #00005269			
		1 respondent expressed support for a CPZ to	#00005281			

			reduce parking on local roads.			
			15 respondents raised concerns about the high cost of parking at the London Resort forcing people to park on local streets.	#00004883 #00003231 #00004920 #00005032 #00004988 #00005258 #00003537 #00004948 #00004941 #00004923 #00004913 #00005053 #00005184 #00004910 #00005266	N	<p>Free parking could encourage use by private vehicle, which could have knock on effects and minimise uptake of sustainable modes of travel. The Travel Demand Management Plan sets out how LRCH will incentivise transport by active and sustainable modes.</p> <p>An off-site parking strategy has been developed 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> <p>In addition, the inclusion of 25% visitor parking north of the River significantly reduces the number of additional vehicles at the Kent Project Site. The full highway impact assessment has been undertaken and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>LRCH is confident that the Travel Demand Management Plan will incentivise transport by active and sustainable modes and reduce travel to the Resort by car. LRCH will monitor parking on an ongoing basis and work with Local Authorities.</p>
			6 respondents stated that car parking facilities and easy road access need to be provided for those travelling by car and should either be free or not too costly.	#00002794 #00003358 #00003114 #00005238 #00002766 #00005234	N	<p>LRCH is committed to maximising public transport access to the site but acknowledges that car travel remains a key mode for a number of people and so the assessments take this into account.</p> <p>A comprehensive multi-modal Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) has been developed that seeks to create the best package from walking, cycling and public transport options.</p> <p>In reality, LRCH and The Resort will promote sustainable travel above car travel wherever possible and will seek to reduce the amount of car movements at the site. Free parking could encourage use by private vehicle, which could have knock on effects and minimise uptake of sustainable modes of travel. The Travel Demand Management Plan sets out how LRCH will incentivise transport by active and sustainable modes.</p>

Onsite access and transport	3	1 respondent suggested the inclusion of Fasttrack and other public transport services for onsite transport.	#00003156	N	The London Resort is served by existing Fastrack routes with proposals for a dedicated stop. Any additional mitigation has been discussed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
		1 respondent commented that the People Movers, and its connection with the 'Park and Glide' was complex.	#00004782	N	The Park and Glide proposals are part of the River Strategy to facilitate 25% of visitors parking in Tilbury and using a ferry service to cross the river. A people mover will operate between Swanscombe pier and The London Resort to transport people between these destinations.
		1 respondent suggested an inter-site walkway and bridge across the river.	#00004814	N	LRCH notes the suggestions made, but this is not part of our proposals.
Park and Ride services	16	5 respondents expressed general support for a Park and Ride	#00002842 #00003143 #00002983 #00004688 #00004900	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
		2 respondents expressed support for a Park and Ride on the grounds that it would reduce traffic on the Dartford Crossings.	#00002729 #00003453	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
		1 respondent supported a Park and Ride from Ebbsfleet International Station carpark.	#00003585	N	A people mover is proposed to connect the pier, The London Resort and Ebbsfleet International. A dedicated new walk and cycle way is also proposed between the same points.
		6 respondents expressed support for a Park and Ride to reduce the traffic impact of the resort on the SRN, this	#00002888 #00005029 #00003384 #00004683 #00003175 #00004900	N	A people mover is proposed to connect the pier, The London Resort and Ebbsfleet International. A dedicated new walk and cycle way is also proposed between the same points.

			could include the use of a monorail.			
			1 respondent expressed support for a Park and Ride style transport connection from Bluewater.	#00003424	N	LRCH are not promoting the use of Bluewater or Ebbsfleet International as parking destinations. Existing Fastrack routes serve Bluewater and The London Resort. Additional demand will be assessed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and mitigation options (if required) discussed.
			1 respondent expressed opposition to Resort visitors using Bluewater as a means to Park and Ride.	#00003537	N	

Topic	Issue summary	Tally	Sub-issue (if relevant)	User IDs	Change (y/n)	Regard had to response
Environment		1,481				
	Support for proposals	32	32 respondents supported the environmental proposals and mitigation measures.	#00002743 #00002783 #00002803 #00002813 #00002883 #00002898 #00002910 #00002960 #00002964 #00003030 #00003098 #00003114 #00003144 #00003151 #00003154 #00003256 #00003281 #00003316 #00003337 #00003340 #00003376 #00003399 #00003437 #00003535 #00004683 #00004731 #00004794 #00004799 #00004833	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

				#00004866 #00005008 #00005047		
	Concerns about environmental impact	70	<p>68 respondents expressed concern about the Resort’s potentially detrimental on the environment.</p> <p>Some respondents stated that the benefits for the environment need to be stronger to mitigate damage to the local area.</p> <p>Others felt that the environmental impacts of the Resort cannot be supported due to its proximity to residential areas.</p>	#00002746 #00002778 #00002811 #00002903 #00002909 #00002910 #00002918 #00002936 #00002948 #00002955 #00002971 #00003025 #00003035 #00003177 #00003258 #00003298 #00003317 #00003320 #00003330 #00003339 #00003376 #00003405 #00003439 #00003473 #00003477 #00003484 #00003525 #00003567 #00003585 #00003588 #00003600 #00003604 #00003616	N	<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 LRCH 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. These can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)</p> <p>LRCH has a clearly stated target for the London Resort to be net carbon neutral in operation. Further information about the</p>

			<p>#00004669 #00004670 #00004673 #00004675 #00004713 #00004762 #00004789 #00004815 #00004829 #00004833 #00004866 #00004928 #00004929 #00004931 #00004948 #00004966 #00005008 #00005013 #00005027 #00005043 #00005081 #00005094 #00005126 #00005137 #00005142 #00005151 #00005158 #00005166 #00005176 #00005178 #00005190 #00005253 #00005281 #00006262 #00006272</p>	<p>overarching approach to climate change mitigation and carbon reduction in ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20) and information about the approach to sustainable transport is included in ES Chapter 9 Land Transport (document ref 6.1.9) and ES Chapter 10 River Transport (document ref 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>A DCO, if approved, means that comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will then be in place. This includes noise, air quality and visuals impact, which LRCH must adhere to.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			1 respondent requested the Project Site be left alone for future generations to enjoy. Included suggestion for a Thames Estuary National Park.	#00005081	N	<p>A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings. Further information is available in the Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7).</p> <p>However, the Project Site would not meet the criteria for National Park Designation.</p>
			1 respondent commented that an ecological park in the area named Springhead Park had been proposed.	#00003544	N	<p>LRHC notes the response.</p> <p>LRHC is committed to making a positive impact to local ecological habitats, while providing opportunities for public access to enjoy the space. The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) includes the retention and enhancement of existing habitats situated outside of the construction zone, and the creation of new habitats of ecological value, both inside and outside the Resort area.</p>
	Queries around environmental targets	3	3 respondents queried whether the environmental proposals for the Resort will be implemented, and if there will be	#00002802 #00003569 #00004935	N	A DCO, if approved, means that comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will then be in place. This includes

			commitments around targets, or penalties if they are not met. The appointment of an independent appointee was suggested.			noise, air quality and visuals impact, which LRCH must adhere to. There are established mechanisms in place to oversee delivery of commitments set out within a DCO.
	Support for sustainable transport options	5	5 respondents supported the use of sustainable and public transport to mitigate the environmental impact of the Resort.	#00002717 #00003140 #00003191 #00003574 #00003594	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Concerns about traffic impacts on the environment	10	7 respondent expressed concern that new road infrastructure for the Resort will have a negative impact on the environment.	#00003035 #00004670 #00004930 #00004808 #00004646 #00003534 #00004748	N	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 ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20) and information about the approach to sustainable transport is included in ES

						Chapter 9 Land Transport (document ref 6.1.9) and ES Chapter 10 River Transport (document ref 6.1.10).
			3 respondents expressed concern that encouraging more people to travel from other parts of the UK and internationally will not be better for the environment.	#00003395 #00003439 #00003477	N	<p>LRCH is committed to encouraging the use of sustainable transport mechanisms to the greatest degree possible. This includes establishing connections with rail and river transport mechanisms.</p> <p>As a result, the Resort will be accessible by multiple modes of travel, which will allow connections from major transport hubs around the UK and internationally. In particular the Resort will be adjacent to Ebbsfleet International Station, with a people mover providing rapid connection to rail and river transport.</p> <p>LRHC has established a Transport Strategy that encourages a UK wide 'day of travel' distribution in order to maximise access to and uptake of sustainable transport modes. On-site hotels will be available for those travelling longer distances.</p>

						Further information about the approach to sustainable transport is included in the land and river chapters of the ES Chapter 9 Land Transport (document ref 6.1.9) and ES Chapter 10 River Transport (document ref 6.1.10) and the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
Support of the use of Brownfield land	19	<p>19 respondents expressed general support for the regeneration of a Brownfield site.</p> <p>Some stated that there will be a net gain from developing on the contaminated Brownfield site, and that the Project Site is currently underutilised.</p>	<p>#00002883 #00002943 #00003154 #00003155 #00003256 #00003273 #00003384 #00003406 #00003510 #00003537 #00003567 #00003625 #00004675 #00004706 #00004850 #00004948 #00004995 #00005070 #00005152</p>	N	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.</p> <p>LRHC is committed to making a positive impact to local ecological habitats, while providing opportunities for public access to enjoy the space. The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) includes the retention and enhancement of existing habitats situated outside of the construction zone, and the creation of new habitats of ecological value, both inside and outside the Resort area.</p>	
Opposition to the use of Brownfield land	7	<p>7 respondents opposed the construction of the Resort on a Brownfield site.</p> <p>Reasons for opposition included possible impact on native species and that the area should</p>	<p>#00003298 #00003585 #00004636 #00004789 #00004861 #00004966 #00005061</p>	N	<p>Consultation materials set out that while a significant proportion of the proposed development lies on post-industrial brownfield land, some of which is contaminated, the Project Site also includes areas</p>	

			<p>be returned to Salt Marshes. Some claimed not all of the Project Site is defined as Brownfield, and that some was in the Green Belt.</p>		<p>of marshland, scrub grassland and flood defences as well as industrial premises.</p> <p>In order to protect, and where possible enhance biodiversity and ecological value, a large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings. Further information is available in the Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7). Impact on habitats and species is also assessed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p> <p>If the Kent Project Site were left unmanaged, the current mix of habitats will revert to dense scrub and woodland with loss of open mosaic habitat and chalk and the species associated with these habitats. The former saltmarsh land has been subject to such extensive contaminated landfill that to remove it and revert it to salt marsh is likely to</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

						do more harm than good and is not economically viable. Only a very small area of land within the order limits to the south of the A2 lies within the Green Belt, which is required for minor alterations to the road junction.
	Support for landscape proposals	3	3 respondents commented that this will, in the longer term, enhance the natural environment and that the natural features of the area will attract visitors.	#00003154 #00003268 #00003572	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. A large proportion of the Kent Project Site landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings. Further information is available in the Landscape Strategy (6.2.11.7).
	Suggestions for landscape proposals	1	1 respondent commented that the Resort should make use of natural habitats, including lakes	#00003213	N	The Landscape Strategy (6.2.11.7) includes the retention and enhancement of existing habitats situated outside of the construction zone, and the creation of new habitats of ecological value, both inside and outside the Resort area.
	Concern for impacts on landscape	10	10 respondents expressed concern that the Resort would spoil the landscape, and that it does not need enhancing.	#00002883 #00003099 #00003101 #00003228 #00003616 #00004713	N	The landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development at the Kent and Essex Project Sites are considered within the Landscape

			<p>Others felt that the landscape of the Thames Estuary should not be developed further as it is already very industrialised, and the Resort is too big.</p> <p>Other stated the importance of integrating and not negatively impact on current surroundings.</p>	<p>#00004832 #00004832 #00004877 #00004985</p>	<p>Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) and relevant appendices.</p> <p>From the initial phase of the project, the location of London Resort has been carefully considered based upon a range of criteria, considering how benefits can be maximised and any negative impacts mitigated. Further information on the process of site selection is available in ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4).</p> <p>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 which have been identified to ensure that London Resort is able to reduce potential negative impacts.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

	Concern for impacts on open / green space	22	<p>21 respondents expressed concern about the loss of open spaces / green space due to the Resort.</p> <p>Responses included concern that the area will be fenced off, resulting in a negative impact on locals that want to walk and look at nature; other had a preference to retain or have more open/natural space rather than a Resort</p> <p>Some stated that more green space is required in the area and that open space must be protected for the benefit of local wildlife, including insects, due to the erosion of open space as a result of other developments around Ebbsfleet.</p>	<p>#00002750 #00002918 #00002983 #00002993 #00003320 #00003343 #00003473 #00004664 #00004669 #00004696 #00004713 #00004849 #00004861 #00004894 #00004981 #00005054 #00005076 #00005081 #00005120 #00005122 #00006261</p>	N	<p>The Project Site is currently in private ownership and no community space will be lost. The development will, however, make natural open space available to the local community.</p> <p>LRHC is committed to making a positive impact to local ecological habitats, while providing opportunities for public access to enjoy the space. The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) includes the retention and enhancement of existing habitats situated outside of the construction zone, and the creation of new habitats of ecological value, both inside and outside the Resort area.</p>
			<p>1 respondent expressed concern that the Resort will result in the loss of a lake at the Project Site.</p>	#00004815	N	<p>An attenuation basin, a leachate basin and some open water bodies will be lost as a result of the development as set out in the ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12). New water bodies will be created, and existing water bodies enhanced as also set out within this chapter.</p>
	Support for wildlife proposals	46	<p>46 respondents expressed support for wildlife, ecology and</p>	<p>#00002724 #00002731</p>	N	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.</p>

			<p>biodiversity proposals and mitigation.</p> <p>Some commented the plans would improve access to wildlife and open space for visitors and local people.</p> <p>Other supported the proposed habitat conservation creation by the Resort.</p>	<p>#00002733 #00002741 #00002774 #00002789 #00002808 #00002827 #00002849 #00002887 #00002898 #00002903 #00002910 #00002911 #00002939 #00003029 #00003189 #00003251 #00003252 #00003253 #00003270 #00003277 #00003286 #00003305 #00003317 #00003339 #00003363 #00003510 #00003535 #00003567 #00003574 #00003577 #00003583 #00003588 #00003590 #00003618 #00003622 #00004679</p>	<p>LRHC is committed to making a positive impact to local ecological habitats, while providing opportunities for public access to enjoy the space. The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) includes the retention and enhancement of existing habitats situated outside of the construction zone, and the creation of new habitats of ecological value, both inside and outside the Resort area.</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

				#00004799 #00004946 #00004948 #00004995 #00005008 #00005070 #00005088 #00005258		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Concern due to the impact on wildlife	94	<p>88 respondents expressed concern about the impact on wildlife and biodiversity, both during operation and construction.</p> <p>Comments included concern about the damage to the ecosystem and the wildlife that inhabit the area, traffic impacts, the loss of habitats / impact on marshland, and the impact of visitors already damaging the Project Site.</p> <p>Some respondents commented the creation of new habitats cannot mitigate the loss of existing marshland, questioned the viability of creating new habitat, particularly due to the impact of visitor numbers and noise, and said it would take many years until any enhancements would mature. Others expressed a preference to maintaining the current environment and that local habitats do not need enhancing.</p>	#00002758 #00002778 #00002802 #00002806 #00002811 #00002813 #00002816 #00002822 #00002936 #00002948 #00002971 #00002990 #00003017 #00003035 #00003101 #00003249 #00003251 #00003252 #00003258 #00003297 #00003306 #00003309 #00003320 #00003338 #00003339 #00003343 #00003348 #00003408 #00003490 #00003499 #00003529 #00003569 #00003578 #00003584 #00003585 #00003588	N	<p>LRCH carried out a thorough assessment in order to select the Project Site location, as set out in ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4).</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 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</p>
--	---------------------------------------	----	---	--	---	--

			<p>#00003600 #00003604 #00003616 #00004632 #00004664 #00004666 #00004673 #00004674 #00004693 #00004713 #00004752 #00004755 #00004763 #00004778 #00004797 #00004799 #00004808 #00004815 #00004822 #00004824 #00004831 #00004832 #00004849 #00004861 #00004866 #00004896 #00004928 #00004930 #00004948 #00004965 #00004966 #00004973 #00004981 #00004985 #00005027 #00005028</p>	<p>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 Framework (document ref 6.1.12.3).</p> <p>Impact on habitats and species is assessed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p> <p>The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) identifies how visitor access to the retained habitats outside the</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>#00005036 #00005038 #00005043 #00005057 #00005075 #00005076 #00005081 #00005122 #00005123 #00005142 #00005166 #00005168 #00005269 #00005271 #00006262</p>	<p>Resort area will be carefully managed to avoid human disturbance to sensitive habitats and species, whilst allowing access to other less sensitive areas for the purposes of environmental education and awareness.</p> <p>The impacts of noise on habitats and wildlife are addressed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12) and ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (document ref 6.1.15).</p> <p>Potential impacts of construction and mitigation of these impacts are addressed within the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

			1 respondent expressed concern about the impact of wildlife dispersal from the construction of the Resort on local residents.	#00005230	N	The Illustrative Masterplan includes ecology corridors and buffers around the periphery of the resort to enable wildlife to continue to move between areas of retained habitat. The corridors are included in a wildlife-sensitive lighting strategy to ensure the corridors are suitable for nocturnal wildlife. The Illustrative masterplan for the project provides further information about this approach (document ref 2.21) issues relating to environmental impacts from construction are also addressed in the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2)
			1 respondent expressed concern about the impact on the SSSI.	#00004957	N	The Resort is not being built within the SSSI. The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) sets out the enhancement and management of the marshland network across the Kent Project Site.
			3 respondents expressed concern about marine life, ducks and wading birds, including the potential impact from the 'Park and Glide' and the pier.	#00003339 #00005081 #00005166	N	Careful consideration has been given to potential impacts of London Resort upon marine life and species habitat. The effects on marine life are addressed in ES Chapter 13 Marine Ecology

						and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.13). These effects include impacts resulting from construction and operation of the new pier and the 'Park and Glide' service and mitigations.
			1 respondent expressed concern about the loss of woodland as a result of the Resort.	#00005094	N	<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>As part of the project, more trees will be planted than lost as a result of development. Details of this approach are set out in The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7).</p> <p>Tree and woodland loss are addressed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12) and specifically Appendix 12.9 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (document ref 6.2.12.9)</p>

	Wildlife and transport	7	<p>3 respondents expressed concern that the proposed transport strategy for the Resort may impact wildlife.</p> <p>One questioned if new road infrastructure for the Resort will provide tunnels for local wildlife.</p>	<p>#00003035 #00005151 #00005168</p>	N	<p>Habitat connectivity throughout the development and beyond is central to the Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) and the Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3).</p>
			<p>4 respondents expressed concern that the creation of enhanced pedestrian and cycle route may negatively impact local habitats.</p>	<p>#00003414 #00004808 #00004948 #00004713 #00003361</p>		<p>LRHC has sought to simultaneously address the requirements for enhanced ecological habitats and natural spaces, with the requirement for public access and enhanced transport infrastructure.</p> <p>A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings. The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) identifies how visitor access to the retained habitats outside the Resort area will be carefully managed to avoid human disturbance to sensitive habitats and species, whilst allowing access to other less sensitive areas for the purposes of environmental education and awareness.</p>

						Impacts of increased recreational access on wildlife and habitats, and the approach to mitigation are addressed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).
	Concern about commitments	3	3 respondents questioned how the Resort will maintain its biodiversity commitments.	#00002849 #00003005 #00004861	N	LRCH is committed to net gain in biodiversity. Retained habitat will be enhanced and managed in the long term to ensure biodiversity commitments are met. The management strategy and responsibilities are defined in the landscape and ecology documents accompanying the application. Detail is available in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (doc ref 6.2.12.2).
	Swanscombe Marshes Campaign	53	3 respondents expressed support for the 'Save Swanscombe Marshes' campaign run by Buglife.	#00005271 #00005136 #00006279	N	Sustainability and the environment are at the core of our vision. Our detailed plans, published during our public consultation, show that we will be significantly enhancing and substantially retaining the marshes. A large proportion of the peninsula, including Black Duck Marsh, Broadness Marsh and the Local Wildlife Site at
			50 respondents used language from the 'Save Swanscombe Marshes' campaign run by Buglife but did not explicitly express support for the campaign.	#00005094 #00005027 #00003561 #00003560 #00003554 #00003550	N	

				#00004699 #00004698 #00004697 #00004642 #00004641 #00004640 #00004639 #00003629 #00003628 #00003627 #00004871 #00004870 #00004718 #00005157 #00005147 #00005144 #00005143 #00005140 #00005139 #00005130 #00005129 #00005127 #00005027 #00005022 #00005021 #00005020 #00005019 #00005004 #00005003 #00005002 #00005001 #00004997 #00004996 #00004970	<p>Botany Marsh will remain undeveloped.</p> <p>LRCH has been undertaking environmental surveys and assessment since 2012. As a result, we know a great deal about the environmental conditions on the Kent 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 old industrial structures. The area has been largely left, unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be 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>#00004969 #00004968 #00004967 #00006276 #00005134 #00005133 #00006290 #00006289 #00006288 #00006287 #00006286</p>	<p>This is set out in the Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3).</p> <p>Impact on habitats and species is assessed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p> <p>The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) identifies how visitor access to the retained habitats outside the Resort area will be carefully managed to avoid human disturbance to sensitive habitats and species, whilst allowing access to other less sensitive areas for the purposes of environmental education and awareness.</p> <p>The impacts of noise on habitats and wildlife are addressed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12) and ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (document ref 6.1.15).</p> <p>Potential impacts of construction and mitigation of these impacts are addressed</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						within the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2)
	Specific issues raised by Bug Life Campaign		Development would lead to the loss of nationally important habitat for invertebrates and a host of other wildlife.		N	<p>The peninsula suffers from extensive areas of historical waste disposal, contamination and old industrial structures. The area has been largely left, unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be 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>The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) identifies how visitor access to the retained habitats outside the Resort area will be carefully managed to avoid human disturbance to sensitive habitats and species, whilst allowing access to other less sensitive</p>

					<p>areas for the purposes of environmental education and awareness.</p> <p>A specific invertebrate mitigation strategy has been developed and included in the Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3).</p>
			<p>The Swanscombe Peninsula supports a unique mosaic of coastal habitats, grasslands, scrub and wetlands that have developed as a result of the Project Site's complex brownfield history.</p>	N	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.</p> <p>The peninsula suffers from extensive areas of historical waste disposal, contamination and old industrial structures. The area has been largely left, unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be 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>

						The habitats present on the Swanscombe Peninsula are described in detail within ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).
			This diverse habitat supports an invertebrate assemblage of national importance, with over 250 species of conservation concern already recorded from the Project Site, including the Critically Endangered Distinguished jumping spider (<i>Sitticus distinguendus</i>), the Sea aster mining bee (<i>Colletes halophilus</i>), Brown-banded carder bee (<i>Bombus humilis</i>), Black-headed mason wasp (<i>Odynerus melanocephalus</i>), Five-banded weevil wasp (<i>Cerceris quinquefasciata</i>), and the Saltmarsh shortspur beetle (<i>Anisodactylus poeciloides</i>) among a host of rare and scarce species.		N	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.</p> <p>The peninsula suffers from extensive areas of historical waste disposal, contamination and old industrial structures. The area has been largely left, unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be 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>The habitats present on the Swanscombe Peninsula are described in detail within ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and</p>

					<p>Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12). The results of invertebrate surveys carried out in 2015 and 2020 are contained within the Ecology Baseline Report (document ref 6.2.12.1).</p> <p>A specific invertebrate mitigation strategy has been developed and included in the Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3).</p>
			<p>The proposed layout would lead to the direct losses of significant areas of Priority habitat under Section 41 of the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act (2006), including irreplaceable Open Mosaic Habitat on Previously Developed Land and coastal grazing marsh.</p>	N	<p>A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits. Further information is available in the Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7).</p> <p>The peninsula suffers from extensive areas of historical waste disposal, contamination and old industrial structures. The area has been largely left, unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be 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</p>

					<p>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>The habitats present on the Swanscombe Peninsula are described in detail within ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p> <p>The results of invertebrate surveys carried out in 2015 and 2020 are contained within the Ecology Baseline Report (document ref 6.2.12.1).</p> <p>The impact of the resort on Priority Habitats, and potential mitigation measures are assessed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p>
			The remaining habitats are also likely to suffer from long-term disturbance as a result of visitor numbers, lighting at night, noise, infrastructure and changes to	N	<p>LRCH is committed to net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Retained habitat will be enhanced and managed in the</p>

			the Project Site's habitat resources.			<p>long term to ensure biodiversity commitments are met.</p> <p>The management strategy and responsibilities are defined in the landscape and ecology documents accompanying the application.</p> <p>Detail is available in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (doc ref 6.2.12.2)</p> <p>The impact of the resort on remaining habitats is assessed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p>
			Concerns that the development could disturb the Swanscombe Marine Conservation Zone, designated in 2019 for the Tentacled lagoon worm (<i>Alkmaria romijni</i>) which thrives in the intertidal habitat of the Thames where London Resort intends to create ferry infrastructure.		N	<p>The impact of the resort on the Marine Conservation Zone is assessed in the Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (document ref 6.2.13.8).</p>
			It isn't just invertebrates that would suffer; Swanscombe supports populations of the Red listed Nightingale amongst its diverse breeding bird assemblages, while in winter it		N	<p>LRCH is committed to net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Retained habitat will be enhanced and managed in the</p>

			<p>supports impressive populations of Redshank and Lapwing. Recent surveys have also identified strong populations of Common lizards, the presence of otters and a number of nationally scarce plant species.</p>			<p>long term to ensure biodiversity commitments are met.</p> <p>The management strategy and responsibilities are defined in the landscape and ecology documents accompanying the application.</p> <p>Detail is available in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (doc ref 6.2.12.2)</p> <p>The impact of the resort on Protected species is assessed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p>
			<p>The UK government's self-assessment said it failed on two-thirds of targets (14 out of 20) agreed at the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in Nagoya, Japan, in 2010. Given the government has failed to successfully deliver on targets set-out over 10 years ago, how can we be sure the proposals set out by the London Resort developers will be honoured and the land will remain protected for years to come?</p> <p>Legally binding commitments would be required to ensure the</p>		N	<p>The DCO means that comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will then be in place, which includes habitats requirements, noise, air quality and visual impacts, which LRCH must adhere to.</p>

			relevant marshes are ring-fenced indefinitely and not be overridden in the future by any park expansion plans.			
			Concerns regarding the range of schemes that could be classed as NSIPs being expanded late in 2013 with this project being conveniently being given NSIP status in May 2014. Not been able to identify any other similar projects being given this status to date.		N	This is a unique project and not likely to be replicated elsewhere in the UK anytime soon, hence the inclusion as an NSIP.

	Support for the sustainable proposals	62	<p>62 respondents expressed support for the Resort's sustainable proposals.</p> <p>Comments included a sustainable focus would increase visitor numbers and enjoyment, boost tourism and could inspire others.</p> <p>The use of sustainable technologies and design methods was applauded.</p>	#00002714 #00002715 #00002724 #00002783 #00002803 #00002808 #00002857 #00002872 #00002874 #00002878 #00002883 #00002887 #00002895 #00002910 #00002918 #00002919 #00002920 #00002937 #00002941 #00002955 #00002996 #00002997 #00003004 #00003029 #00003089 #00003127 #00003139 #00003140 #00003154 #00003155 #00003162 #00003166 #00003169 #00003186 #00003215 #00003223	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
--	---------------------------------------	----	---	--	---	--

				#00003233 #00003236 #00003250 #00003337 #00003376 #00003379 #00003394 #00003406 #00003446 #00003525 #00003574 #00003583 #00003622 #00003623 #00004688 #00004713 #00004797 #00004946 #00004948 #00004985 #00004995 #00005042 #00005047 #00005178 #00005231 #00005258		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	General concern about the sustainable proposals	33	<p>33 respondents expressed concern that the Resort will not be sustainable.</p> <p>Comments questioned viability requested more information or stated they wanted to see the plans going further.</p> <p>Others expressed concern about how the Resort’s sustainability commitments, included whether they were realistic and if they could be guaranteed.</p>	#00002751 #00002802 #00002811 #00002866 #00002874 #00002930 #00002990 #00003089 #00003185 #00003219 #00003233 #00003255 #00003288 #00003305 #00003306 #00003319 #00003331 #00003343 #00003441 #00003534 #00004698 #00004780 #00004789 #00004813 #00004984 #00004985 #00005048 #00005054 #00005168 #00005193 #00005281 #00006262 #00006264	N	<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 ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20) and information about the approach to sustainable</p>
--	---	----	---	---	---	--

						<p>transport is included in ES Chapter 9 Land Transport (document ref 6.1.9) and ES Chapter 10 River Transport (document ref 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>A DCO, if approved, means that comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will then be in place. This includes noise, air quality and visuals impact, which LRCH must adhere to.</p>
	Support for sustainable construction practices	3	3 respondents expressed support for the use of river, rail and non-road transport when moving construction materials.	#00003171 #00003382 #00005238	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

	<p>Concern about whether construction practices are sustainable</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>7 respondents questioned if the Resort’s construction practices would be sustainable.</p> <p>Concern was raised about the impact of construction on the local natural area; others asked to see more information and that contractors should be employed on the basis of their environmental credentials.</p>	<p>#00002844 #00003156 #00004675 #00004809 #00004930 #00005178 #00005193</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The challenges of sustainable development are well recognised and the project is committed to achieving this. Sustainability encompasses a variety of topics, please refer to the Outline Sustainability Strategy (document ref 7.7) for more information.</p> <p>The Outline Sustainability Strategy considers both construction and operational phases of the Resort, including sustainable design and construction materials.</p> <p>LRHC has established an Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2) which identifies the approaches that will be followed to reduce the potential impacts of construction upon the environment.</p> <p>The location of the Resort has significant advantages to alleviate construction impacts. Firstly, the ability to organise materials at Tilbury and bring them to the Project Site by barge minimises lorries on the road network – in excess of 80% of materials will be transported by river. Secondly, utilising the</p>
--	---	----------	--	--	----------	--

						<p>river access allows construction compounds to be provided away from residential areas.</p> <p>The use of construction materials has also been considered in order to reduce embedded carbon and the environmental impacts of construction. The assessment of material usage within the proposed development is included within ES Chapter 19 Materials and Waste (document ref 6.1.19).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Sustainable materials in construction	11	<p>11 respondents suggested the use of sustainable materials in the construction of the Resort generally.</p> <p>Suggestions included the use of recycled materials for the creation of new public footpaths, the new access road and staff accommodation.</p> <p>Some questioned how sustainable construction materials would be used, especially if they cost more.</p>	<p>#00003143 #00003144 #00003209 #00003369 #00003389 #00004688 #00004706 #00004737 #00004833 #00004861 #00005269</p>	N	<p>LRHC has an overarching commitment to sustainable development. The assessment of material usage within the proposed development is included within ES Chapter 19 Materials and Waste (document ref 6.1.19).</p> <p>The Outline Sustainability Strategy (document ref 7.7) considers both construction and operational phases of the Resort, including ways in which the development can maximise sustainable design and construction materials.</p>
	Sustainable materials in operation	3	1 respondent expressed the staff accommodation should be sustainable.	#00003298	N	The staff accommodation will be considered, along with all other buildings, as part of the Outline Sustainability Strategy (document 7.7). Part of the rationale for development of staff accommodation is to reduce the need for transport movements for those employed at the Resort, thereby reducing environmental impacts.
			2 respondents supported the use of sustainable food stuffs and packaging during the operation of the Resort.	#00004670 #00005273	N	London Resort will not be operational for a number of years, as such it is too early to provide details about the foods available in on-site concessions and hotels.

						<p>However, an assessment of material usage within the proposed development is included within ES Chapter 19 Materials and Waste (document ref 6.1.19).</p> <p>The Outline Sustainability Strategy (document ref 7.7) also considers both construction and operational phases of the Resort, including sustainable design and construction materials.</p>
	Support for the proposals to combat climate change	16	3 respondents expressed support for the proposed plans to counteract climate change.	#00002910 #00003098 #00004678	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			1 respondent requested the use of planting as a means of tackling climate change.	#00003548	N	LRCH intends to operate London Resort on a net carbon neutral basis. A number of strategies will combine to realise this goal one of which could include tree planting. Further details of this approach is included in ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20) and the Sustainability Strategy (document ref 7.7). The approach to tree planting, including the intention to plant more trees than are removed, is also covered in the Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7)

			10 respondents commented that the Resort would have a negative impact on climate change.	#00003529 #00003600 #00003616 #00003622 #00004808 #00004824 #00004861 #00005043 #00005151 #00005166	N	LRCH intends to operate London Resort on a net carbon neutral basis. A number of strategies will combine to realise this goal one of which could include tree planting. Further details of this approach is included ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20) and the Sustainability Strategy (document ref 7.7).
			2 respondents commented on the need to consider tackling climate change when developing an environmental strategy.	#00003548 #00006271	N	The Energy Statement for the proposed development details the energy and emissions targets for the proposed development.
	Support for the Resort seeking to be carbon neutral	85	85 respondents expressed support for the Resort seeking to be carbon neutral. Comments included the adoption of carbon neutral policies at the Resort could be beneficial locally, regionally and nationwide; support for the enhancement of cycle and pedestrian routes and public transport as a means of reducing emissions.	#00002717 #00002733 #00002750 #00002758 #00002760 #00002763 #00002803 #00002808 #00002811 #00002813 #00002822 #00002827 #00002857 #00002878 #00002887 #00002895 #00002900 #00002903 #00002908	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

				#00002910 #00002911 #00002918 #00002937 #00002941 #00002955 #00002987 #00002996 #00003029 #00003041 #00003054 #00003058 #00003083 #00003094 #00003098 #00003099 #00003127 #00003140 #00003143 #00003156 #00003162 #00003171 #00003177 #00003188 #00003195 #00003197 #00003202 #00003207 #00003225 #00003229 #00003237 #00003251 #00003292 #00003310 #00003340 #00003345		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00003375 #00003380 #00003386 #00003389 #00003403 #00003405 #00003406 #00003439 #00003446 #00003544 #00003548 #00003567 #00003571 #00003583 #00003585 #00003594 #00003622 #00004670 #00004809 #00004833 #00004849 #00004854 #00004866 #00004943 #00004946 #00004948 #00005018 #00005042 #00005238 #00005258		
	Requests for more information on the carbon neutral / emissions proposals	8	8 respondents requested further details about the carbon neutral / emissions proposals.	#00003288 #00003296 #00003394 #00003395 #00003447 #00004984	N	The resort is aiming to achieve a net zero operational carbon target in line with the UKGBC framework, which is an industry standard approach.

				#00004985 #00005193		Further information about the approach to carbon and other emissions are available within within the ES Chapter 16 Air Quality (document ref 6.1.16) and ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20).
	Concern about the viability of the carbon neutral / emissions proposals	64	64 respondents questioned the viability of the carbon neutral / emissions proposals for the Resort. Comments included emissions related to rides, Resort traffic, construction, materials and the new access road.	#00002746 #00002758 #00002778 #00002866 #00002906 #00002911 #00002943 #00003089 #00003156 #00003167 #00003197 #00003224 #00003255 #00003269 #00003283 #00003288 #00003295 #00003306 #00003320 #00003320 #00003331 #00003338 #00003343 #00003344 #00003347 #00003384 #00003406	N	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 ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20) and information about the approach to sustainable transport is included in ES Chapter 9 Land Transport (document ref 6.1.9) and ES Chapter 10 River Transport (document ref 6.1.10).

				#00003421 #00003431 #00003474 #00003477 #00003585 #00003589 #00003600 #00003604 #00003616 #00004666 #00004669 #00004731 #00004748 #00004751 #00004793 #00004832 #00004861 #00004913 #00004928 #00004957 #00004966 #00005018 #00005027 #00005028 #00005054 #00005065 #00005101 #00005106 #00005142 #00005151 #00005168 #00005174 #00005190 #00005200 #00005269 #00006262	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.
--	--	--	--	--	---

				#00006272		
	Want to see more done/ carbon neutral proposals go further	8	8 respondents stated that the Resort should go further and seek to be carbon negative.	#00002750 #00002827 #00002900 #00003112 #00003389 #00004670 #00004943 #00005048	N	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. More detail can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	Carbon neutral targets and data	11	10 respondents suggested that net zero emissions from the Resort should be a commitment / measurable targets.	#00002811 #00003029 #00003389 #00003406 #00003434 #00003583 #00004670 #00004844 #00005044 #00005271	N	Further information about the overarching approach to climate change mitigation and carbon reduction in ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20). 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 A DCO, if approved, means that comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will then be in place. This includes noise, air quality and visuals

						impact, which LRCH must adhere to.
			1 respondent expressed concern about emissions data from the Resort being skewed.	#00004670	N	All survey data has been obtained by professional consultants as part of the planning process and is robust and reliable.
	Support for proposals regarding pollution/air quality	2	2 respondents expressed support for efforts to mitigate pollution from the Resort.	#00003339 #000028780 #0004797	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Concern about pollution/air quality	142	141 respondents expressed concern that the Resort would create pollution/impact air quality for local residents and areas. Comments included concern about methodology and impact on specific areas.	#00002746 #00002784 #00002910 #00002936 #00002948 #00002971 #00003000 #00003035 #00003060 #00003219 #00003221 #00003228 #00003231 #00003239 #00003249 #00003260 #00003295 #00003305 #00003306 #00003320 #00003331 #00003338 #00003339 #00003343 #00003358	N	In the development of proposals for London Resort LRCH has given careful consideration to issues and potential impacts in relation to air quality and emissions. The emissions from the proposed development and the proposed mitigation measures during construction and operation are outlined within the ES Chapter 16 Air Quality (document ref 6.1.16). Measures have also been identified to govern the construction phase of the project in the Outline Construction and Environment Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2), reducing

			#00003385 #00003392 #00003393 #00003414 #00003421 #00003422 #00003425 #00003431 #00003434 #00003461 #00003473 #00003474 #00003484 #00003497 #00003499 #00003501 #00003502 #00003546 #00003552 #00003569 #00003585 #00003592 #00003599 #00003600 #00003604 #00003619 #00003623 #00004631 #00004643 #00004657 #00004664 #00004666 #00004693 #00004713 #00004732 #00004751	Active Travel and Public Transport Strategies have been developed to facilitate more sustainable travel and a Travel Demand Management Plan incentivises this travel. These will play an important part in mitigating potential impacts from transport within the local area. More detail can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) also considers and addresses possible impacts on the health of local people, while addressing potential mitigation measures.
--	--	--	--	---

				#00004763 #00004768 #00004780 #00004784 #00004802 #00004808 #00004815 #00004819 #00004824 #00004829 #00004832 #00004844 #00004849 #00004851 #00004861 #00004873 #00004885 #00004895 #00004905 #00004911 #00004915 #00004945 #00004946 #00004965 #00004966 #00004984 #00004986 #00004994 #00004999 #00005013 #00005028 #00005032 #00005035 #00005036 #00005040 #00005049		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00005054 #00005063 #00005064 #00005065 #00005077 #00005088 #00005095 #00005106 #00005116 #00005123 #00005126 #00005128 #00005132 #00005136 #00005141 #00005149 #00005158 #00005159 #00005166 #00005173 #00005174 #00005178 #00005182 #00005198 #00005200 #00005227 #00005229 #00005230 #00005237 #00005253 #00005258 #00005260 #00005268 #00005269 #00005271 #00005274		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00005281 #00006261 #00006262 #00006269 #00006272 #00006279 #00003331 #00004778		
			1 respondent suggested a 'Pollution Control Plan'.	#00005097	N	
	Concern about the impact of construction on pollution / air quality	21	18 respondents expressed concern that the construction, and construction traffic, of would create pollution / impact air quality.	#00002866 #00003060 #00003331 #00003590 #00004664 #00004670 #00004713 #00004792 #00004849 #00004861 #00005028 #00005040 #00005116 #00005158 #00005178 #00005181 #00005200 #00005253	N	The construction of London Resort is being planned in order to be as sustainable as possible, within LRHC's overarching vision for the Resort. Measures that have been identified to reduce emissions and thereby impacts from construction traffic are included in the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2) and the Sustainability Strategy which governs both construction and operation (document ref 7.7)
			2 respondents questioned if emissions proposals include the construction of the Resort.	#00004957 #00005058	N	The emissions from the proposed development and the proposed mitigation measures during construction and operation are outlined within the ES Chapter 16 Air Quality (Chapter 16).
			1 respondent expressed concern that the emissions impact of the construction of the Resort will have a negative effect on the	#00004849	N	

			UK's national and international emissions targets.			
	Concern about current pollution levels	49	48 respondents expressed pre-existing dissatisfaction with current pollution levels in the local area, including Tilbury, Thurrock, Dartford, Kent, north-west Kent, Gravesham and Swanscombe.	#00002746 #00002910 #00003269 #00003383 #00003393 #00003402 #00003425 #00003455 #00003461 #00003474 #00003478 #00003501 #00003592 #00004635 #00004713 #00004768 #00004778 #00004780 #00004817 #00004832 #00004844 #00004851 #00004966 #00004993 #00005040 #00005057 #00005077 #00005106 #00005136 #00005145 #00005149 #00005155 #00005159 #00005164	N	LRHC has undertaken extensive research and evaluation to consider the appropriate location for London Resort. This baseline evaluation can be found in the ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4). It has also considered the underlying levels of emissions and potential impacts within the ES Chapter 16 Air Quality (document ref 6.1.16).

				#00005165 #00005166 #00005168 #00005173 #00005174 #00005177 #00005189 #00005229 #00005260 #00005268 #00005271 #00006264 #00006272 #00006279		
			1 respondent expressed concern that the Resort would result in increased electro-magnetic pollution.	#00003552	N	The impact and mitigation of EMF from the proposed development is deemed negligible and is assessed within ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8).
	Support for a transport strategy that reduces pollution	7	7 respondents expressed support for a transport strategy that reduces pollution. Comments included the positive promotion of public transport.	#00002813 #00003194 #00003577 #00004847 #00004849 #00004861 #00005101	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Concern about pollution from Resort traffic and river transport.	94	93 respondents expressed concern about pollution from Resort traffic and river transport. Comments included specific concerns regarding areas including Tilbury, Thurrock,	#00002746 #00002758 #00002943 #00002983 #00003035 #00003060 #00003221	N	In the development of proposals for London Resort LRHC has given careful consideration to issues and potential impacts in relation to air quality and emissions.

			<p>Dartford, Greenhithe, Swanscombe, Ebbsfleet Garden City, Kent, Dartford, cycle and pedestrian routes, and proximity to LTC.</p> <p>Some suggested a complete ban on cars; others expressed concern about pollution due to the proposed car park in Tilbury.</p>	<p>#00003231 #00003249 #00003258 #00003269 #00003295 #00003305 #00003317 #00003320 #00003327 #00003331 #00003338 #00003339 #00003340 #00003343 #00003392 #00003402 #00003425 #00003431 #00003474 #00003499 #00003523 #00003552 #00003585 #00003592 #00003619 #00004631 #00004645 #00004657 #00004666 #00004670 #00004713 #00004732 #00004748 #00004780 #00004784 #00004789</p>	<p>The emissions from the proposed development and the proposed mitigation measures during construction and operation are outlined within ES Chapter 16 Air Quality (document ref 6.1.16).</p> <p>Measures have also been identified to govern the construction phase of the project in the Outline Construction and Environment Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2)</p> <p>Active Travel and Public Transport Strategies have been developed to facilitate more sustainable travel and a Travel Demand Management Plan incentivises this travel. These will play an important part in reducing potential impacts from transport within the local area. More information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) also considers and addresses possibly impacts on the health of local people, while addressing potential mitigation measures. It finds that there may be some</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				#00004790 #00004797 #00004802 #00004808 #00004817 #00004819 #00004821 #00004824 #00004832 #00004849 #00004854 #00004894 #00004896 #00004986 #00004994 #00004999 #00005037 #00005038 #00005040 #00005042 #00005048 #00005054 #00005081 #00005106 #00005109 #00005116 #00005136 #00005142 #00005145 #00005149 #00005164 #00005165 #00005166 #00005177 #00005229 #00005230	<p>minor adverse effects during construction due to some temporary works and disruption. However, once operational, the long-term impact of the London Resort on open space, public rights of way and routes is expected to be positive and material. More information is contained in the Landscape Strategy (doc ref 6.2.11.7).</p> <p>The construction of London Resort is being planned in order to be as sustainable as possible, within LRHC's overarching vision for the Resort. Measures that have been identified to reduce emissions and thereby impacts from construction traffic are included in the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2) and the Sustainability Strategy which governs both construction and operation (document ref 7.7)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				#00005237 #00005248 #00005258 #00005260 #00005268 #00005269 #00005271 #00005274 #00006262 #00006263 #00006264 #00006271 #00006272 #00006280		
			1 respondent expressed concern about the negative impact of proposed post-Brexit lorry parks in the area on pollution.	#00005036	N	This is not within LRCH's remit.
	Pre-existing pollution from traffic	16	16 respondents expressed pre-existing dissatisfaction with pollution related to traffic in the area. Some comments mentioned existing air quality issues relating to Dartford Crossing traffic.	#00003139 #00003443 #00003474 #00003478 #00003585 #00003604 #00003623 #00004784 #00004913 #00004925 #00005106 #00005136 #00005173 #00005178 #00005234 #00006279	N	LRHC has undertaken extensive research and evaluation to consider the appropriate location for London Resort. This baseline evaluation can be found in the ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4). It has also considered the underlying levels of emissions and potential impacts within ES Chapter 16 Air Quality (document ref 6.1.16).

	Request for compensation	1	1 respondent questioned if LRCH would provide compensation to local people due to a perceived negative impact on air quality from the Resort.	#00003269	N	<p>In the development of proposals for London Resort, LRHC has given careful consideration to issues and potential impacts in relation to air quality and emissions.</p> <p>The emissions from the proposed development and the associated mitigation measures during construction and operation are outlined within the Air Quality chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.16).</p> <p>Measures have also been identified to govern the construction phase of the project in the Outline Construction and Environment Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2)</p> <p>Active Travel and Public Transport Strategies have been developed to facilitate more sustainable travel and a Travel Demand Management Plan incentivises this travel. These will play an important part in reducing potential impacts from transport within the local area. More information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
--	--------------------------	---	---	-----------	---	---

						<p>ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) also considers and addresses possibly impacts on the health of local people, while addressing potential mitigation measures.</p> <p>In bringing together the measures above, issues of air quality can be managed and mitigated to be at acceptable levels for local residents.</p>
	Support for proposals relating to noise mitigation	6	6 respondents expressed support for proposed measures to mitigate noise impact on local residents.	#00002919 #00003422 #00003529 #00003590 #00004674 #00004985	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Concern about impact from noise	148	114 respondents expressed general concerns about the impact of noise from the Resort. Comments included increased noise levels in local and wider areas, and the impact on residents both during construction and operation.	#00002758 #00002781 #00002847 #00002866 #00002919 #00002948 #00002971 #00003000 #00003035 #00003113 #00003114 #00003148 #00003231 #00003248 #00003295 #00003306 #00003320 #00003330	N	The noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development (including local residents) have been fully assessed and the results, along with any mitigation measures, are identified within ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (doc ref 6.1.15).

				#00003339 #00003363 #00003400 #00003408 #00003421 #00003431 #00003435 #00003448 #00003474 #00003484 #00003490 #00003502 #00003529 #00003552 #00003569 #00003585 #00003590 #00003600 #00003604 #00003618 #00003622 #00004636 #00004643 #00004657 #00004664 #00004666 #00004669 #00004673 #00004674 #00004675 #00004693 #00004713 #00004726 #00004768 #00004792 #00004802		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00004808 #00004815 #00004829 #00004832 #00004833 #00004844 #00004849 #00004861 #00004873 #00004895 #00004897 #00004898 #00004902 #00004905 #00004907 #00004920 #00004945 #00004946 #00004947 #00004948 #00004949 #00004965 #00004966 #00004980 #00004985 #00004999 #00005008 #00005032 #00005035 #00005037 #00005038 #00005040 #00005049 #00005054 #00005065 #00005081		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00005088 #00005095 #00005096 #00005106 #00005116 #00005120 #00005123 #00005126 #00005137 #00005158 #00005166 #00005173 #00005174 #00005178 #00005182 #00005230 #00005238 #00005253 #00005258 #00005268 #00005274 #00005281 #00006272 #00006285		
			1 respondent suggested the use of water features to mitigate noise impacts from the resort.	#00004797	N	
			14 respondents expressed concern about the impact of noise from Resort traffic and river transport on local residents and local areas.	#00002781 #00003474 #00003523 #00004673 #00004713 #00004902 #00004911 #00004915 #00004946	N	Potential noise and vibration impacts associated with Resort traffic and river transport have been fully assessed and the results, along with any mitigation measures, identified within ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (doc ref 6.1.15).

				#00004966 #00005081 #00005106 #00005230 #00005281		The impact of noise and vibration from the proposed development is also assessed within ES Chapter 8 Human Health (doc ref 6.1.8).
			15 respondents expressed concern about the impact of Resort noise on wildlife and habitats.	#00003035 #00003343 #00003431 #00003529 #00003600 #00003604 #00004790 #00004984 #00005081 #00005133 #00005158 #00005166 #00005241 #00005253 #00006285	N	
			4 respondent expressed concern about noise from entertainment within the Resort, including music and fireworks.	#00003619 #00004732 #00004907 #00005238	N	The noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development (including local residents) are assessed within ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (Chapter 15). With regard to fireworks, LRCH consider that these are not very environmentally friendly and we are looking at alternatives once the Resort is in operation. We are not planning on parades (as had been suggested in our 2015

						consultation) and there will not be nightclubs.
	Support for water proposals	4	4 respondents expressed support for the harvesting of rainwater.	#00002930 #00003339 #00003548 #00003209		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Concern regarding waste water	6	5 respondents expressed concern about the Resort's waste water.	#00003339 #00003143 #00003529 #00003623 #00004751	N	The assessment of waste water generation from the proposed development is assessed in ES Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk (document ref 6.1.17) and the accompanying Surface Water Drainage Strategy (doc ref 6.2.17.2).
			1 respondent suggested the use of waste water treatments when dealing with water runoff from the Resort into the local area.	#00005008	N	The drainage strategy incorporates sustainable drainage systems such as swales and wetland areas to ensure that run-off from the resort is cleaned prior to discharge. More information can be found in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy (doc ref 6.2.17.2).
	General concerns regarding water	10	10 respondents expressed general water-related concerns. Comments included concern about drainage, supply, pressure and pollution, and the impacts on wildlife and the climate.	#00003035 #00003143 #00003269 #00003473 #00003600 #00003623 #00004790 #00005028 #00005119 #00005230	N	LRCH is working closely with Thames Water and Southern Water to ensure water supply for the development can be provided sustainably and without impact on other local users. The impact of the proposed development in terms of water pollution, water supply and flooding are assessed in the

						<p>ES Chapter 17 Water resources and flood risk (document ref 6.1.17).</p> <p>The impact of the proposed development on climate change is assessed in ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20). The impact of the proposed development on birdlife is assessed in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p> <p>The Surface Water Drainage Strategy (document ref 6.2.17.2) incorporates sustainable drainage systems such as swales and wetland areas to ensure that run-off from the resort is cleaned prior to discharge.</p>
	General support regarding visual impacts	2	2 respondents commented they are reassured that potential issues with the visual impact for the Resort and light pollution will be addressed	#00003590 #00004849	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses
	Concern regarding visual impacts	30	4 respondents expressed concern about the visual impact of the Resort, including concern about large buildings and solar panels	#00002781 #00003000 #00004643 #00005088	N	The landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development at the Kent and Essex Project Sites is considered within ES Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual Effects (document ref 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 (document ref 6.2.11.7) and Landscape Masterplan (document ref 6.3.11.15) provide the details of mitigation measures.
			1 respondent expressed concern about not being able to see boats on the River from Tilbury due to the Resort.	#00003402	N	From time to time, there will be obstruction of views to the River Thames at Tilbury due to docked cruise ships at the International Cruise Terminal as is currently the case. Receptors can still observe boats travelling on the Thames via a public footpath from cruise terminal to the World's End Public House and Tilbury Fort.
			1 respondent expressed pre-existing dissatisfaction with the visual impact of lorries in Tilbury.	#00005227	N	Lorry movements associated with the Resort will be kept to a minimum through the use of river transport as set out in Chapter 10 of the ES (doc ref 6.1.10).
			23 respondents expressed concern about light pollution from the Resort; impact on residents and wildlife were	#00002758 #00003000 #00003431 #00003484	N	The Lighting Strategy (doc ref 7.9) ensures that lighting through construction to post completion of the Proposed

			specifically mentioned by some respondents.	#00003490 #00003529 #00003619 #00004643 #00004693 #00004732 #00004768 #00004873 #00004897 #00005035 #00005040 #00005081 #00005088 #00005095 #00005158 #00005241 #00005253 #00005258 #00005281		Development is in accordance with best practice industry guidance.
			1 respondent expressed concern about the visual impact of fireworks from the Resort.	#00004732	Y	Fireworks are not very environmentally friendly, and we are looking at alternatives once the Resort is in operation. We are not now planning on parades (as had been suggested in our 2015 consultation).
	Support regarding proposals for use of contaminated land	1	1 respondent was positive about the proposed net gain with regard to the use of a contaminated site.	#00004706	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Concern regarding construction on contaminated land.	2	2 respondents expressed concern that the construction of the Resort will create toxins from previous industry.	#00003338 #00003484	N	Much of the Kent Site has been previously used for waste disposal, both in licenced and historic landfills. The

						redevelopment proposals have taken this into account; the impact of the proposed development in terms of contamination is assessed in ES Chapter 18 Soils, Hydrology and Ground Conditions (document ref 6.1.18), and management strategies set out in the Contaminated Land Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.18.9).
Support regarding safety and security	4	4 respondents raised importance of safety and security measures.	#00002909 #00003339 #00003358 #00004719	N		LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
Concern regarding safety and security	54	31 respondents expressed concern that the Resort may result in increased crime and anti-social behaviour. Concern included criminals may make use of the riverside access routes and the potential rise in crime in local areas, which may require more police resource. Some respondents made suggestions to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour, such as CCTV, searching of visitors upon entry and high-quality dining and retail outlets onsite.	#00002988 #00003060 #00003214 #00003231 #00003235 #00003295 #00003306 #00003320 #00003330 #00003393 #00003424 #00003435 #00003441 #00003448 #00003473 #00003513 #00003525 #00003599	N		LRCH is committed to ensuring London Resort is safe and secure for all employees, visitors and for local communities. Safety and security are therefore very important to LRCH. More detail on proposals in this regard can be found in the Security Planning Report (document ref 7.8).

				#00004738 #00004763 #00004784 #00004844 #00004897 #00004911 #00004929 #00004948 #00005138 #00005155 #00005182 #00005198 #00005274		
			21 respondents commented on the importance of safety and security in and around the Resort.	#00002909 #00002937 #00002988 #00003045 #00003091 #00003207 #00003306 #00003339 #00003358 #00003405 #00003441 #00004657 #00004670 #00004688 #00004719 #00004794 #00004830 #00004895 #00004930 #00004958 #00005184	N	

			2 respondents commented on the impact of the Resort on emergency services and hospitals.	#00003306 #00004675	N	The London Resort would include an on-site health facility, catering to minor accidents and ailments. The Security Planning Report (document ref 7.8) outlines the ways in which the London Resort will mitigate against any major incidents. ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) considers the effect of the London Resort on healthcare services.
	Support regarding health impacts	13	13 respondents stated that the Resort may be beneficial for health and wellbeing, including mental health.	#00002813 #00002878 #00002887 #00003139 #00003273 #00003277 #00003345 #00003583 #00004670 #00004797 #00004830 #00004930 #00005265	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Concern regarding health impacts	35	30 respondents expressed concern that the Resort may have a negative impact on physical and mental health, in surrounding areas including Tilbury, Dartford, Greenhithe, Thurrock, Kent, Swanscombe, Ebbsfleet Garden City and Gravesham.	#00003221 #00003231 #00003327 #00003383 #00003402 #00003443 #00003497 #00003585 #00003600 #00003604 #00004768	N	Development and planning can play a role in the wider determinants of health and wellbeing. ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) considers the effects of the various environmental proposals on health of local residents, workers and visitors, providing the formal Health Impact Assessment of the proposals.

			<p>#00004829 #00004925 #00004966 #00005057 #00005106 #00005133 #00005136 #00005149 #00005158 #00005166 #00005173 #00005177 #00005184 #00005230 #00005248 #00005253 #00005271 #00005274 #00006279</p>		<p>This chapter relies upon other ES chapters (Chapters 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 of the ES) and the mitigation contained within them. The existing conditions both with regards to physical environment (e.g. pollution) and pre-existing health conditions of the population, as well as health priorities, are all summarised within that chapter.</p> <p>LRCH is committed to a net gain in biodiversity as a result of the development with habitat creation and enhancement included as part of a comprehensive strategy which considers the health and well-being benefits of Green Infrastructure. More information can be found in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (document ref 6.2.12.2).</p>
		<p>1 respondent expressed concern that poor working conditions may have a negative health impact on employees, including through binge drinking and teenage pregnancy.</p>	#00002990	N	<p>LRCH recognises that the London Resort will only be successful if they are good employers. LRCH is committed to being a model of employment, creating not just jobs, but careers. The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) demonstrates how LRCH is committed to helping develop skills, paying well and ensuring</p>

						that diversity and inclusion is at the heart of the employment strategy. The London Resort will not be successful if the workers are not happy and healthy. As such, the working conditions will be first class, thus minimising any potential for adverse health outcomes.
			4 respondents expressed concern that changes to open space may have a negative impact on health and well-being of local residents.	#00004752 #00004854 #00005028 #00005094	N	<p>ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) considers the health impact of changes in open space and access to open space as a result of the London Resort. It finds that there may be some minor adverse effects during construction due to some temporary works and disruption. However, once operational, the long-term impact of the London Resort on open space, public rights of way and routes is expected to be positive and material. More information is contained in the Landscape Strategy (doc ref 6.2.11.7).</p> <p>The development will open up more free-to-access, open natural space than at present with added benefits of public facilities and improved access.</p> <p>Increased open access to natural habitats and the Thames riverside as well as recreational</p>

						opportunities such as fitness, play and nature watching can have beneficial effects on the wellbeing of those who take advantage of it.
	Renewable energy sources	36	26 respondents expressed support for 100% renewable/ green / sustainable energy sources, including solar, wind, tidal, geothermal and onsite energy generation.	#00002813 #00002900 #00002919 #00002930 #00003035 #00003143 #00003143 #00003156 #00003162 #00003209 #00003254 #00003298 #00003339 #00003361 #00003537 #00003544 #00003548 #00003567 #00004701 #00004731 #00004738 #00004809 #00004854 #00005008 #00003298 #00004731	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. It is LRCH's intention that the energy needed to operate the London Resort will be generated where possible by optimised on-site low-carbon and renewable generating technologies such as solar panels and heat pumps, integrating storage and intelligently managing demand to deliver a dynamic energy system fit for the future. More information can be found in the Energy Strategy (doc ref 6.2.20.3).
			8 respondents commented on the Resort's energy supply and use. Comments included using local energy, 100% green energy,	#00002920 #00003156 #00003298 #00003343	N	LRCH has taken a robust approach to its green commitments. More information can be found in the Energy

			having a dedicated power supply, batteries and asking for more information.	#00003361 #00003537 #00004751 #00005200 #00006271		Strategy (document ref 6.2.20.3).
			1 respondent questioned if solar and wind technologies will be used as a means of achieving net zero emissions.	#00004687	N	Renewable technology is incorporated within the Energy Strategy for the Resort (document ref 6.2.20.3).
			1 respondent stated that solar powered light sources should be used on public access ways.	#00003143	N	Renewable technology is integrated into the Resort proposals. More information can be found in the Energy Strategy (document ref 6.2.20.3).
	Concern about the impact of the Resort on local utilities and the grid	5	5 respondents expressed concern about the impact of the Resort on local utilities and the grid.	#00003306 #00003143 #00003449 #00004789 #00005230	N	The potential impact of the Resort on local utilities and the energy network has been fully considered by LRCH. More information on this can be found in the Utilities Statement (document ref 7.6).
	Support for environmental management plans	6	6 respondents expressed support for a commitment by LRCH to maintain the enhanced natural sites/features going forward.	#00002789 #00002988 #00003231 #00003251 #00005018 #00005273	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Concern about for environmental management plans	13	6 respondents stated generally that management of the Project Site is important. Comments included concern that host local authorities may be required to fund the maintenance and security of the enhanced areas.	#00003005 #00004657 #00004713 #00004930 #00005047 #00005093	N	The Landscape Masterplan and Landscape Strategy sets out the enhancement and management of the marshland network across the Kent Project Site. LRCH will manage the Project Site over the longer term, with a management plan agreed with

			One commented that the provision of access routes through wildlife areas should be the responsibility of local authorities and the government.			local authority and appropriate nature conservation bodies. More details can be found in the Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3).
			2 respondents questioned how the Resort could expand in the future while also maintaining its environmental commitments.	#00003095 #00002943	N	There are no plans for the resort to expand beyond the footprint within the application.
			1 respondent stated that the Resort should not expand beyond what is currently proposed in order to create a 'natural boundary' around the Resort.	#00004985	N	LRCH recognises the value of the natural areas in creating a setting and sense of place to the resort and there are no plans for the resort to expand beyond the footprint within the application.
			2 respondents questioned if the Resort will follow through on its environmental proposals given the costs likely to be incurred	#00003386 #00003406	N	Environmental proposals are costed within the budget for the resort and are deliverable.
			1 respondent expressed support for the creation of a 'covenant' to ensure the maintenance of enhanced access routes and cycle ways.	#00003583	N	Matters such as this will be addressed in the long-term management plan for the Project Site.
			1 respondent stated that the wildlife is already currently well maintained by other organisations.	#00006264	N	Other than a management plan for Botany Marsh East, implemented by the current landowner, the Project Site is largely a dis-used brownfield area with no management for wildlife.
	Concerns regarding litter and waste	39	38 respondents expressed concerns about litter and waste from the Resort.	#00002878 #00002910 #00003089	N	The issue of waste management has been considered as part of the proposed development. An

			<p>Some were concerned about more litter and waste, including microplastics, in the surrounding area. Comments mentioned potential pollution in the river and impact on the environment.</p> <p>Respondents requested waste from the Resort is managed responsibly. Some questioned how the Resort plans to dispose of its waste given perceived pre-existing strain on local waste disposal facilities.</p>	#00003143 #00003229 #00003295 #00003306 #00003339 #00003441 #00003449 #00003473 #00003474 #00003490 #00003604 #00004670 #00004673 #00004713 #00004808 #00004815 #00004819 #00004854 #00004861 #00004873 #00004895 #00004994 #00005048 #00005065 #00005095 #00005116 #00005118 #00005120 #00005126 #00005135 #00005182 #00005200 #00005230 #00006280 #00003089	assessment of waste generation and any mitigation required is included within the ES Chapter 19 Materials and Waste (document ref 6.1.19).
--	--	--	--	---	--

			1 respondent requested the provision of bins along enhance pedestrian and cycle routes.	#00002948	N	The assessment of waste generation and locations for waste facilities are included in the Outline Operational Waste Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.19.1).
Concern about plastic / single use F&B and merchandise	11	11 respondents expressed concerns about single-use plastics, particularly related to food and beverage and merchandise. Comments included suggestions for F&B outlets in the resort using recyclable containers and minimal or no single-use plastics.	#00002758 #00003101 #00003156 #00003177 #00003185 #00004670 #00004738 #00004748 #00005047 #00005135 #00005273	N	The assessment of waste generation and aspirations for recycling targets and plastic usage are included in the Outline Operational Waste Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.19.1).	
Support for recycling on site	3	3 respondents expressed support for recycling on site at the Resort.	#00003177 #00003194 #00005008	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.	
Questions about recycling commitments	4	4 respondent questioned what commitments have been set to recycling and reusing waste from the Resort.	#00003344 #00003156 #00003144 #00003026	N	The assessment of waste generation and aspirations for recycling targets are included in the Outline Operational Waste Management Strategy (document ref 6.2.19.1).	
Concerns about flood risk	22	19 respondents expressed general concerns about flood risk. Concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that the Resort will increase flooding in the local area and result in higher tides and storm surges. 	#00003143 #00003288 #00003348 #00003421 #00003435 #00003461 #00003529 #00003585 #00003600	N	A comprehensive flood risk assessment has been undertaken and is included in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference 6.2.17.1). This considers flood risk to the proposed development and any potential increase in flooding to other areas, along with	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> that the development is in a floodplain and the local area already suffers from surface level flooding. some questioned if the Resort would increase the need for flood barriers in other parts of the Thames. 	#00003622 #00004824 #00004849 #00004861 #00004919 #00004930 #00004991 #00005137 #00005230 #00005258		appropriate mitigation measures. The impact of the proposed development in terms of carbon emissions has been assessed in ES Chapter 20 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change (document ref 6.1.20). The proposed development is protected through existing flood defences and does not form part of the floodplain.
			1 respondent expressed concern about the impact of enhanced pedestrian and cycle access routes on drainage and surface level flooding.	#00005230	N	Surface water drainage relating to the London Resort is considered in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy (document ref 6.2.17.2) submitted with the application.
			1 respondent suggested that the DCO should make clear who is responsible for managing flood defences relating to the Project Site.	#00005241	N	As per all flood defences, the riparian owner is responsible for maintenance and management of flood defences.
			1 respondent suggested that a Flood Risk Management Plan may be required should consider methods of protecting local strategic infrastructure.	#00005241	N	A resort specific flood management and evacuation plan will be developed at detailed design stage.
	Queries regarding flood assessments	1	1 respondent stated that any flood risk assessments should be undertaken in line with Government guidance and the UKCP18; the Resort flood risk assessment should factor in a	#00005241	N	A comprehensive flood risk assessment has been undertaken and is included in the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference 6.2.17.1). This considers flood risk to the

			timeline of one hundred years; and suggested that any existing flood defences should be raised to T2100 levels.			proposed development and any potential increase in flooding to other areas, along with appropriate mitigation measures.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Topic	Issue summary	Tally	Sub-issue (if relevant)	Change to application (y/n)	Regard had to response	
Cultural heritage		363				
	Recognises local history and its importance	113	108 respondents recognised local history or said it's important.	#00002724 #00002733 #00002741 #00002783 #00002794 #00002813 #00002826 #00002849 #00002906 #00003005 #00003017 #00003024 #00003041 #00003048 #00003058 #00003098 #00003099 #00003101 #00003114 #00003144 #00003188 #00003197 #00003207 #00003213 #00003225 #00003233 #00003237 #00003251	N	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.</p> <p>In order to properly address this level of interest, LRCH will be incorporating local history and creating cultural reference points within the London Resort.</p> <p>LRCH recognises that the Project Site lies in an area with significant cultural heritage interest.</p> <p>Heritage in all its forms, archaeological remains or standing buildings, tangible and non-tangible, is an important aspect of the project consideration, not simply from a planning requirement, but also as a desire to inform the proposals and ground the project within its host communities.</p> <p>Further detail is provided in ES Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document ref 6.1.14).</p>

				#00003252 #00003269 #00003270 #00003277 #00003292 #00003340 #00003345 #00003367 #00003369 #00003380 #00003386 #00003395 #00003399 #00003403 #00003405 #00003408 #00003424 #00003433 #00003435 #00003474 #00003525 #00003537 #00003544 #00003548 #00003571 #00003574 #00003577 #00003578 #00003589 #00003590 #00003594 #00003618 #00003619		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				#00003622 #00003623 #00004632 #00004646 #00004657 #00004660 #00004670 #00004674 #00004675 #00004679 #00004683 #00004687 #00004688 #00004706 #00004732 #00004780 #00004793 #00004797 #00004833 #00004850 #00004866 #00004877 #00004885 #00004919 #00004929 #00004930 #00004966 #00005031 #00005047 #00005054 #00005065 #00005076 #00005088		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				#00005090 #00005106 #00005112 #00005121 #00005123 #00005166 #00005200 #00005216 #00005234 #00005238 #00005265 #00005267 #00005273 #00006266		
			1 respondent specifically referenced the importance of Northfleet Harbour, and that LRCH support for the Northfleet Harbour Restoration Trust's plans to open up harbour would benefit the area.	#00002717	N	LRCH notes these responses, but Northfleet Harbour is outside the Order Limits.
			1 respondent said historic waterborne access and facilities are important.	#00005093	N	LRCH notes this response.
			1 respondent said more could be done to protect and showcase the heritage of the river.	#00004732	Y	The improved public footpaths and cycleways around the peninsula will improve accessibility to the River, enabling access for people wishing to view examples of heritage which exist along the River Thames. The new Ferry Terminals on both sides of the River Thames will also provide excellent opportunities to celebrate its heritage and importance as an arterial route.

			2 respondents specifically referenced the importance of Tilbury Fort, including concerns that it will be impacted by cars using the A1089.	#00003581 #00003305	N	The effects to the significance of Tilbury Fort through change within setting are considered within ES Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document ref 6.1.14) and the Built Heritage Statement (document ref 6.2.14.2).
	Preserving and showcasing local heritage is important	63	63 respondents said showcasing and preserving heritage is important.	#00002733 #00002743 #00002794 #00002826 #00002849 #00002941 #00003017 #00003024 #00003041 #00003048 #00003058 #00003098 #00003101 #00003114 #00003155 #00003188 #00003197 #00003207 #00003213 #00003224 #00003233 #00003237 #00003251 #00003252 #00003269	N	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.</p> <p>In order to properly address this level of interest, LRCH will be incorporating local history and creating cultural reference points within the London Resort.</p> <p>LRCH recognises that the Project Site lies in an area with significant cultural heritage interest.</p> <p>Heritage in all its forms, archaeological remains or standing buildings, tangible and non-tangible, is an important aspect of the project consideration, not simply from a planning requirement, but also as a desire to inform the proposals and ground the project within its host communities.</p> <p>Further detail is provided in ES Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document ref 6.1.14).</p>

				#00003270 #00003277 #00003339 #00003358 #00003367 #00003399 #00003405 #00003424 #00003431 #00003433 #00003510 #00003525 #00003530 #00003544 #00003574 #00003581 #00003590 #00003594 #00003623 #00004632 #00004646 #00004660 #00004670 #00004675 #00004687 #00004794 #00004825 #00004830 #00004866 #00004923 #00005054 #00005097 #00005152	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				#00005216 #00005234 #00005238 #00005241 #00005265		
	Mitigating impacts and retaining heritage is important	23	23 respondents said mitigating impacts and retaining heritage is important.	#00002941 #00003098 #00002943 #00003340 #00003024 #00003017 #00003005 #00003403 #00003386 #00003574 #00004674 #00003623 #00004797 #00004793 #00004991 #00004978 #00004966 #00004866 #00002924 #00002849 #00002826 #00003505 #00004675	N	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes this response.</p> <p>LRCH recognises that the Project site lies in an area with significant cultural heritage interest.</p> <p>Heritage in all its forms, archaeological remains or standing buildings, tangible and non-tangible, is an important aspect of the project consideration, not simply from a planning requirement, but also as a desire to inform the proposals and ground the project within its host communities.</p> <p>Further detail is provided in ES Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document ref 6.1.14).</p> <p>In addition, a Historic Environment Framework (HEF) (document ref 6.2.14.9) has been prepared for the management of the archaeological and heritage resource of the Project Site and proposals. This outlines methods for further assessment/evaluation and mitigation of the development proposals, where harm is unavoidable. Suggestions for heritage interpretation and public engagement are also included to enhance public value and benefit from engagement with the historic environment, to contribute to place-making and to provide information on the special archaeological and historic interest of the area. LRCH is committed to recognising the history and heritage of the area and acknowledge it within the design of the London Resort.</p>

	Cultural heritage is too important	11	11 respondents said heritage should not be impacted and avoiding development and retaining heritage would be preferred.	#00002943 #00003060 #00003414 #00005081 #00005054 #00004797 #00003343 #00004755 #00005234 #00005076 #00005065	N	<p>LRCH recognises the potential that any project of this scale has to harm archaeological remains through construction, and to the significance of heritage assets (from changes in setting). This potential has been considered from the earliest stages of the project, and LRCH has undertaken consultation with the statutory consultees (HE and NE, as well as KCC's archaeologist on behalf of the County and the districts and boroughs, and ECC for Thurrock and the County). Cultural Heritage is also one of the technical areas for which an Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken. The assessment has been supported by desk-based and field-based surveys to ensure appropriate consideration.</p> <p>An Historic Environment Framework (HEF) (document ref 6.2.14.9) has been prepared for the management of the archaeological and heritage resource of the Project Site and proposals. This outlines methods for further assessment/evaluation and mitigation of the development proposals, where harm is unavoidable. Suggestions for heritage interpretation and public engagement are also included to enhance public value and benefit from engagement with the historic environment, to contribute to place-making and to provide information on the special archaeological and historic interest of the area. LRCH is committed to recognising the history and heritage of the area and acknowledge it within the design of the London Resort.</p>
	Opposition to development	12	12 respondents used this space to reiterate opposition to development in general.	#00002816 #00003214 #00003099 #00003473	N	LRCH notes these responses.

				#00003435 #00003414 #00003393 #00004784 #00005190 #00005122 #00005120 #00005054		
	The importance of cultural heritage Cultural heritage is not important	10	10 respondents considered that heritage is not important or not existent.	#00002953 #00003350 #00003304 #00003268 #00003214 #00003421 #00003583 #00004962 #00004813 #00004751	N	LRHC notes these responses. However, the Project Site lies in an area with significant cultural heritage interest. Heritage in all its forms, archaeological remains or standing buildings, tangible and non-tangible, is an important aspect of the project consideration, not simply from a planning requirement, but also as a desire to inform the proposals and ground the project within its host communities. Further detail is provided in ES Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document ref 6.1.14).
	Praise for the proposals	38	21 respondents felt that heritage is recognised and well showcased in proposals.	#00002750 #00002827 #00002857 #00002997 #00003102 #00003143 #00003256 #00003286 #00003329 #00003331 #00003567		LRCH notes and welcome these responses.

				#00003571 #00003577 #00004713 #00004774 #00004797 #00004913 #00004985 #00004995 #00005093 #00005152		
			17 respondents considered that the impacts on heritage are being mitigated in the proposals.	#00002827 #00002763 #00002750 #00002717 #00003331 #00003329 #00003306 #00003155 #00003144 #00003102 #00003079 #00003544 #00003525 #00003577 #00004774 #00004995 #00005093	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
	Cultural Heritage will be impacted	38	38 respondents raised concerns that local heritage will be negatively impacted.	#00002746 #00002778 #00002948 #00003060 #00003202 #00003258	N	LRCH recognises that the Project Site lies in an area with significant cultural heritage interest. Significant consideration has been given to the role that LRCH can play in not only preserving but where possible enhancing and showcasing that heritage to a wider audience.

				#00003259 #00003295 #00003408 #00003431 #00003439 #00003440 #00003524 #00003567 #00003585 #00003604 #00004657 #00004751 #00004789 #00004829 #00004868 #00004873 #00004918 #00004929 #00004984 #00005028 #00005090 #00005109 #00005116 #00005121 #00005123 #00005141 #00005142 #00005151 #00005166 #00005241 #00005269 #00006262	LRCH is committed to recognising local heritage and mitigating impacts. ES Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document ref 6.1.14), and The Historic Environment Framework and Mitigation Strategy (document ref 6.2.14.9) contains further detail of options for heritage interpretation and dissemination of the results of investigations. This also includes details of options for assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains. As this is a staged process this is designed to evolve in order to take account of the results of investigations at each stage.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Heritage won't be showcased	10	7 respondents questioned whether heritage will be showcased and whether impacts on heritage will be mitigated.	#00003343 #00004657 #00005090 #00006272 #00004913 #00004850 #00006266	N	LRCH is committed to recognising local heritage and mitigating impacts. In order to properly address local interest, LRCH will be incorporating local history and creating cultural reference points within the London Resort. We are accommodating all feedback from consultation as part of this approach. ES Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document ref 6.1.14), and The Historic Environment Framework and Mitigation Strategy (document ref 6.2.14.9) contains further detail of options for heritage interpretation and dissemination of the results of investigations. This also includes details of options for assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains. As this is a staged process this is designed to evolve in order to take in account the results of investigations at each stage.
		2 respondents felt that the name implied that local history would be ignored in favour of London's history. 1 respondent stated that Area is not London.	#00004919 #00005112 #00003231	N	LRCH notes these responses. LRCH is considering a range of options through which the cultural heritage of the local area will be preserved and showcased and will continue to engage with local communities and interest groups on this and other topics areas. The results of archaeological investigations will be from areas within the Project Site.
Legal requirements around cultural heritage	1	1 respondent stated that the site should be protected by law – in	#00003005	N	LRCH notes this response.

			terms of showcasing heritage.			
Requests for more information	9	5 respondents requested more information on how heritage will be showcased.	#00003005 #00003422 #00003403 #00004675	N	The Historic Environment Framework and Mitigation Strategy (document ref 6.2.14.9) contains further detail of options for heritage interpretation and dissemination of the results of investigations. This also includes details of options for assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains. As this is a staged process this is designed to evolve in order to take account of the results of investigations at each stage.	
		4 respondents wanted more information on how impacts will be mitigated.	#00003447 #00003422 #00004713 #00005200	N		
Showcasing heritage	22	19 respondents suggested the Resort should include facilities and information to allow visitors to learn about heritage and to help local communities learn more about local heritage.	#00002943 #00002951 #00002808 #00002898 #00002822 #00002813 #00002741 #00003345 #00003395 #00003369 #00003548 #00003537 #00003589 #00003578 #00003571 #00004679 #00004833 #00004797 #00005057	Y	There are a range of options under consideration for enabling Resort visitors and the local community to learn about local heritage of the area both during construction and when the Resort is operational. Considerations include inviting groups (including schools) to the Visitor centre and on-site tours (where health and safety allows), sharing updates about ongoing excavations/what has been found – this could be through information boards/displays, talks, webinars and podcasts and other digital tools.	
		3 respondents felt that cultural heritage needs be	#00002990 #00002900	N	There are a range of options under consideration for enabling Resort visitors and the local community to learn	

			highlighted within the Resort.	#00004688		<p>about local heritage of the area when the Resort is operational.</p> <p>Considerations include a heritage walk or trail within the Resort with information boards highlighting specific areas/sites/periods of interest and perhaps linked to the wider environment or related heritage assets either side of the river. Digital tools are also under consideration, which would allow the local heritage of the area to be shared with a wide audience, and ongoing engagement with schools.</p>
	Engagement around cultural heritage	5	5 respondents referenced the importance of bringing together the right expertise. Suggestions included local heritage groups, local and national archaeologists, KCCs archaeology team, and experienced educators to work with the archaeologists.	#00003406 #00003619 #00005273 #00005207 #00005047 #00003005	N	LRCH has consulted with a range of organisations on this topic area and this will continue as we develop the detailed design. This has and will continue to include the heritage teams from Kent and Essex County Councils, Historic England and Natural England and archaeological (and other) educators and outreach personnel. LRCH will also engage with local communities and interest groups on a range of topic areas.
	Suggestions	8	1 respondent said showcasing local heritage will help convince local government.	#00003050	N	<p>LRCH notes this response.</p> <p>LRCH in working closely with local government and other organisations and taking their feedback and advice into consideration.</p>
			4 respondents said delivering modern infrastructure alongside	#00002987 #00002937 #00003256 #00003380	N	The London Resort seeks to make use of the existing landscape and heritage features wherever possible within the masterplan, celebrating its rich history and context on the River Thames.

			preserving heritage is important.			The London Resort will accommodate a wide variety of architectural styles both within and outside the payline.
			2 respondents said celebrating multi-cultural heritage and women is important.	#00002903 #00004988	N	Given the nature of the Proposed Development, there are a variety of opportunities and methods through which cultural heritage and diversity could be celebrated. This could include celebrating historic figures and events connected to the local area, including musicians, writers and other artists, and a variety of ways in which culturally significant events could be highlighted and showcased. LRCH will work with local community groups and others as we further progress these considerations.
			1 respondent said showcasing the story of Covid-19 is important.	#00004688	N	LRCH has noted this comment.

Topic	Issue summary	Tally	Sub-issue (if relevant)	User IDs	Change to application (y/n)	Regard had to response
Socio-economic benefits and impacts		530				
	Local benefits and impacts	249	<p>96 respondents believed that the Resort will bring benefits / to the surrounding areas, including providing the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic benefits, including provision of jobs, infrastructure, investment within the local community and further afield • Environmental benefits, including support for habitat creation and protection of species • Transport benefits, including improved transport links, infrastructure • Improved entertainment, amenities and facilities for local people. 	#00002714 #00002726 #00002731 #00002744 #00002778 #00002808 #00002813 #00002855 #00002888 #00002898 #00002910 #00002911 #00002939 #00002940 #00002997 #00003006 #00003026 #00003030 #00003038 #00003041 #00003058 #00003079 #00003088 #00003089 #00003102 #00003159 #00003166	N	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.</p> <p>London Resort will bring a significant range of benefits to the local, regional and national economy. This includes the creation of a significant number of direct and indirect jobs during construction and operation, investment in infrastructure and world class facilities, many of which will be accessible outside the payline.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the many ways in which locals would have the opportunity to benefit from London Resort.</p>

				#00003186 #00003193 #00003197 #00003225 #00003233 #00003237 #00003238 #00003251 #00003271 #00003273 #00003277 #00003281 #00003300 #00003301 #00003337 #00003340 #00003341 #00003344 #00003359 #00003367 #00003376 #00003385 #00003386 #00003399 #00003405 #00003406 #00003421 #00003433 #00003437 #00003525 #00003527 #00003532 #00003535		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				#00003542 #00003570 #00003571 #00003577 #00003588 #00003590 #00003601 #00004632 #00004633 #00004660 #00004673 #00004701 #00004705 #00004709 #00004731 #00004750 #00004762 #00004794 #00004799 #00004809 #00004830 #00004843 #00004901 #00004985 #00004992 #00004995 #00005008 #00005039 #00005096 #00005104 #00005121 #00005150 #00005166		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				#00005177 #00005231 #00005255		
			9 respondents expressed support for the Resort as it will improve facilities/infrastructure for local community.	#00003358 #00002939 #00002773 #00003131 #00004793 #00004794 #00003457 #00002816 #00002801	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the many ways in which locals would benefit from London Resort, including: thousands of direct and indirect jobs created during construction and operation, spending in the local area, the Resort acting as a catalyst for investment in the area, new infrastructure, green networks, supply chain opportunities and access to high-quality retail and entertainment outside the payline.
			10 respondents thought the Resort would bring some benefits but were concerned there may also be some adverse impacts.	#00003384 #00003228 #00003270 #00002866 #00002960 #00003517 #00005049 #00003330 #00004910 #00004731	N	LRCH has given careful consideration to ways in which it can maximise the positive socio-economic impacts of the project, while minimising potentially negative impacts. ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) consider both the negative and positive impacts of the regeneration associated with the London Resort. These conclude that the benefits in terms of creating new jobs, positively contributing towards reversing entrenched problems of low skills and deprivation, providing business opportunities to local firms, and local spending (among others) are expected to far outweigh adverse impacts.

			12 respondents stated there is not enough evidence that locals will benefit.	#00004908 #00005173 #00004979 #00005040 #00005174 #00005178 #00005184 #00003317 #00003619 #00003255 #00004908 #00005200	N	<p>LRHC has invested significant consideration into identifying ways that local people, as well as visitors will be able to benefit from the development of London Resort.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the many ways in which locals would benefit from London Resort, including: thousands of direct and indirect jobs created during construction and operation, spending in the local area, the Resort acting as a catalyst for investment in the area, new infrastructure, green networks, supply chain opportunities and access to high-quality retail and entertainment outside the payline.</p> <p>In addition, the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how the Applicant will maximise the number of local jobs during construction and once the Resort is operational. Where appropriate and possible, employment opportunities will be advertised to residents proactively for two weeks (via a jobs brokerage service) before being offered to a wider audience. The Employment and Skills taskforce has been set up with representative members from local authorities, local education institutions and community groups, to ensure that local knowledge and best practise can be built upon.</p>

		<p>42 respondents expressed that the Resort will not bring benefits/will have negative impacts, with some respondents citing multiple concerns.</p> <p>Comments included concerns about noise, pollution, parking, wildlife, public rights of way, impacts on social infrastructure, housing demand and local business, and increase in crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>#00005166 #00005088 #00004990 #00002988 #00004981 #00005155 #00003327 #00005237 #00003625 #00003585 #00004666 #00005071 #00003331 #00004946 #00005178 #00005174 #00003447 #00003343 #00003269 #00003600 #00003615 #00003442 #00004675 #00003569 #00004948 #00004905 #00005116 #00004657 #00004885 #00004994 #00002948 #00004732 #00004751</p>	N	<p>LRCH has given careful consideration to ways in which it can maximise the positive socio-economic impacts of the project, while minimising potentially negative impacts.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) consider both the negative and positive impacts of the regeneration associated with the London Resort. These conclude that the benefits in terms of creating new jobs, positively contributing towards reversing entrenched problems of low skills and deprivation, providing business opportunities to local firms, and local spending (among others) are expected to far outweigh adverse impacts.</p> <p>Specific impacts have been assessed, addressed and mitigations identified in the relevant chapters of the ES, including Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12), Noise and Vibration (document ref 6.1.15), Air Quality (document ref 6.1.16), Land Transport (document ref 6.1.9).</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				#00003392 #00004713 #00005043 #00003448 00005056 #00003402 #00004695 #00004867 #00004712		
			3 respondents stated that the project will have a negative impact on Ingress Park.	#00005178 #00004948 #00005038	N	
	Traffic		80 respondents expressed concern that problems will outweigh benefits due to additional traffic and pressure on the road network.	#00002781 #00003592 #00004675 #00004957 #00005269 #00003269 #00003392 #00002936 #00002911 #00004905 #00004948 #00005068 #00004984 #00004713 #00004990 #00003270 #00003099 #00003472 #00003453 #00003443	N	LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport, designed to relieve impacts on the road network. This includes investment in enhanced rail, river and road transport infrastructure. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken and is available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Traffic Flows (document ref 6.2.9.2) associated with the London Resort have been fully considered as part of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). As can be seen in this document, it is considered that most traffic generated by the scheme would be generally outside of the conventional network peak hours. However, there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks.

				#00003431 #00003400 #00003506 #00003569 #00004696 #00003619 #00003618 #00004962 #00004925 #00004922 #00004895 #00004802 #00003589 #00003442 #00003343 #00003231 #00003035 #00003441 #00003393 #00003604 #00004666 #00004915 #00004854 #00004737 #00005106 #00005054 #00005090 #00004998 #00003577 #00002906 #00002784 #00004949 #00004947	<p>To take account of these figures the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. In addition, the Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.</p> <p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p> <p>The Demand Management Plan and Ticketing Strategy will incentivise transport by active and sustainable modes.</p> <p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				#00006264 #00005166 #00003214 #00005077 #00003440 #00003546 #00005256 #00005116 #00005044 #00002919 #00002948 #00004644 #00003318 #00005063 #00002960 #00003389 #00004885 #00004803 #00004943 #00002866 #00003330 #00005047 #00006263 #00004994 #00004732 #00004751 #00003402 #00004867		
	Local economy	29	29 respondents said that the Resort will boost the local economy	#00002919 #00002810 #00005008 #00003042 #00003380	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. London Resort will bring a significant range of benefits to the local, regional and national economy. This includes the creation of a significant

				#00005280 #00003185 #00003140 #00002887 #00004793 #00002943 #00002822 #00002716 #00005103 #00003575 #00002724 #00004678 #00003570 #00003623 #00002813 #00003567 #00004797 #00002808 #00003281 #00004794 #00003475 #00004846 #00003031 #00005047		number of direct and indirect jobs during construction and operation, investment in infrastructure and world class facilities, many of which will be accessible outside the payline. ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the many ways in which locals would have the opportunity to benefit from London Resort.
	Investment	69	69 respondents commented the Proposal will have a positive multiplier effect on the local economy.	#00002943 #00002919 #00002808 #00002823 #00003197 #00003156 #00003154 #00002887	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. London Resort will bring a significant range of benefits to the local, regional and national economy. This includes the creation of a significant number of direct and indirect jobs during construction and operation, investment in

				#00005255 #00002832 #00002822 #00002810 #00002794 #00002763 #00002727 #00002717 #00003330 #00003141 #00003140 #00003131 #00003422 #00003558 #00003541 #00003535 #00003380 #00003601 #00003577 #00003575 #00003571 #00004687 #00004793 #00004762 #00005280 #00005152 #00005103 #00005039 #00005008 #00003567 #00002862 #00003280 #00003254	<p>infrastructure and world class facilities, many of which will be accessible outside the payline.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the many ways in which locals would have the opportunity to benefit from London Resort.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				#00003166 #00002910 #00002731 #00003038 #00003375 #00003572 #00004660 #00004995 #00003202 #00003532 #00003233 #00004843 #00003029 #00002762 #00005231 #00002883 #00006263 #00002716 #00004678 #00003570 #00003623 #00002813 #00004797 #00003281 #00004794 #00003475 #00004846 #00003031		
	Impacts of regeneration	46	46 respondents commented the project would be positive for the area and be a significant driver for growth/regeneration.	#00005029 #00005104 #00004762 #00004833 #00004797	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. London Resort will bring a significant range of benefits to the local, regional and national economy. This includes the creation of a significant

				#00004813 #00004646 #00003567 #00003578 #00003601 #00003030 #00003038 #00003141 #00003144 #00003250 #00003285 #00002763 #00002794 #00002808 #00002810 #00002813 #00002832 #00002888 #00002987 #00005039 #00005280 #00002717 #00002727 #00002724 #00004776 #00004678 #00003024 #00003273 #00003341 #00003532 #00003384 #00003570 #00003590	number of direct and indirect jobs during construction and operation, investment in infrastructure and world class facilities, many of which will be accessible outside the payline. ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the many ways in which locals would have the opportunity to benefit from London Resort. Further information about the impact of London Resort on economic regeneration is available in the Economic and Regeneration Statement (document ref 7.5).
--	--	--	--	---	--

				#00002714 #00003277 #00004794 #00004750 #00005162 #00004660 #00004799 #00003373		
	Tourism	41	41 respondents commented the London Resort will boost tourism / benefit the tourism industry.	#00002987 #00002919 #00002910 #00002888 #00002878 #00003038 #00003424 #00005070 #00005131 #00002943 #00002823 #00002794 #00002716 #00003197 #00004866 #00005152 #00002911 #00002909 #00003143 #00003289 #00003175 #00003154 #00003251 #00002955 #00005077	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. London Resort will bring a significant range of benefits to the local, regional and national economy. This includes the creation of a significant number of direct and indirect jobs during construction and operation, investment in infrastructure and world class facilities, many of which will be accessible outside the payline. ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the many ways in which locals would have the opportunity to benefit from London Resort. Further information on the impact that London Resort would have on Retail and Leisure can be found in the Retail and Leisure Impact Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9)

				#00002857 #00002813 #00003300 #00003031 #00003041 #00004866 #00003301 #00004644 #00002937 #00002997 #00002763 #00004985 #00003437 #00003404 #00004914		
		3	3 respondents commented that potential issues related to tourism can be successfully mitigated.	#00002919 #00002911 #00004866	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. Further information on the impact that London Resort would have on Retail and Leisure can be found in the Retail and Leisure Impact Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9)
		1	1 respondent said area does not need tourism as area already has thriving tourism and job opportunities from Bluewater.	#00004905	N	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) describes how there is significant demand for tourism and entertainment in the region and UK generally. The London Resort will be a unique global attraction and as such is expected to result in overall market growth, rather than displacing existing tourism.

						ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and the Economic and Regeneration Statement (document ref 7.5) find that the local area, and wider Thames Estuary, have pockets of deprivation and low skills and education attainment. The documents explain how - together with other investments in the area - the London Resort is an opportunity to provide local jobs and training, spending opportunities, stimulate business opportunities to local firms (including the growing creative sector) and be a catalyst to kick start growth in the area.
Visitor impact on local area	79	26 respondents were concerned that the local areas will become overpopulated; comments related to visitors and workers.	#00003400 #00003546 #00003569 #00003392 #00005063 #00003440 #00004948 #00005256 #00005122 #00005043 #00004998 #00004991 #00004979 #00002746 #00004803 #00004737 #00003389 #00004885 #00003255 #00003619	N	<p>The implications of the additional workers and visitors are considered in the ES (specifically Chapter 7 ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8)), which consider the social, economic and health implications. Overall, the assessments conclude that most of the impacts are not significant (in EIA terms). Where there are significant adverse implications mitigation measures are proposed. The benefits of the London Resort on the local area (providing job opportunities, spending, new leisure, improved green routes, improved skills etc) are expected to far outweigh any adverse impacts.</p> <p>Specific efforts are being undertaken regarding future employees, initially to recruit from the local area, but then to provide appropriate infrastructure and accommodation to support employees from elsewhere without placing an</p>	

				#00004644 #00002910 #00002906 #00002862 #00002810 #00004915		inappropriate burden on the local services. This approach is set out in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how the Applicant will maximise the number of local jobs during construction and once the Resort is operational.
			45 respondents expressed concern that local infrastructure, such as schools and medical services, may struggle to cope with increased pressure from the Resort	##00002746 #00002752 #00002778 #00002801 #00002866 #00003017 #00003060 #00003298 #00003317 #00003324 #00003340 #00003375 #00003386 #00003389 #00003440 #00003443 #00003447 #00003449 #00003453 #00003472 #00003473 #00003477 #00003506 #00003507 #00003530 #00003585	N	LRCH has considered the impact of the London Resort on social and infrastructure issues, identifying existing constraints and assessing the proposals against this future baseline. The implications of the additional workers and visitors are considered in the ES, specifically ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8), which consider the social, economic and health implications. LRCH has developed a comprehensive travel strategy, which includes new infrastructure and transport interchanges, to support sustainable modes of transport, and improved river connectivity, along with a dedicated new access road, in order to relieve impacts on the road network. Detail is set out in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) in the ES and supporting documentation. Proposals also include an improved network of pedestrian and cycle routes, improving connectivity within existing neighbourhoods and creating linkages with the network of green spaces and the

				#00003619 #00003622 #00004675 #00004737 #00004803 #00004867 #00004902 #00004911 #00004913 #00004935 #00004948 #00004978 #00005010 #00005044 #00005047 #00005116 #00005126 #00005273 #00005281		river. Detail is provided the Walking and Cycling Strategy.
			6 respondents commented that the Resort will bring more people into the area without improving key infrastructure.	#00002801 #00002746 #00003440 #00004675 #00005010 #00004994		
	Property prices	10	7 respondents thought there would be a negative impact on local property prices.	#00004803 #00004802 #00004994 #00004974 #00002971 #00003000 #00005072	N	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) considers the impact of the London Resort on the housing market. It considers the additional demand created by the visitors and workers to the area. The assessment finds that there would be additional demand in the area and whilst this would be mitigated to some extent by

			3 respondents thought there would be a positive impact on local property prices.	#00004802 #00003385 #00004709		provision of hotels and worker accommodation within the Resort, and by the likely development response in the local area, it conservatively assumes that the additional demand will exceed supply. The London Resort will make the area more attractive for investment and is likely to make new development more viable. The development response is likely to be a key factor on prices – if the response is greater, the impact on prices will be smaller. However, the extent to which there will be new development is uncertain. The ES chapter therefore assumes a reasonable worst case where prices increase to an extent.
	Facilities and amenities	3	2 respondents stated that facilities and amenities already exist within the area.	#00004908 #00005200	N	The London Resort will be the first of its kind in the UK. The UK is one of the most visited countries in the world but currently fails to provide an entertainment resort comparable with those found elsewhere in Europe, North America and across Asia. Information on the likely demand for the project, along with possible impacts on local facilities can be found in the ES Chapter 7 Land and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) along with the Retail and Leisure Impact Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9)
			1 respondent raised a concern that Bluewater may undercut LRCH on low rents for shops and restaurants.	#00003306	N	LRCH is confident that because of the unique mixture of attractions and ambition of the development, that the retail and leisure offering will be distinct from anything in the local area and

						<p>will therefore compliment rather than compete with what is available.</p> <p>Further Information on the likely demand for the project, along with possible impacts on local facilities can be found in the ES Chapter 7 Land and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) along with the Retail and Leisure Impact Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Topic	Issue Summary	Tally	Sub-issue if relevant	User IDs	Change to application (y/n)	Regard had to response
Benefits – jobs and skills		289				
	Improving the local economy and local employment	205	158 respondents supported the jobs and investment that the project could provide.	#00002716 #00002718 #00002731 #00002741 #00002743 #00002751 #00002767 #00002773 #00002803 #00002810 #00002813 #00002822 #00002823 #00002832 #00002849 #00002849 #00002857 #00002862 #00002887 #00002908 #00002909 #00002912 #00002919 #00002920 #00002932 #00002936 #00002940	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. Consideration of how economic opportunity can be maximised has been given and further information is included within The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7). Further information on the overall socio-economic opportunities or impacts to be created are included in ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Social-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7)

			#00002943 #00002948 #00002955 #00002966 #00002982 #00002986 #00002987 #00002988 #00002997 #00003005 #00003006 #00003025 #00003030 #00003031 #00003034 #00003038 #00003039 #00003041 #00003042 #00003043 #00003047 #00003050 #00003058 #00003079 #00003084 #00003101 #00003114 #00003141 #00003144 #00003154 #00003156 #00003175 #00003188		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			#00003195 #00003224 #00003229 #00003231 #00003256 #00003265 #00003277 #00003285 #00003286 #00003289 #00003296 #00003298 #00003300 #00003301 #00003318 #00003320 #00003335 #00003337 #00003339 #00003340 #00003350 #00003359 #00003366 #00003368 #00003375 #00003379 #00003384 #00003385 #00003405 #00003406 #00003410 #00003421 #00003422		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			#00003424		
			#00003437		
			#00003453		
			#00003466		
			#00003467		
			#00003473		
			#00003475		
			#00003503		
			#00003508		
			#00003523		
			#00003527		
			#00003535		
			#00003541		
			#00003558		
			#00003567		
			#00003578		
			#00003601		
			#00003615		
			#00003622		
			#00004633		
			#00004673		
			#00004683		
			#00004688		
			#00004705		
			#00004709		
			#00004710		
			#00004750		
			#00004757		
			#00004762		
			#00004793		
			#00004794		
			#00004797		
			#00004799		

			#00004830		
			#00004833		
			#00004846		
			#00004847		
			#00004850		
			#00004859		
			#00004866		
			#00004900		
			#00004914		
			#00004966		
			#00004985		
			#00004998		
			#00005005		
			#00005008		
			#00005042		
			#00005049		
			#00005059		
			#00005060		
			#00005077		
			#00005093		
			#00005103		
			#00005104		
			#00005119		
			#00005131		
			#00005224		
			#00005234		
			#00005238		
			#00005265		
			#00005278		
			#00006263		
			#00006266		
			#00006272		

			2 respondents commented the UK entertainment industry needs a boost like this.	#00003076 #00004833	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			1 respondent hoped that the project will help boost the theatrical industry.	#00004833	N	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides a breakdown of entertainment-related roles needed.
			27 respondents requested special consideration be made for local people when recruiting.	#00002849 #00002902 #00002912 #00002987 #00003026 #00003045 #00003304 #00003319 #00003322 #00003337 #00003406 #00003417 #00003520 #00003590 #00004674 #00004683 #00004684 #00004688 #00004732 #00004819 #00004825 #00004835 #00004843 #00004913 #00004923	N	<p>The London Resort has a long-term need to recruit from within the local community.</p> <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how the Applicant will maximise the number of local jobs during construction and once the Resort is operational. Where appropriate and possible, employment opportunities will be advertised to residents proactively for two weeks (via a jobs brokerage service) before being offered to a wider audience. The Employment and Skills taskforce has been set up with representative members from local authorities, local education institutions and community groups, to ensure that local knowledge and best practise can be built upon.</p> <p>A recruitment and staff training facility is proposed at the head of Swanscombe High Street and Pilgrims Way, close to and easily accessed by the surrounding communities.</p>

			#00004939 #00005047		
		6 respondents commented that with COVID-19 it would be good to have investment in jobs for local people.	#00002731 #00002918 #00002958 #00003101 #00003250 #00004663	N	<p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how the London Resort will invest in local people through job opportunities, training, providing apprenticeships, working with schools, colleges and universities, and committing to equal opportunities for all.</p> <p>This is not just about job opportunities, but long-term career development within the community, and we will be providing the London Resort Academy to accommodate the long-term training needs of London Resort staff, a significant investment in the local community. There will also be opportunities for local businesses to make a contribution towards the day-to-day needs of the London Resort and its employees. Many companies have already expressed an interest in being involved and The London Resort will make contact at the appropriate time to ensure that these opportunities are explored in a timely manner.</p>
		7 respondents queried why on-site employee accommodation was needed if the Resort was supposed to bring in jobs for local people.	#00002781 #00003167 #00003338 #00003592 #00004917 #00005256 #00005269	N	There is an aim to maximise the number of local jobs but inevitably, due to the scale of the workforce required on-site (over 17,000 by 2038), some workers will come from further afield. By providing accommodation for these workers, the on-site accommodation will reduce the pressure on the local housing market.
		4 respondents commented investment and jobs should not just be focused on the South East.	#00002856 #00003083 #00003331 #00004644	N	The development is located in the South East. ES Appendix 7.6 Attendance Technical Note (document ref 6.2.7.6) sets out the catchments and penetration rates for global theme parks. A key reason for choice of site for London Resort relates to accessibility to the widest possible catchment of potential visitors (both domestic residents and international tourists).

	Interest in employment or supplier opportunities	5	3 respondents enquired how people could get to work on the project.	#00002724 #00003058 #00005150	N	It is currently too early to advertise job opportunities. More information will be available as the plans evolve. LRCH is committed to advertising employment opportunities to local residents and ensuring that the workforce of London Resort is diverse and inclusive. More information can be found in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7).
			1 respondent enquired as to how their business can help supply the park.	#00003357	N	It is currently too early to advertise job and supplier opportunities. More information will be available as the plans evolve, but LRCH is committed to using local suppliers and recruiting locally.
			1 respondent enquired as to how they would be able to open a concession stand.	#00003048	N	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) outlines how the London Resort would work with the local supply chain to maximise the impact on local businesses.
	Opportunities for young people	10	9 respondents commented this is a good opportunity to create jobs for young people and help to train them / offer apprenticeships.	#00003101 #00003140 #00003226 #00003320 #00003395 #00003429 #00003460 #00004807 #00006266	N	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) outlines commitments to working with young people in schools, colleges and universities. It also outlines a commitment to apprenticeships and training. The London Resort will have a long-term need to recruit from within the local community. A recruitment and staff training facility is proposed at the head of Swanscombe High Street and Pilgrims Way, close to and easily accessed by the surrounding community.
			1 respondent suggested that London Resort should reach out to local schools to employ those with pre-existing language skills.	#00005047	N	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) summarises the commitments to training and working with local schools, colleges and universities. These will evolve as the plans continue to develop but there will be opportunities for local residents with language skills.
	Opportunities for minority sectors and older people	9	6 respondents requested jobs for BAME communities and	#00003235 #00004802 #00003444 #00004688	N	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains that one of London Resort's key employment objectives is to celebrate diversity and inclusion and ensure equal opportunity for all. LRCH will seek to support a community-based programme for

			disabled members of the public.	#00004713 #00005231		residents from disadvantaged backgrounds, aiming to reduce inequalities.
			2 respondents requested jobs for older members of the community.	#00002741 #00003537	N	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how the Resort will adopt a culture of learning and opportunities for advancement. The strategy also explains how the London Resort is committed to equal opportunities for all and LRCH's fully inclusive approach will reduce inequalities in access to employment. The Resort provides a range of job opportunities which will be accessible to all.
			1 respondent commented jobs are not enticing for those who have retired to this area.	#00003334	N	There will be benefits for local residents who are not working at the London Resort, including: improved access to Marshes, provision of accessible places and amenities for people to meet outside the pay line and improvements to local infrastructure. These are discussed in ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8).
	Concerns related to employment	38	6 respondents raised concern about the influx of employees, in particular those living on-site, and that the local infrastructure cannot provide for them.	#00002983 #00003170 #00003389 #00003431 #00003530 #00004957 #00005137	N	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) assesses the impact of the workers on the existing social infrastructure, with further detail about our employment and skills strategy is available in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7). The assessment of impacts on transport infrastructure are available in ES Appendix 9.1 Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 respondent expressed concern over where all the new workers come from and where will they live.	#00003431	N	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) summarises the commitments to training and working with local schools, colleges and universities. These will evolve as the plans continue to develop but there will be opportunities for local residents with language skills.

					ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) describes how the on-site worker accommodation will be high quality and affordable for workers.	
			1 respondent commented the lack of breakdown of jobs is concerning.	#00003306	N	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.
			2 respondents raised concern about job losses if Resort closes down.	#00003089 #00004913	N	The London Resort has no specified end date and is a permanent attraction that will evolve over time.
			4 respondents raised concern about only zero-hour contract jobs being available for local people post construction.	#00003507 #00002990 #00005190 #00003306	N	Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) 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.
			2 respondents asked that local people have jobs at all levels, not just the lowest paid.	#00004757 #00003622	N	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how there would be a diverse range of jobs from entry level roles to management roles and jobs in the knowledge economy. The strategy also focuses on the commitment to delivering careers and not just jobs, with all roles having the potential for progression. This is not just about job opportunities, but long-term career development within the community, and we will be providing the London Resort Academy to accommodate the long-term training needs of London Resort staff, a significant investment in the local community.
			1 respondent commented local people are not suited to theme park jobs.	#00004902	N	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how the Resort will adopt a culture of learning and opportunities for advancement. All workers will be appropriately trained, encouraged and supported to widen skills and develop professionally. The strategy also explains how the London Resort is

						committed to equal opportunities for all, and LRCH's fully inclusive approach will reduce inequalities in access to employment. The Resort provides a range of job opportunities which will be accessible to all.
			4 respondents queried whether the jobs would be worth the negative environmental and traffic related effects.	#00003497 #00003473 #00003421 #00003431	N	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) consider both the negative and positive impacts of the regeneration associated with the London Resort. Overall, it concludes that the benefits in terms of creating new jobs, providing business opportunities to local firms, and local spending (among others) are expected to far outweigh adverse impacts. As set out in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.
	Impact on business	18	11 respondents expressed concerns over how beneficial the Resort will be for employment in the local area. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing businesses may shut down existing jobs may be lost. 	#00003089 #00003167 #00003622 #00004868 #00004923 #00005061 #00005142 #00005151 #00005190 #00005224 #00005279	N	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) considers the direct and indirect effects of the London Resort on the labour market. It considers the loss of existing jobs onsite as well as the indirect and induced jobs supported by local companies due to the supply chain expenditure and additional worker and visitor expenditure in the area. The London Resort will create opportunities to stimulate and provide business opportunities for local firms (e.g., florists, hoteliers, security firms and catering etc) and also creative ones (entertainers, actors, designers, musicians, gamers etc). The Economic and Regeneration Statement (document ref 7.5) show that there would be a significant net increase in jobs. The existing site supports approximately 1,160 workers and the Resort would support over 17,000 direct jobs in 2038 at maturity. This does not include knock on effects due to additional income and supply chain purchases. The Statement shows that the Resort could support up to 48,000 direct, indirect and induced jobs by 2038.
			2 respondents were concerned about relocating existing businesses.	#00005142 #00005190	N	

			1 respondent was concerned the retail section would have a negative impact on Bluewater.	#00004928	N	The impact of the London Resort on Bluewater is considered in the Retail and Leisure Impact Assessment (document ref 6.2.7.9). The assessment concludes that the impact of the London Resort on Bluewater's convenience and comparison retail will be positive due to spending of the Resort's visitors and workers in the local area. The impact on the food and beverage floorspace could be slightly adverse but is not significant. The assessment is deliberately based on worst case assumptions which assume direct competition between the Bluewater and London Resort. In reality, no direct competition is envisaged. The offer provided at the London Resort is intended to be distinct from the existing offer at Bluewater and other centres, so it is not considered a competitor.
			3 respondents commented there was no benefit/negative impact on local businesses.	#00004666 #00004949 #00005256	N	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) notes how there would be a beneficial impact for local businesses, both in terms of additional worker and visitor spending in the local area and opportunities to be part of the supply chain for the London Resort. It presents evidence from Disneyland Paris (a similar scale Resort, in a similar location near a global city) shows that one job at Disneyland Paris results in three jobs elsewhere in France, many of which are local.
			1 respondent felt that the project should only be built by British companies.	#00003466		LRCH will need access to the best suppliers in the world, that are able to supply the right skills and expertise. More information can be found in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7).
	Employee accommodation	1	1 respondent commented homes for workers should be of a high standard and should be affordable for lower paid staff.	#00004720		ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) describes how the on-site worker accommodation will be high quality and affordable for workers.

Topic	Issue Summary	Tally	Sub-issue if relevant	User IDs	Change to application (y/n)	Regard had to response
Accessibility		348				
	Importance of accessibility and inclusivity	112	28 respondents stated that they felt the proposals are accessible and inclusive, and welcomed proposals and welcomed that LRCH are consulting on accessibility and inclusivity.	#00002717 #00002724 #00002754 #00002887 #00002951 #00003099 #00003113 #00003143 #00003156 #00003159 #00003188 #00003249 #00003254 #00003277 #00003345 #00003358 #00003389 #00003567 #00003572 #00003622 #00004762 #00004774 #00004913 #00004966 #00004995 #00004998 #00005077 #00005231	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			84 respondents wanted to see as much as possible to be accessible including toilets, walkways, rides, hotels and eateries, to	#00002750 #00002774 #00002808	N	The LRCH design approach to accessibility is to allow for as many guests as possible to experience every attraction, show, live entertainment and ride.

		<p>enable everyone to take advantage of what the Resort has to offer.</p> <p>Respondents also stated that this should be a standard approach everywhere.</p>	<p>#00002810 #00002813 #00002822 #00002826 #00002827 #00002857 #00002902 #00002903 #00002910 #00002911 #00002919 #00002920 #00002944 #00002988 #00002997 #00003035 #00003041 #00003048 #00003050 #00003070 #00003079 #00003098 #00003101 #00003114 #00003118 #00003140 #00003188 #00003207 #00003233 #00003251 #00003253 #00003254 #00003269 #00003270 #00003273 #00003292</p>	<p>Due to some limitations based on safety, driven by manufacturer and regulatory agency safety requirements, not all experiences can be made available to all guests. In these situations, the design team will strive to provide alternative or complimentary experiences that allow access to the stories and shows to the most people possible.</p> <p>The design team will follow best practice and consult with accessibility experts and engineers to find innovative and comprehensive solutions, including in the detailed design phases of transport infrastructure and other facilities.</p> <p>More information can be found in the Design and Access Statements (document ref 7.1) and the Design Codes (document ref 7.2).</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				#00003379 #00003399 #00003405 #00003408 #00003414 #00003429 #00003437 #00003443 #00003447 #00003473 #00003530 #00003574 #00003575 #00003577 #00003589 #00003590 #00003593 #00003594 #00003623 #00004660 #00004679 #00004683 #00004738 #00004751 #00004794 #00004797 #00004799 #00004813 #00004835 #00004854 #00004866 #00004883 #00004948 #00004984 #00005008 #00005031		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				#00005060 #00005070 #00005096 #00005109 #00005131 #00005174 #00005200 #00005216 #00005265		
Accessibility and inclusivity for all disabilities, including hidden disabilities and sensory impaired	15	<p>15 respondents referenced the importance of accessibility for all disabilities.</p> <p>Some specified wheelchair access for attractions and around the Resort, others specified that making a place accessible is more than making some wheelchair accessible.</p> <p>Some specially referenced hidden disabilities, those who are blind or visually impaired, deaf or hard of hearing, people with autism and other sensory disabilities.</p> <p>1 also raised that hidden disabilities can be hard to manage for parents, and the importance of staff training.</p>	#00002740 #00002844 #00002862 #00002887 #00003228 #00003304 #00003495 #00004706 #00004762 #00004793 #00004794 #00004830 #00004833 #00004835 #00004948	N	<p>Design and operational solutions will not only consider those barriers that form physical constraints but also barriers experienced by people who are Deaf, deafened or hard-of-hearing, people who are blind or partially sighted and people who are neurodivergent.</p> <p>LRCH's aim is to ensure that people can make effective, independent choices about how they use the London Resort without experiencing undue effort or separation.</p> <p>LRCH will ensure the provision of designated places, changing spaces and specified areas for guests with particular needs or requirements.</p> <p>Staff training will also play an important role in our proposals for accessibility and inclusivity. LRCH will ensure that staff in our guest relations teams receive appropriate training.</p> <p>More information can be found in the Design and Access Statement Parts 1 and 2 (document ref 7.1) and the Design Codes Parts 1 and 2 (document ref 7.2)</p>	
The importance of incorporating accessibility into	7	7 respondents stressed the importance of incorporating accessibility into the design. Comments included:	#00002908 #00002941 #00003590	N	Inclusivity is a key consideration and fundamental to the London Resort. Key inclusivity criteria have been written into the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) for the Resort to ensure they are integral	

	the design from the outset		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That accessibility should be built into the Resort as a cornerstone of the design, not added as an extra, a niche issue, or an afterthought. • That as a project of the 21st century, accessibility should be at the heart of all of planning. • As a new resort, LRCH has the opportunity to set this in place at the outset, putting it ahead of competitors who have to adjust over time. • That if done right, this is an opportunity to set new standards • That accessibility should naturally blend into any architecture. <p>Some respondents provided examples of what they considered good examples of accessible and quality design.</p>	<p>#00003114 #00004835</p> <p>#00003251 #00003623</p>		<p>to the design from the outset. Wherever possible, this should be invisible and a natural part of a cohesive concept for the London Resort as a whole.</p> <p>This approach has been applied to the masterplan as a whole and will continue to be an integral part of the Design Codes going forward.</p> <p>Accessibility and inclusivity is being factored in across all elements of design and operation including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport – getting to and from the London Resort • Facilities and amenities • Rides and attractions • Employment, skills and training <p>LRCH welcomes suggestions of what works well in other Resorts and will take these into consideration. LRCH is bringing together the right skills and expertise, working with our IP Partners and industry experts to create a unique, modern, innovative and accessible new entertainment destination.</p>
	Design	1	1 respondent felt that the design should not be secondary to accessibility, believing that design can be revised afterwards to include accessible features.	#00002828	N	
	Respondents stated that they have a disability	12	12 respondents generally welcomed and were encouraged by proposals.	#00002754 #00002887 #00002908	N	LRCH is committed to creating a development

	<p>or are the parent/carer/friend of someone with a disability, stating that comments are based on first-hand experiences in other theme parks and entertainment facilities.</p>		<p>Some expressed extreme disappointment based on experience of places that are not as accessible as they claim to be, reiterating the importance of getting this right, and delivering on what is promised.</p>	<p>#00002937 #00002941 #00002951 #00003099 #00003188 #00003249 #00003334 #00004835 #00005096</p>		<p>that is accessible and inclusive. Our aim is to ensure that people can make effective, independent choices about how they use the London Resort without experiencing undue effort or separation.</p> <p>Key inclusivity criteria have been written into the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) for the Resort to ensure they are integral to the design from the outset. Wherever possible, this should be invisible and a natural part of a cohesive concept for the London Resort as a whole.</p> <p>In terms of operational policy, sufficiently robust provision, criteria and practices will be established by the London Resort and our partners – this will include the development of active management plans.</p> <p>Consultation and engagement are essential means of informing the design and ultimately the management and operation of the London Resort.</p> <p>LRCH will continue to consult with and involve disabled people, to help guide design development and our operational policies. This will include local and national stakeholder groups, but we are also in the process of establishing an accessibility forum.</p>
<p>Rides and attractions and amenities</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>8 respondents stated they would like a range of rides, attractions and amenities for all age groups, with some specifying toddlers and pre-schoolers and others specifying older people.</p> <p>1 requested consideration for older people who are less physically able or with cognitive ageing such as dementia.</p> <p>2 felt that the Resort would not appeal to or interest older people.</p>	<p>#00003098 #00002862 #00003185 #00003320 #00003447 #00003529 #00004861 #00005065</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The London Resort will be both family friendly and attractive to visitors of all ages, providing something for everybody to enjoy. This is central to the success of the Resort.</p> <p>LRCH is committed to creating a development that is accessible and inclusive. Our aim is to ensure that people can make effective, independent choices about how they use the London Resort without experiencing undue effort or separation.</p> <p>Key inclusivity criteria have been written into the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) for the Resort to ensure they are integral to the design from the outset. Wherever possible, this should be invisible</p>	

					and a natural part of a cohesive concept for the London Resort as a whole.	
	Insufficient information	27	27 respondents felt that they needed more information or expressed some scepticism that LRCH would deliver what is being promised, given the level of detail available during consultation.	#00002811 #00002923 #00003005 #00003094 #00003202 #00003219 #00003252 #00003288 #00003334 #00003367 #00003386 #00003422 #00003529 #00003537 #00004657 #00004675 #00004732 #00004748 #00004782 #00004802 #00004984 #00004985 #00004990 #00005121 #00005141 #00005184 #00005273	N	LRCH is committed to creating a development that is accessible and inclusive. Key inclusivity criteria have been written into the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) for the Resort to ensure they are integral to the design from the outset. Wherever possible, this should be invisible and a natural part of a cohesive concept for the London Resort as a whole. LRCH believes a sufficient level of detail was provided for consultation. LRCH has designed the Resort to be flexible, in order to ensure that emerging technologies and innovations can be included, while enabling LRCH to respond to changes in demand. Specific details regarding attractions or services will be developed and communicated in due course. Further information about detailed designs and operational management will be made available at later stages of development, and in consultation with key stakeholders.
	Scepticism	7	7 respondents expressed scepticism over the Resort's accessibility. Comments included: 2 respondents were supportive in principle of the aims, but expressed scepticism that	#00005065 #00002746	N	LRCH is committed to creating a development that is accessible and inclusive. Accessibility and inclusivity are being factored in across all elements of design and operation of the Resort.

		<p>proposals will be delivered, stating that few places deliver on what they promise.</p> <p>3 respondents were more sceptical overall, expressing the view that what is being proposed is the law anyway, that LRCH isn't proposing anything above the minimum, or that it was a tick box exercise.</p> <p>1 respondent stated that DDA and related legislation is ongoing therefore compliance will always be a challenge.</p> <p>1 respondent felt they needed more info in order to comment, 1 felt that without detail and measurable benefits identified it is more of a political statement.</p>	<p>#00004868 #00004985 #00003440</p> <p>#00005625</p> <p>#00003439</p>		<p>The LRCH design approach to accessibility is to allow for as many guests as possible to experience every attraction, show, live entertainment and ride.</p> <p>The design team will follow best practices, meeting and consulting with accessibility experts, engineers and consultants to find innovative and comprehensive solutions to address concerns.</p> <p>LRCH believes that the approach to accessibility surpasses legal requirements and is instead seeking to operate as an exemplar attraction.</p>
Lack of accessibility	3	3 respondents felt that proposals are not accessible and inclusive.	<p>#00002846 #00004861 #00005013</p>	N	<p>LRCH is committed to creating a development that is accessible and inclusive.</p> <p>Accessibility and inclusivity are being factored in across all elements of design and operation of the Resort.</p> <p>Key inclusivity criteria have been written into the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) for the Resort to ensure they are integral to the design from the outset. Wherever possible, this should be invisible and a natural part of a cohesive concept for the London Resort as a whole.</p>
Reduced accessibility	8	<p>8 respondents commented that the Resort will make the area less accessible. Comments included:</p> <p>Less access to the marshes and public walkways.</p>	<p>#00004815 #00004808 #00005106 #00004755 #00003600 #00006264</p>	N	<p>Accessibility and inclusivity are being factored in across all elements of design and operation of the Resort. LRCH is committed to creating a development that is accessible and inclusive.</p>

		<p>No thought given to the exclusion of the wishes of people living locally, and that their lives will be disrupted for years.</p> <p>One stated that they live close to the site and are autistic and feel they will need to move because of the noise.</p>	<p>#00005071 #00004902</p>		<p>Careful consideration has been given to potential impacts of the proposed development, with appropriate mitigations identified wherever possible.</p> <p>Possible construction impacts have been identified and addressed within the ES Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (document ref 6.2.3.2).</p> <p>Issues of noise have been addressed through the outline Masterplan design of the Resort, with efforts undertaken to locate attractions with the potential to cause noise or other disruption in locations away from existing or planned housing.</p> <p>Overarching consideration of noise and mitigations are addressed in ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (document ref 6.1.15) as well as assessments of the noise and vibration during construction and operation in Appendix 15.3 (document ref 6.2.15.3), Appendix 15.4 (document ref 6.2.15.4) and Appendix 15.5 (document ref 6.2.15.5).</p> <p>LRCH recognises that not all in the community are supportive of the proposals. However, we will continue to work with everybody to address concerns and operate as a good neighbour.</p>
Opposed to development	9	9 respondents used this space to reiterate their opposition to the Resort.	<p>#00002800 #00003297 #00003343 #00003431 #00004849 #00005028 #00005081 #00005090 #00005190</p>	N	<p>LRCH recognises that not all in the community are supportive of the proposals. However, we will continue to work with everybody to address concerns and operate as a good neighbour.</p>

<p>Access to rides and attractions for disabled guests is important.</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>11 respondents specified access to rides and attractions for disabled guests is important. Comments included:</p> <p>Wheelchair accessibility, and others specified access for all disabilities, including hidden disabilities.</p> <p>Some requested that all rides and all attractions be accessible for all disabilities, including wheelchair users.</p> <p>One requested the facility for a wheelchair user to stay in their chair whilst on a ride, stating this makes it more accessible for the wheelchair user and eases the pressure on their carers or assistants having to manually transfer someone.</p> <p>One suggested dark rides, and creating alternate experiences for disabled guests, including ensuring ways for deaf or blind people to still experience the storyline via BSL or audio description.</p>	<p>#00002862 #00002739 #00002754 #00003114 #00004835 #00003304 #00005070 #00003253 #00004762 #00005008 #00002941</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Where possible, rides and attractions will be designed in accordance with the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) to accommodate disabled guests. It should be noted that ride access will be driven by manufacturer and regulatory agency safety requirements.</p> <p>The general approach taken is that someone in a wheelchair must be able to transfer themselves in order to access fast rides. There are specific biomechanical reasons behind this based in passenger safety.</p> <p>Slow or passive rides typically can accommodate a wheelchair or ECV. The Resort will feature a wide variety of rides and the latest in technology.</p> <p>We will also design rides, queues and spaces to reasonably accommodate the width and turning radius of wheelchairs and electric mobility scooters.</p> <p>We will design Shows, Theatres and Cinema locations to accommodate guests using mobility devices, as well as restrooms and comfort stations. All Park Circulation Transport will be accessible.</p> <p>For those who are hearing impaired, subtitles could be provided on monitors / displays. Some parks offer a portable electronic display device that provide “real time” narration in text form. This works on some attractions but not coasters. We will ensure that a number of staff in our guest relations teams are taught sign language. Live entertainment and characters can be also taught sign language to support interaction.</p>
<p>Disabled access and inclusivity</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>3 respondents requested disabled access / fast passes for rides and attractions to minimise queueing, with examples provided</p>	<p>#00002739 #00003361 #00003095</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>LRCH will be implementing an access pass system for disabled guests and their carers.</p>

	<p>of other theme parks systems who utilise these successfully.</p> <p>1 also suggested a virtual queuing system, similar to the Disney Access Card</p> <p>1 also requested that system is robust so that it can't be abused.</p>			
	<p>5 respondents commented on families and carers, with requests for access schemes to be flexible, allowing families to stay together when having days out with their disabled family member, rather than limiting the amount of people allowed to access the facilities with the disabled person.</p>	<p>#00002727 #00004794 #00002740 #00004866 #00002754</p>	N	<p>LRCH notes this comment and will take it into consideration when developing its access pass scheme.</p>
24	<p>8 respondents requested quiet areas, with less external stimulus and a calming zone, which are autistic friendly, and for other sensory and mental health difficulties. 1 also requested quiet times and events (such as shows) for autistic people or people with sensory issues such as noise.</p>	<p>#00002878 #00002910 #00002918 #00002987 #00003070 #00003237 #00004866 #00005152</p>	N	<p>LRCH welcomes these responses and suggestions.</p> <p>Options under consideration are to run shows or attractions at certain times, where the effects that are known to trigger conditions are reduced or completely removed. For example, at set times, shows would run without the strobes/pyrotechnics.</p> <p>Guests can be provided with material (guide maps / signage / website) signposting shows, experiences and facilities that are more appropriate for those who have specific requirements.</p> <p>The provision of 'quiet spaces' will allow guests and their families to retire to designated safe and quiet spaces within the park.</p> <p>Staff training will also play a significant part in ensuring that the Resort provides a safe and welcoming environment, and robust</p>

					staff training programmes will be established at an appropriate time and reviewed in consultation with stakeholders.	
			6 respondents commented on considerations for those who are hearing and visually impaired. Suggestions included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signage, audio guides and hearing loops. 1 stated that deaf visitors' needs could be better addressed in proposals. They also stated that staff training is essential, to ensure they understand what being hearing accessible really means. • Signs in braille and large fonts. • Easy open doors and automatic doors • Sensory garden and other sensory areas. 	#00004762 #00003339 #00002937 #00002822 #00003202 #00003334	N	LRCH welcomes these suggestions and are taking them into consideration as we develop our detailed design and operational policy. For guests who are visually impaired, a portable narration unit could be offered, which would have narration throughout the park and narrates each ride, telling guests what is happening scene by scene. Additionally, menus, park maps and signage can be presented in braille. Signage strategy will be looked at in the detailed design stage. For those who are hearing impaired, subtitles could be provided on monitors / displays. Some parks offer a portable electronic display device that provide "real time" narration in text form. This works on some attractions but not coasters. We will ensure that a number of staff in our guest relations teams are taught sign language. Live entertainment and characters can be also taught sign language to support interaction. Easy open and automatic doors will be considered within buildings main access routes at detail design stage in accordance with the Design Codes (document ref 7.2).
			4 respondents requested sufficient quiet areas in general and sufficient seating for elderly and disabled people, with one stating that insufficient seating can be the biggest barrier to someone not visiting places.	#00003339 #00002822 #00002944 #00003294	N	A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings. Furthermore, there will be seating, rest areas and designated 'quiet spaces' across the resort.

			1 respondent requested that there is sufficient space for wide enough access inside eating areas for wheelchairs, mobility scooters and pushchairs.	#00002727	N	Key inclusivity criteria have been written into the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) for the Resort to ensure they are integral to the design from the outset. Wherever possible, this should be invisible and a natural part of a cohesive concept for the London Resort as a whole. As a result, restaurants will be designed to be wheelchair accessible.
			5 respondents requested affordable and inclusive food options. Specific requests included halal, kosher, vegetarian, vegan dishes and non-alcoholic beverages.	#00002964 #00003035 #00003085 #00003344 #00004776 #00005070	N	Guests will be offered a range of potential restaurant and hotel options to suit different tastes, budgets and to address requirements of a range of different cultural or religious groups.
Cultural diversity	23	13 respondents stated that the Resort needs to be inclusive and accessible for all backgrounds. Specific comments included: Celebrating cultural diversity, women, and reflecting the local area is important to make people feel welcome. Requests for holding events and celebrations for different religious holidays - specific references to cultural events covering all faiths such as Christmas, Easter, Diwali - also Pride, and a query about what inclusion will be made to showcase LGBTQ community. Suggestion to look to obtaining property rights for rides and attractions that represent minority and socially excluded groups. Another felt that many of these types of investments target a	#00002903 #00003344 #00003437 #00003529 #00004683 #00004713 #00004732 #00004830 #00005018 #00005070 #00005096 #00005108 #00005258	N	Given the nature of the Proposed Development, there are a variety of opportunities and methods through which cultural heritage and diversity could be celebrated. This could include celebrating historic figures and events connected to the local area, including musicians, writers and other artists, and a variety of ways in which culturally significant events could be highlighted and showcased. Through the Community Liaison Group and stakeholder outreach, the London Resort will work with local community groups and others as we further progress these considerations. Cultural heritage is explored further in ES Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document ref 6.1.14) and the Heritage Statement at Appendix 14.2 (document ref 6.2.14.2).	

		predominantly white, English speaking market and welcomed that LRCH is consulting on accessibility and inclusivity.			
		5 respondents raised the importance of catering for different languages and different disabilities. Suggestions included headsets for different languages, multi-language signage, training for staff in guest-facing roles including sign language, and alternative formats for guest-facing literature and signage, including Braille, large font and audio.	#00004683 #00004762 #00003339 #00004948 #00003361	N	The London Resort will attract visitors from around the world. LRCH welcomes these suggestions, which will be taken into considerations at our detailed design stage. Considerations include multi-lingual staff (including British Sign Language) in guest-facing roles, multi-lingual headsets and signage, and alternative, accessible formats for literature, to help ensure that all visitors feel welcome and can fully enjoy the experience.
		2 respondents suggested accessible prayer facilities / prayer rooms	#00003488 #00003344	N	LRCH will ensure the provision of a multi faith space.
		3 respondents expressed the view that inclusivity should mean that all are treated the same, and no emphasis should be given regarding faith, race or sexuality. Inclusion does not work in other places and why would the Resort be any different.	#00003599 #00002813 #00005054	N	LRCH is committed to creating a development that is accessible and inclusive, and an environment that everyone can enjoy confidently and independently, with choice and dignity, regardless of disability, age, gender, sexual orientation, race and faith. The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how LRCH is committed to equal opportunities for all and LRCH's fully inclusive approach will reduce inequalities in access to employment.
Walkways and pathways	24	8 respondents specified the need for wide and smooth pathways, walkways and ramps to ensure the Resort is accessible for wheelchairs, mobility aids, and pushchairs. 1 respondent made reference to gravel, which is 'awful' to navigate in a wheelchair.	#00002854 #00002903 #00002937 #00003235 #00003339 #00003623 #00004645 #00004833	N	The Design Codes (document ref 7.2) define that path widths to be a minimum of 2m wide with no obstructions or street furniture within the clear width. Access routes are to have a firm, slip-resistant and reasonably smooth surfaces. Appropriate slip resistance is essential in inclement weather.
		7 respondents requested that all pathways inside and around the park should be made wheelchair/pram accessible and that it	#00002743 #00002903 #00002937	N	Key inclusivity criteria have been written into the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) for the Resort to ensure they are integral to the design from the outset. Wherever possible, this should be invisible

		<p>should be easy and simple for wheelchair users to access every single part of the resort.</p> <p>Others made specific requests including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To not have steep inclines and make sure ramps are not on sideways tilts. Minimal steps and step free areas. Lift access. 	<p>#00002987 #00003070 #00003162 #00003339</p>		<p>and a natural part of a cohesive concept for the London Resort as a whole.</p> <p>Gradients on newly formed circulation routes are preferably to be less steep than 1:21 (e.g., slopes). Where this cannot be achieved, ramps (e.g., gradients steeper than 1:20) should ideally be as shallow as possible but will not exceed 1:12.</p> <p>Note that existing site constraints such as the gradients that form the Chalk Spine cannot be ameliorated to meet this criterion: however, where this is the case, alternative step-free and stepped routes will be investigated to give the widest possible opportunity of access to users.</p>
		<p>1 respondent requested that transport lines up flush with the pavement, so for example a wheelchair user does not have to get a staff member or wait for a ramp.</p>	<p>#00002908</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Inclusivity is a core consideration for LRCH as it develops increasingly detailed design proposals for the Resort. Key inclusivity criteria have been written into the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) for the Resort to ensure they are integral to the design from the outset. Wherever possible, this should be invisible and a natural part of a cohesive concept for the London Resort as a whole, including at transport interfaces.</p>
	Transportation	<p>2 respondents suggested that the Resort should incorporate some kind of monorail or transportation system within the park and avoid too much walking for disabled people and older people.</p>	<p>#00003118 #00003339</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>LRCH welcomes these comments and is considering how a movement system may be incorporated for guests. Explicit consideration is also being given to support for disabled and older guests.</p>
		<p>2 respondents suggested wheelchair or mobility scooter hire facility for older people.</p>	<p>#00003339 #00002823</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>This comment is noted and LRCH is giving consideration to provision.</p>
		<p>2 respondents requested places to leave mobility scooters and pushchairs while on the rides and attractions.</p>	<p>#00002727 #00002944</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>This comment is noted and LRCH is giving consideration to provision.</p>
	Public transport and non-motorised access	<p>16</p> <p>4 respondents commented about the lack of accessibility on public transport, in particular that wheelchair access on public transport is important.</p>	<p>#00002948 #00003623 #00005200 #00005060</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>This comment is noted and LRCH is giving consideration to provision within the Park. Moreover, LRCH will ensure that the People Mover connecting Ebbsfleet International Station with the resort will be fully accessible. Details regarding considerations of</p>

					public transport options are available, for more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)	
			7 respondents commented on lack of accessibility of local railway stations, with Swanscombe specified by multiple respondents and Northfleet station also referenced. Respondents requested that improvements at Swanscombe station be included as part of proposals. 1 requested that all local rail stations, all site buses are wheelchair accessible.	#00004657 #00004799 #00004883 #00004898 #00005047 #00005273 #00006263	N	<p>Ebbsfleet International is fully accessible for wheelchair users and is being promoted as the primary rail access point.</p> <p>Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing regarding the potential for future improvements at Swanscombe Station. Other transport options are also being made available, including access to river-based transportation and the local bus network. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)</p> <p>With regard to the design of transport interfaces within the Resort, key inclusivity criteria have been written into the Design Codes (document ref 7.2) for the Resort to ensure they are integral to the design from the outset. Wherever possible, this should be invisible and a natural part of a cohesive concept for the London Resort as a whole.</p>
			1 respondent requested shuttle services from local train station(s) as public transport across Kent is poor.	#00003175	N	A People Mover will operate between Ebbsfleet International Station, The London Resort and the pier to connect passengers to available river transport.
			1 respondent requested a dedicated train station.	#00002867	N	The rail strategy considers the impact of the 'worst-case' rail demand on the existing network. Access to multiple existing railway stations was deemed sufficient and a dedicated train station is not necessary or feasible as part of the transport strategy. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1)
			1 respondent requested LRCH to look at the wider environment for accessibility, citing London as a whole being very inaccessible in a wheelchair with only a few underground stations usable.	#00002902	N	Accessibility and inclusivity are key considerations for LRCH and are factored into the underlying design principles for the Resort. However, accessibility of London Underground stations lies beyond the scope of assessment for the London Resort.

			1 respondent stated that a range of transport routes need to be considered in terms of accessibility.	#00002783	N	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and strategy reviews considers a wide range of modes of transport in terms of the Resort's accessibility and review the impact of the forecast demand on existing operations.
			1 respondent requested the removal of barriers for disabled cyclists.	#00003353	N	Proposed cycling improvements will be designed to allow for all cycle users. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
Parking	4		2 requested sufficient designated parking spaces for wheelchair users and for parents with toddlers.	#00002854 #00003143	N	The car parking strategy at The London Resort will include designated accessible parking spaces in line with policy guidance. LRCH will seek to implement disabled parking bay provision that exceed local policy requirements. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 requested that disabled parking should be near the entrance.	#00003114	N	The car parking strategy at The London Resort will include designated accessible parking spaces in line with policy guidance. This will be located near the entrance where possible. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			1 responder requested that parking facilities should be for disabled users only.	#00003086	N	The Active Travel strategy and Public Transport Strategy seeks to incentivise active and sustainable travel and reduce reliance on private vehicles alongside the ticketing strategy however it is accepted that some people will still chose to use private vehicles and parking will not be limited to disabled users only. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
Consulting with disabled people and relevant organisations regarding access	14		5 respondents raised importance of consulting with relevant expertise and organisations on accessibility.	#00004670 #00004780 #00002941 #00002908 #00003331	N	Consultation and engagement are essential to informing the design and ultimately the management and operation of the London Resort. As set out in this Report, LRCH has engaged from the outset with local authorities and other organisations with relevant expertise, and with local communities and business, and is committed to ongoing engagement.
			3 stated the importance of consulting with disabled people, and requested to be consulted further, stating that things designed for wheelchair users are often not designed by wheelchair users and as a result they are not as accessible as they could be.	#00002941 #00004835 #00002903	N	LRCH operates a Community Liaison Group. Membership is comprised of elected representatives and community

			1 suggested keeping the conversation going after opening and always being open to the comments of those with needs.	#00002727	N	organisations and has been expanded to include more groups north of the river.
			4 stated that ongoing engagement with local people is imperative, both sides of the river, and welcomed the suggestion of the access forum.	#00003588 #00003185 #00005116 #00005047	N	LRCH will also continue to consult with and involve disabled people, to help guide design development and our operational policies. This will include local and national stakeholder groups and are also in the process of establishing an Accessibility Forum.
			1 respondent requested that LRCH creates a permanent task force, and to commit to a certain percentage to be from disadvantaged groups.	#00003444	N	
Employment at the park should be accessible and inclusive	7		1 respondent said jobs need to be inclusive for local people	#00003614	N	
			2 respondents said jobs at the park should be inclusive for everyone. 1 specified jobs for older people.	#00004713 #00002741	N	
			2 respondents said staff need to be culturally diverse, from senior executives and board members through to employees.	#00004688 #00004713	N	<p>The Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) also explains how the Applicant will maximise the number of local jobs during construction and once the Resort is operational. Where appropriate and possible, employment opportunities will be advertised to residents proactively for two weeks (via a jobs brokerage service) before being offered to a wider audience.</p> <p>The strategy also explains how the London Resort will invest in local people through job opportunities, training, providing apprenticeships, and also how the Resort will adopt a culture of learning and opportunities for advancement.</p> <p>LRCH's fully inclusive approach will reduce inequalities in access to employment. The Resort will offer a range of job opportunities which will be accessible to all.</p>

			1 suggested the Resort should offer internships and work experience for local disadvantaged children.	#00003185	N	The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) outlines commitments to working with young people in schools, colleges and universities. LRCH will work with their Education and Skills taskforce, local authorities, charities and other bodies to build upon their existing employment and skills programmes. The work will identify vulnerable and under-represented groups, identifying and prioritising ways to make employment opportunities available to them, breaking down barriers to entry to the labour market.
			1 respondent said staff should be specifically trained for accessibility issues, that inclusivity will be felt by the way staff deliver their roles, and this needs to play a huge part of their training, with specialists for those with complex needs.	#00003045	N	All workers, particularly those in guest facing roles, will be appropriately trained. The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) summarises the commitments to training.
Day to day operations	2		1 respondent acknowledged that this is a long way off but requested that accessibility information be easy to find on the website when the Resort is open, commenting that accessibility information is often out of date, contradictory or wrong. The respondent cited a specific incident where they queued for 40 minutes at the wrong place due to inaccurate information on the website.	#00002908	N	LRCH notes this comment and will ensure this is factored when developing the website, and ensuring it is regularly maintained and updated when the Resort is in operation.
			1 respondent suggested allowing purchasing tickets by phone	#00002823	N	LRCH recognises that digital platforms are not suitable for everyone. This will be taken into consideration when setting up the ticket booking and purchase systems for the Resort.
Access during construction	1		1 respondent requested that LRCH considers wheelchair access during construction, stating that this is often not the case.	#00002903	N	LRCH is mindful that a facility of this scale requires an approach to construction that minimises impacts on the road network and local residents. LRCH will work with key stakeholders, including local authorities and Highways England, to agree a Construction Logistics Plan to manage vehicle movements and an Outline Construction and

						Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (document ref 6.2.3.2) that includes safeguards controlling the effects of the construction period on local residents and wildlife habitats.
	Price of admission	5	<p>5 respondents used this space to state that for the Resort to be inclusive, it needs to be affordable for local residents.</p> <p>Suggestions included offering affordable prices or deals for low-income families and disadvantaged children, such as children in care, and for off-peak/out of season concessions.</p>	<p>#00002823 #00004825 #00002964 #00003035 #00003185</p>	N	<p>The Travel Demand Management Plan will include considerations for local residents.</p> <p>A diverse range of amenities will also be accessible to local communities and businesses outside the 'payline' of the theme parks. This includes The Market, the eSports Centre, the Conference Centre (Conference and Convention Centre), and a variety of hotels, retail and dining.</p> <p>These will be designed to be flexible use space for concerts, theatre, comedy, live television productions, exhibitions, conventions, and business events.</p>

Topic	Issue summary	Tally	Sub-issue (if relevant)	User IDs	Change to application (y/n)	Regard had to response
Emerging Masterplan		223				
	General support for the proposed masterplan	72	<p>72 respondents supported the masterplan, giving the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well thought out, incorporating everything in one place. • A good mix and balance of facilities and leisure. • Support for the mix of entertainment, business and hospitality venues. • Support for the "RDE" outside of the payline, with some seeing this as a 'big plus' which would offer significant improvement to the area as a whole. • Support for the inclusion of the WaterPark, with one stating that these are not something done very well anywhere in the UK. 	#00003185 #00004797 #00002717 #00000324 #00002966 #00005216 #00002964 #00005070 #00002960 #00005059 #00002794 #00002783 #00002766 #00002750 #00002743 #00005178 #00005234 #00002733 #00002727 #00003345 #00003277 #00003270 #00003254 #00003233 #00003237 #00003228	N	LRCH notes and welcomes this response.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomed the focus on "experiences" and not just rollercoasters, of which they felt are already in plentiful supply in the UK, and that the experiential elements would keep the Resort flexible and relevant for the future. • Support for proposals to enhance and keep the natural features of the site, which will help the resort to be a nice environment to be in, and good for wildlife and the environment. 	#00003202 #00003194 #00003188 #00003156 #00003155 #00003143 #00003140 #00003144 #00003113 #00003098 #00003079 #00003252 #00003050 #00003048 #00003039 #00003405 #00003389 #00003379 #00004985 #00003375 #00003369 #00003367 #00003380 #00003542 #00005265 #00003541 #00003530 #00003577 #00003571 #00003567 #00004683 #00004706 #00004670	
--	--	--	---	---	--

				#00003622 #00004866 #00004813 #00004794 #00004793 #00004774 #00004859 #00004833 #00004854 #00004995 #00003114 #00004914		
Rides and attractions	24	17 expressed support and excitement for a new theme park. Specific comments includes requests for a world class park with cutting edge rides and attractions, a mixture of large, fast rollercoasters, repetitive motion rides, big thrill seeker rides, dark rides, 4D rides and water rides, a mix of family and thrill rides to cater for to appeal to the whole family and wide age range.	#00002987 #00003166 #00003149 #00003098 #00003403 #00004866 #00004850 #00004725 #00003222 #00003218 #00003162 #00003098 #00003033 #00002937 #00003310 #00003255 #00003254 #00004964	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses. LRCH is exploring the most up-to-date technology available. This will be a next generation Resort. Central to our strategy is to partner with the best brands from across film and TV, to tell stories and create timeless experiences and memories, all in one place. The London Resort will be globally competitive, including drawing inspiration and insight from Resorts in the US and elsewhere, and mark a step change in leisure and entertainment provision in the UK. The three core principles for development of attractions are to be innovative, relevant and flexible, to satisfy visitors in 2024 and beyond,	

			6 respondents specified the importance of choosing rollercoaster manufacturers carefully in order to attract international visitors and make this a flagship project for the UK.	#00003149 #00003222 #00003218 #00003175 #00003149 #00003403 #00006270	N	<p>creating a park that can evolve and adapt easily to ensure that it always has fresh appeal to visitors.</p> <p>The detailed design phase of the project will explore rides, attractions and theming in more detail, working with our IP Partners and industry experts to create timeless experiences and memories, all in one place.</p>
			1 respondent suggested that LRCH look at the American theme parks for inspiration and competition.	#00003308	N	
IP Partners and Branding	2		2 respondents wanted more information about how the theming and branding, in terms of venues, rides, themed areas, esports IP/videogames IP and how the two theme parks will distinguish themselves.	#00003379 #00003403	N	
Facilities and amenities, including the Esports centre	8		7 respondents specifically welcomed the esports centre, stating that this was innovative and would benefit the local area.	#00003548 #00002930 #00003421 #00004943 #00004866 #00004797 #00002997	N	LRCH notes and welcomes this response
			1 respondent felt there was no demand for an esports centre.	#00004984	N	
Facilities and amenities	6		6 specified that having a range of facilities and amenities is key for this project to be a success.	#00003213 #00003188 #00003143	N	LRCH notes this response. The London Resort will be the first of its kind in the UK, with a range of

				#00003019 #00003369 #00003622		<p>facilities and amenities, creating one of the largest, immersive experience centres in the world.</p> <p>LRCH's DCO application allows for flexibility around the detailed design and content of the London Resort, to enable attractions to be updated or replaced over time, in line with changing customer tastes and expectations, to ensure that it always has a fresh appeal to visitors.</p>
Facilities and amenities, including RDE and hotels	14	<p>2 responders requested that the facilities and amenities be family friendly.</p> <p>1 responder stated that facilities for all ages is key to success.</p>	#00003089 #00003404 #00003063	N	<p>The London Resort will be both family friendly and attractive to visitors of all ages, providing a something for everybody to enjoy. This is central to the success of the Resort.</p>	
		<p>3 respondents raised that there should be an area for other cultural uses.</p>	#00003357 #00003404 #00004670	N	<p>The London Resort masterplan provides opportunities and flexible space to accommodate a wide variety of cultural functions.</p>	
		<p>3 respondents expressed concern that there are too many hotels, houses, dining and retail, with one stating that more open spaces are needed, not these facilities.</p> <p>1 respondent supported the masterplan, but sought reassurance that there is not too much retail and shopping rather than theme park.</p>	#00003343 #00004748 #00005071 #00003254 #00003319	N	<p>LRCH revised scheme content following the 2015 consultation, to ensure a diverse range of amenities is accessible to local communities and businesses outside the 'payline' of the theme parks, and to ensure access to retail, dining and entertainment for all Resort visitors.</p> <p>LRCH is also committed to delivering a net gain in biodiversity. A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity</p>	

			Another queried whether 3500 hotel beds is enough.			benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings. Our assessment demonstrates that provision of 3,550 hotel keys within the London Resort is sufficient. While there may be unmet demand for hotel providers outside the London Resort, we are satisfied that we are meeting our immediate commercial need.
			1 respondent felt that there should be a 5-star hotel. 1 respondent suggested an additional cheap, backpacker-friendly hotel and suggested London Resort should acquire local cruise ship Cruise Maritime Voyage.	#00003071 #00005267	N	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. The comment about the acquisition of the Cruise Maritime Voyage is a commercial matter for consideration at the appropriate time.
			1 respondent was concerned about what will happen when people are ill or need medical care.	#00003324	N	The London Resort will have its own security and emergency response personnel to provide immediate response to incidents within the site and there will be medical facilities on site.

	Local communities	7	<p>2 respondents felt that the masterplan does not demonstrate benefits to the local community and is more aimed at people from further afield.</p> <p>1 felt the area outside the theme park gates is as important as the area behind the gates, and that a range of amenities and entertainment need to be on offer for local people.</p>	<p>#00003317 #00005122</p> <p>#00003577</p>	Y	<p>LRCH revised scheme content following the 2015 consultation, to ensure a diverse range of amenities is accessible to local communities and businesses outside the 'payline' of the theme parks.</p> <p>The proposed entertainment and amenities on offer outside the park gates includes The Market, the eSports Centre, the Conferention Centre (Conference and Convention Centre), and a variety of hotels, retail and dining.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and supporting documentation details the many ways in which the local area and communities would benefit, including: thousands of direct and indirect jobs created during construction and operation, spending in the local area, catalyst for investment in the area, new infrastructure, green networks, supply chain opportunities and access to high quality retail and entertainment outside the payline.</p>
			<p>1 respondent commented the masterplan appears to have lost its educational aspects in favour of corporate entertainment, with no reference to the heritage of the region or the nation.</p>	#00005090	N	<p>LRCH revised scheme content following the 2015 consultation, to ensure a diverse range of amenities is accessible to local communities and businesses outside the 'payline' of the theme parks, and to ensure retail, dining and entertainment for all Resort visitors.</p> <p>The London Resort will contain a wide variety of venues, which will be designed to be a flexible use space.</p>

						LRCH is also committed to protecting and showcasing local heritage with a range of cultural and heritage-based initiatives. Furthermore we have, in response to consultation also looked to develop education and inclusion initiatives to ensure the Resort meets aspirations for learning and educational opportunities.
			3 respondents raised concerns about Gate 2, seeking reassurance that it is not intended to be used for "noisy" rides, especially given its proximity to new and existing residential areas.	#00005174 #00004948 #00005178	N	Noisy rides will be located away from residential areas. Rides that are closer to residential areas, including areas to the west like Ingress Park, will be buffered by distance, built form and landscape, with the majority contained within enclosed space to avoid issues of noise or local disruption. ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) consider the various effects of the London Resort on local residents at various assessment years. Gate 2 is operational in the later assessment years, 2030 and 2038, so these account for the impact of Gate 2 on local residents. Noise impacts are assessed and considered in ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (document ref 6.1.15).
	General opposition to proposed masterplan	38	Reasons provided generally reiterated opposition expressed elsewhere rather than to the Masterplan specifically. Reasons given included:	#00006261 #00002746 #00003521 #00003435 #00003434 #00003072	N	The ES and supporting documentation considers both the positive benefits and negative impacts associated with the London Resort. Where there are adverse impacts, mitigation measures are proposed, and these are detailed in the relevant

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General opposition to the Resort • Opposition to the location of the Resort • Concerns about transport proposals, traffic impacts and parking • Concerns about impacts on wildlife, habitats, and the environment generally. • Concerns about impacts on residential areas and local communities, including increased volume of people, noise, air quality and litter. • Concerns about lack of detail, particularly about content of Gate 2 and potential impacts on nearby residential areas. • That the novelty would wear off resulting in the investment being a waste of money. 	#00003600 #00003592 #00004919 #00004918 #00004946 #00004913 #00004894 #00004861 #00004849 #00004778 #00004755 #00004832 #00006262 #00005281 #00005190 #00005145 #00005122 #00005090 #00005071 #00003399 #00004986 #00002781 #00003355 #00004918 #00005281 #00004732 #00005047 #00005199 #00005178 #00005061 #00003442 #00003089	<p>topic chapters of the ES and supporting documentation.</p> <p>Overall, LRCH concludes that the benefits are expected to far outweigh any adverse impacts.</p> <p>LRCH’s three core principles for development of attractions are to be innovative, relevant and flexible. The DCO application allows for flexibility around the detailed design and content of the London Resort, to enable attractions to be updated or replaced over time, in line with changing customer tastes and expectations, to ensure that it always has a fresh appeal to visitors.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

Insufficient information	6	2 responders raised that there is not an 'emerging masterplan'.	#00005168 #00005166	N	<p>The focus during consultation was on scheme content, land use, impacts and technical assessments. The consultation materials set out the potential benefits and impacts of the Resort, and LRCH's proposals to minimise and mitigate negative impacts. These were covered in more detail under relevant topic area, such as environmental impacts, traffic impacts, and impacts on local communities. These are covered in detail in the ES under relevant chapter headings and an illustrative scheme is provided in the Design and Access Statement (document ref 7.1).</p> <p>LRCH's DCO application allows for flexibility around the detailed design and content of the London Resort, to enable attractions to be updated or replaced over time, in line with changing customer tastes and expectations, to ensure that it always has a fresh appeal to visitors.</p> <p>The detailed design phase of the project will explore rides and attractions in more detail, working with LRCH's IP Partners and industry experts. LRCH will share more as designs progress and engage with the local community and others interested in proposals throughout the development process.</p>
		3 responders supported the masterplan at present but suggested more work is still needed.	#00002827 #00005258 #00004984	N	
		1 responder wanted more information on the negatives that the masterplan has identified.	#00003344	N	
Design and layout	15	4 respondents stated that indoor facilities for the winter will be key.	#00003132 #00003522 #00002763 #00002920	N	The UK climate and the particular characteristics of the Resort's riverside setting are being factored into the design.

		2 respondents suggested designing covered walkways to accommodate for wet weather conditions.	#00003186 #00002920		Circa 70% of the attractions will be covered. Outside of the payline there will significant shelter, enclosed facilities and attractions.
		3 respondents felt that retaining some of the old features will help to build support with the local communities. 1 respondent felt that the park should incorporate older British designs. Another suggested a blend of new and old would be the best.	#00002943 #00002822 #00002987 #00003515 #00002937	N	The London Resort seeks to make use of the existing landscape features wherever possible within the masterplan, celebrating the area's rich history and context on the River Thames. The London Resort will accommodate a wide variety of architectural styles both within and outside the payline. This includes the Grade II* listed former Tilbury Riverside Station where we will be giving this much loved but neglected building a new lease of life that is very similar to its original use as a passenger terminal for the new ferry service that connects Tilbury to the Swanscombe Peninsula and London beyond.
		1 respondent felt that the size of the plot of the theme park is too small for what is being proposed.	#00003306	N	The size is comparable to similar category A attractions worldwide. This is set out in more detail in ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4)
		1 respondent felt that the concept art had an office, business look, and felt it needs to look more inviting, warm and fun, with more theming.	#00003361	N	The consultation materials included early illustrative concept art. Theming and branding of the Resort will be developed with LRCH's IP partners.

			1 responder raised that there needs to be adequate signage within the Resort to all destinations.	#00003143	N	<p>The layout of the masterplan will be designed to be intuitive to use, with landmarks acting as familiar waypoints. Appropriate signage, including intelligent signage, will be provided throughout the Resort to assist in wayfinding and to avoid queues and congestion.</p> <p>Signage strategy will be developed at the detailed design stage.</p>
			1 responder raised that solar powered lighting would be favourable.	#00003143	N	<p>Solar powered lighting will be an integral part of the net carbon neutral in operation requirements for the London Resort. This is outlined in the Energy strategy and Lighting strategy and Sustainability Statement.</p>
			1 responder suggested water features fountains and interactive features, giving the wands at Universal Studios as an example and wanted to see lots of trees and plants.	#00003254	N	<p>There are opportunities to incorporate these types of features within the London Resort. This will be explored in more during the next stages of the project development.</p>
	Restoration and habitat provision	3	3 responders explained that there should be no loss associated with history and habitat in any masterplan.	#00004797 #00005081 #00005037	N	<p>LRCH is committed to delivering a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings.</p> <p>The history of the Swanscombe Peninsula, and its wider context and the natural landscape will be celebrated in the masterplan.</p>

	Cycle and pedestrian routes	2	<p>1 responder supported the masterplan, but suggested that more local mobility is included, suggesting cycle routes, and fewer big open spaces that they felt are a poor use of natural resources.</p> <p>1 responder suggested including designated cycle paths within the Resort, the provision of cycle parking facilities and suggested picnic areas along the river's edge.</p>	<p>#00002878</p> <p>#00003143</p>	N	<p>Proposals included dedicated cycle routes and there will be secure cycle parking in key locations. These are explained and highlighted in plans within the ES Chapter 9 Land Transport (document ref 6.1.9).</p> <p>The area supports a variety of wildlife habitats and species associated with the land, the river and its banksides. Previous stages of consultation showed strong support for proposals to enhance and manage these spaces, and the importance of retaining publicly accessible green space and marshland. LRCH is committed to a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Proposals also include an improved network of pedestrian routes, including walkways within the marsh habitats and a riverside route aimed at reconnecting local residents with the river, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings.</p>
	Entertainment	2	<p>1 wanted to know whether other entertainment opportunities had been explored, such as theatres, themed bars/ restaurants. A range of suggestions were provided.</p>	#00003033	N	<p>Indoor and outdoor venues both inside and outside the theme park 'payline' will provide West End quality theatre productions, comedy acts and music concerts, along with retail and dining.</p> <p>The range of amenities and facilities on offer outside the payline means that the London Resort will offer an appealing destination to afternoon or evening visitors from the local area and beyond, without them</p>

						<p>having to pay for theme park entrance.</p> <p>The London Resort plan to include a music venue that sits outside the payline with flexibility to accommodate a wide variety events. Opportunities to work with range of groups to showcase skills and experience.</p>
			1 queried if there is an opportunity to expand the park in the future, to introduce new rides and to utilise the space outside of the Theme Parks to host open air events such as cinema screenings, concerts and festivals.	#00003379	N	<p>A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings.</p> <p>There is sufficient land within the boundary of the London Resort to deliver a compelling mix of attractions.</p>
	Future plans and development	2	Important the Resort never extends beyond the established boundary.	#00004985	N	<p>While LRCH's DCO application allows for flexibility around the detailed design and content of the London Resort, to enable attractions to be updated or replaced over time, the DCO also ensures comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will be in place, which includes noise, air quality and visuals impacts to which LRCH must adhere.</p> <p>Our draft DCO and our PEIR, setting out our environmental assessments, which were available as part of the suite of consultation materials on our consultation website set out our commitment to work within those boundaries.</p>
			1 respondent expressed that it would be good to understand how the Resort	#00002950	N	<p>While LRCH's DCO application allows for flexibility around the detailed design and content of the London Resort, to enable attractions to be updated</p>

			might be expanded in future (such as other hotels in the local area).			<p>or replaced over time, the DCO also ensures comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will be in place, which includes noise, air quality and visuals impacts to which LRCH must adhere.</p> <p>This is further explored in ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7).</p>
Suggestions	22	<p>Some respondents made suggestions about the proposed facilities and amenities. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • visitor centre to showcase heritage, • country park with educational centre • themed dinner shows, themed restaurants or bars • cinema • escape rooms • darts • a nightclub • a 24-hour casino • a dance hall • place for performing arts • British theme/celebration <p>Some respondents requested sports/leisure facilities, stating that there is a lack of good facilities in the surrounding area. Suggestions included:</p>	<p>#00003537 #00004670 #00003404 #00005057 #00005077 #00003589 #00004679</p> <p>#00002797</p> <p>#00003464 #00003537 #00003577 #00003033</p> <p>#00003251 #00003233 #00003548</p>	Y	<p>LRCH welcomes these comments.</p> <p>The London Resort will contain a wide variety of venues. This includes a Visitor Centre and staff training facility, a Conferention Centre and an Esports Centre.</p> <p>These will be designed to be a flexible use space for concerts, theatre, comedy, live television productions, exhibitions, conventions, and business events.</p> <p>If there is appropriate demand, we have the ability to accommodate some of the suggested functions.</p> <p>Themed rides, shows and attractions will be inspired by globally recognised brands to create a unique, world-class entertainment destination. This will include themed restaurant and hotels. The detail will developed with LRCH’s IP Partners.</p> <p>LRCH is also committed to protecting and showcasing local heritage.</p>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mini-golf / crazy golf / themed mini-golf • a Championship Links Golf Course • indoor canoeing training facility • partnership with the local football team to create a stadium in some of the land not being used, but opens up all sorts of possibilities to sponsor them • gym and leisure centre with diverse sporting facilities • swimming facilities 			<p>Sporting facilities and a golf course are not part of the core offer for the Resort.</p>
			1 respondent suggested a park app, which shows all amenities, restaurant booking, park map, wait times for each ride so guests can plan their day based on the queue length.	#00003228	N	LRCH has welcomes this suggestion and will fully explore at the appropriate stage of development.
			2 respondents requested space and parking for motorhomes, caravans or a campsite.	#00002755 #00002860 #00003544 4	N	These facilities are not under consideration for the London Resort.
			1 respondent wished to see shower facilities onsite for cyclists.	#00003570	Y	The London Resort will be providing shower facilities for its employees who choose to cycle to work within the resort.
			1 suggested that restaurants / fast food outlets to be sited/ located by price.	#00003544	N	LRCH noted this comment.

			Visitors should be able to bring their own food and drink into the Resort to save money.	#00003035	N	LRCH noted this comment.
			1 respondent expressed Local area would benefit from independent retailers or outlets.	#00005091	N	LRCH noted this comment.

Topic	Issue Summary	Tally	Sub-issue if relevant	User IDs	Change (y/n)	Regard had to response
General comments		493				
	General support	198	<p>198 respondents expressed support for the project.</p> <p>Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> excitement for the future of the project. support for the creation of a new social place and entertainment on offer. support for the employment opportunities it will provide. belief that a theme park like this in the UK would change the industry for the better. wishing LRCH good luck. 	#00002951 #00002937 #00002808 #00002783 #00002750 #00002717 #00003460 #00003459 #00003457 #00003436 #00003175 #00003155 #00003154 #00003403 #00003390 #00003383 #00003367 #00003541 #00003530 #00003517 #00003510 #00003601 #00003590 #00003583 #00003577 #00003571 #00004701	N	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes this response.</p> <p>The London Resort will be the first entertainment destination of this scale and profile in the UK and a unique opportunity to bring a major attraction and entertainment-led regeneration scheme to the UK.</p> <p>As set out in ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7), thousands of direct and indirect jobs will be created during construction and operation, with increased spending in the local area, a catalyst for investment in the area, new infrastructure, green networks, supply chain opportunities and access to high quality retail and entertainment outside the payline.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) also describes how there is significant demand for tourism and entertainment in the region and UK generally. The London Resort will be a unique global attraction and as such is expected to result in overall market growth.</p> <p>LRCH has always been committed to ensuring that the London Resort works for local communities as well as our visitors. We are very encouraged by the levels of</p>

				#00003330 #00003228 #00003114 #00002997 #00003424 #00003399 #00004847 #00005267 #00005005 #00002987 #00002986 #00002982 #00002967 #00002966 #00002956 #00002947 #00002940 #00002905 #00002888 #00002856 #00002854 #00002818 #00002773 #00002813 #00002762 #00003329 #00003308 #00003285 #00003281 #00003277 #00003276 #00003238 #00003225	participation, support and constructive feedback received during this consultation process.
--	--	--	--	---	---

				#00003223 #00003213 #00003193 #00003164 #00003159 #00003155 #00003134 #00003122 #00003042 #00003031 #00003030 #00003467 #00003462 #00003401 #00003392 #00003380 #00003513 #00003511 #00003510 #00003509 #00003508 #00003503 #00003498 #00003601 #00003571 #00004687 #00004676 #00004634 #00004633 #00003613 #00004874 #00004830 #00004794		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				#00004788 #00004787 #00005278 #00005267 #00005194 #00005138 #00005108 #00004995 #00006275 #00002726 #00002714 #00003335 #00002987 #00002986 #00002951 #00002910 #00002908 #00002813 #00002717 #00003270 #00003194 #00003156 #00003155 #00003140 #00003079 #00003567 #00004797 #00004794 #00004793 #00005029 #00004995 #00002930 #00002750		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				#00003277 #00003251 #00003237 #00003300 #00003277 #00003254 #00003159 #00003156 #00003443 #00004948 #00004981 #00002953 #00003300 #00003281 #00003280 #00003277 #00003268 #00003267 #00003256 #00003250 #00003215 #00003159 #00003155 #00003154 #00003151 #00003140 #00003114 #00003079 #00003050 #00003048 #00003038 #00003035 #00002996		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				#00003405 #00003403 #00003375 #00003530 #00003517 #00003510 #00003590 #00003583 #00004683 #00004660 #00004910 #00004877 #00004866 #00004859 #00004847 #00004797 #00004794 #00004774 #00004749 #00004712 #00005265 #00005258 #00005234 #00005042 #00005010 #00005008 #00003590 #00004723 #00002873 #00002762 #00002721 #00003233 #00003084		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				#00003073 #00003367 #00003530 #00005096 #00002849 #00003289		
	Benefits for local communities	55	55 respondents expressed concern that this project won't benefit the local communities.	#00004929 #00003393 #00003619 #00004956 #00005248 #00005178 #00003406 #00005112 #00005088 #00002910 #00004984 #00004829 #00003288 #00005227 #00002866 #00004868 #00005044 #00005190 #00002717 #00003306 #00005097 #00004895 #00005121 #00002936 #00004752 #00004990 #00005184	N	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and supporting documentation details the many ways in which the local area and communities would benefit, including: thousands of direct and indirect jobs created during construction and operation, spending in the local area, catalyst for investment in the area, new infrastructure, green networks, supply chain opportunities and access to high quality retail and entertainment outside the payline.

				#00005166 #00005013 #00003060 #00005037 #00002752 #00004998 #00005026 #00004679 #00005081 #00004784 #00005269 #00003094 #00004911 #00004808 #00005071 #00005137 #00003367 #00004991 #00003317 #00003434 #00004918 #00004917 #00004919 #00003331 #00005038 #00003408 #00004873 #00003414		
	General opposition	109	65 respondents were generally opposed to the project on all grounds	#00003408 #00003592 #00003585 #00004675 #00004664	N	The Environmental Statement (ES) (document ref 6.1) and supporting documentation considers both the positive benefits and negative impacts associated with the London Resort. Where there are adverse impacts, mitigation measures are proposed, and these are detailed in the

				#00003619 #00003616 #00004877 #00004868 #00002800 #00003600 #00003584 #00004692 #00004861 #00003474 #00003393 #00004824 #00004723 #00005095 #00004755 #00005281 #00005269 #00005112 #00003343 #00003297 #00005173 #00005190 #00004930 #00003338 #00003440 #00003484 #00003302 #00004692 #00004666 #00004894 #00004819 #00005256 #00005198	relevant topic chapters of the ES and supporting documentation. Overall, LRCH concludes that the benefits are expected to far outweigh any adverse impacts.
--	--	--	--	---	--

				#00004965 #00003442 #00002988 #00002816 #00003350 #00003258 #00003231 #00003072 #00003441 #00004918 #00004808 #00004784 #00006261 #00005268 #00005166 #00005142 #00005122 #00005090 #00005081 #00005071 #00005054 #00005027 #00004902 #00005043 #00004748 #00002866 #00004801		
			25 respondents expressed concern around the increased level of development in the local area.	#00002800 #00003214 #00003018 #00003569 #00004778 #00003297	N	LRCH undertook a comprehensive site selection process at the early stage of the project development. The UK is one of the most visited countries in the world but currently fails to provide an entertainment resort

			<p>#00005141 #00004998 #00002816 #00002890 #00003484 #00004877 #00005137 #00005081 #00002778 #00003017 #00003442 #00004911 #00004784 #00004778 #00005071 #00005028 #00004993 #00004983 #00003439 #00004748 #00005274 #00003350 #00003434</p>		<p>comparable with those found elsewhere in Europe, North America and across Asia.</p> <p>LRCH drew up a list of site selection criteria. These were broadly based in order to give weight to planning, environmental, social and economic considerations that lay beyond LRCH's immediate commercial objectives. This approach aligns with the dimensions of sustainable development identified in paragraph 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, published in February 2019).</p> <p>The identification and testing of options, supported by several rounds of consultation, has been an integral component of the iterative design process for the London Resort, giving confidence that the Project would be deliverable and viable.</p> <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.</p>
		3 respondents expressed opposition to the increase in population in the local area as a result of the development.	<p>#00002816 #00004867 #00004841</p>	N	<p>Overall, LRCH concludes that the benefits are expected to far outweigh any adverse impacts.</p>
		1 respondent felt the Resort is not needed here and should be built in Spain.	#00002985	N	
		8 stated it is the wrong location to build the Resort, that it is not needed in the South East	<p>#00003331 #00003255 #00004669</p>	N	

			generally, or that it is too close to residential areas.	#00005190 #00004966 #00004948 #00005178 #00005174 #00005061		
			1 respondent expressed opposition to economic development in the local area.	#00002816	N	
			6 respondents expressed concern about the removal of green space in the local area to make room for the proposed scheme.	#00004644 #00004778 #00005043 #00005028 #00005137 #00003502	N	
	Need for project	23	9 respondents felt that the Resort is not needed.	#00005076 #00004962 #00004905 #00004713 #00005200 #00005088 #00004947 #00004868 #00004894	N	The ES and supporting documentation consider both the positive benefits and negative impacts associated with the London Resort. Where there are adverse impacts, mitigation measures are proposed, and these are detailed in the relevant topic chapters of the ES and supporting documentation. More information can be found in ES Chapter 5 Relevant Law and Policy (document ref 6.1.5). Overall, LRCH concludes that the benefits are expected to far outweigh any adverse impacts.
			5 respondents questioned the motivation of LRCH and felt it was just a scheme to make others rich, and the LRCH only cares about profit.	#00004894 #00004778 #00003473 #00004657 #00004928	N	LRCH is committed to creating and ensuring the Resort works for local communities as well as visitors. It will be the first entertainment destination of this scale and profile in the UK and will have a global profile, attracting visitors from all over the UK and the world, generating economic benefits that will reach far into Kent, Essex and London, while also delivering benefits to the whole UK.

						ES Chapter 5 Relevant Law and Policy (document ref 6.1.5) and ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and supporting documentation details the many ways in which the local area and communities would benefit, including: thousands of direct and indirect jobs created during construction and operation, spending in the local area, catalyst for investment in the area, new infrastructure, green networks, supply chain opportunities and access to high quality retail and entertainment outside the payline.
			1 was supportive overall, but “10%” concern that profits will be more important than the potential benefits to the local communities.	#00002803	N	
			4 respondents felt that the investment, damage and disruption of the project is not worth it.	#00003473 #00005166 #00005081 #00005054	N	
			1 stated that more hospitals and homes are needed instead of a theme park.	#00005256	N	
			1 stated that the money would be better spent enhancing local areas.	#00002988	N	
			1 felt preservation of nature was more important.	#00005076	N	
			1 felt that the land would be better used as an extension of the Ebbsfleet Garden City for residential-led mixed use.	#00005281	N	
Impacts on local communities	23		19 respondents were concerned that this project will result in the harmful compulsory purchasing of lots of land and concerns about established businesses on the Swanscombe Peninsula closure and displacement of	#00005142 #00004752 #00005013 #00005168 #00004643 #00004949 #00004947	N	LRCH wishes to do what it reasonably can to reduce the extent to which it will need to use Compulsory Acquisition powers and is therefore seeking to negotiate to acquire the land and interests in land that it needs and to agree terms for compensation, on a voluntary basis.

			businesses, resulting in loss of jobs if they can't relocate, and the effects of ongoing uncertainty – unable to sell or grow.	#00004918 #00004868 #00004815 #00005076 #00005061 #00005175 #00005166 #00005126 #00003167 #00005151 #00004763 #00005148		LRCH is already in discussions with a number of those likely to be affected, and their advisers, with a view to agreeing fair and reasonable terms, prior to resorting to Compulsory Acquisition powers. In line with this it is offering an enhanced proposal to qualifying claimants of 30% capped at £500,000. LRCH has also written to all those listed in the Book of Reference as part of statutory consultation to ensure they are given an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposals.
			2 expressed concerns about what will happen to local business and a request to keep local business updated, and that there has been too much uncertainty for too long.	#00005168 #00006285 #00003272	N	For business in the area (not within the Order Limits), the Resort is an opportunity to stimulate business opportunities to local firms (including the growing creative sector) and be a catalyst to kick start growth in the area. More details of this are provided in ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7).
			1 felt protection of local businesses is more important.	#00005076	N	
			1 felt it was unlikely the Resort will go ahead if local businesses have to relocate.	#00003384	N	
	Opposition to 'London Resort' name	12	12 respondents queried, and were opposed to, the name London Resort when the Proposed Development is in Kent.	#00004669 #00003477 #00005174 #00003455 #00003185 #00003533 #00003496 #00002808 #00004696 #00004990	N	The London Resort will be the first entertainment destination of this scale and profile in the UK. It will have a global profile, attracting visitors from all over the UK and the world, generating economic benefits that will reach far into Kent, Essex and London, while also delivering benefits to the whole UK. This is a unique opportunity to bring a major attraction and entertainment-led regeneration scheme to the UK, only 17

				#00002778 #00003231		minutes from central London. It is important that the name has international recognition. Protecting and showcasing local heritage forms an important part of our proposals, which is set out in ES Chapter 14 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (document ref 6.1.14).
Concern about delivery timescales	5	3 respondents asked LRCH to get this built quickly.	#00004738 #00005280 #00005099 #00002838	N		The London Resort is a hugely complex project, and it is important that we get it right. LRCH is carrying out all necessary assessments and consultation as required for NSIPs, as set out in the Planning Act 2008.
		1 respondent felt that if LRCH doesn't act quickly people will lose interest.				
		1 respondent raised concerns over how long construction will take.	#00005178	N		The 2020 PEIR reflected the available information at the time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail. This includes the construction and operational phases of the project. The Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2) considers how LRCH will avoid, minimise or mitigate which considers the mitigation required during this period.
Pricing and local concessions	48	33 respondents wanted to see free or reduced entry / concessions for local residents.	#00003334 #00004866 #00005158 #00003344 #00003100 #00005258 #00005238 #00005119 #00005104 #00002823 #00002772	N		The London Resort is not scheduled to open until 2024, therefore it is too early for decisions about the ticketing strategy. The ticketing strategy will include considerations for local residents and annual passes. Further details will be available closer to the time of opening.

				#00003462 #00003359 #00003339 #00003237 #00003236 #00003169 #00003026 #00003421 #00003563 #00003531 #00003590 #00003578 #00004679 #00004948 #00005114 #00004798 #00005097 #00005029 #00005072 #00003101 #00003361 #00005047 #00003319 #00003231 #00003525 #00004679 #00004799 #00003622 #00003005		
			12 respondents requested that certain groups should be given discounted tickets, such as student discounts.	#00002939 #00002823 #00002727 #00003185	N	

				#00003155 #00003510 #00004679 #00004825 #00004799 #00005152 #00005096 #00004802		
			1 suggested that having fair ticket prices will be crucial the success of the Resort and suggested multi-day tickets.	#00003228	N	
			1 respondent suggested to do what Disneyland does and do it better, reward programme, annual passes, general maintenance, good customer service.	#00005070	N	
			1 respondent suggested that tickets to esports events should be free.	#00003421	N	
	Tickets and public transport	10	5 respondents suggested that tickets should include cost of travel.	#00002919 #00005053 #00005199 #00003300 #00005053	N	A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
			5 suggested a benefit system for people who use environmentally friendly transport options.	#00003035 #00004631 #00003035 #00003373 #00004943	N	

COVID-19 plans and mitigating risks of infection	10	3 respondents believed that the plans should be modified in light of COVID-19.	#00003495 #00003447 #00004688	N	<p>Neither Covid-19 nor Brexit have had any impact on the delivery programme.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7). acknowledges that COVID-19 has the potential to impact a variety of health, social, economic and demographic indicators. This notes that 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 opening year of Gate One).</p> <p>The Resort is already designed to avoid queues and congestion. LRCH will of course continue to monitor the situation regarding Covid-19 and Government guidelines.</p> <p>The London Resort will generate economic benefits that will reach far into Kent, Essex and London, while also delivering benefits to the whole UK, as set out in ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7).</p>
		2 respondents felt the Resort is a bad idea due to the effects of COVID-19.	#00005200 #00004861	N	
		2 respondents stated that they hope Brexit and COVID-19 won't disrupt these plans.	#00003268 #00002856	N	
		3 respondents expressed concern regarding impact of COVID-19 on visitor numbers.	#00003343 #00003331 #00004861	N	

Topic	Issue summary	Tally	Sub-issue (if relevant)	User IDs	Change to application (y/n)	Regard had to response
Consultation		251				
	General support of the consultation	57	<p>52 respondents provided positive feedback about the consultation.</p> <p>Comments included that the information was easy to find and accessible and the materials were comprehensive, fair and informative.</p>	#00002717 #00002813 #00002874 #00002883 #00002910 #00003048 #00003050 #00003113 #00003114 #00003140 #00003144 #00003188 #00003228 #00003229 #00003236 #00003237 #00003254 #00003277 #00003298 #00003299 #00003329	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.

				#00003331 #00003344 #00003345 #00003363 #00003367 #00003373 #00003386 #00003403 #00003424 #00003542 #00003567 #00003585 #00003615 #00004660 #00004683 #00004687 #00004794 #00004797 #00004866 #00004877 #00004960 #00005029 #00005047 #00005077 #00005099 #00005131		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			5 respondents considered the consultation and informing local residents has been a positive step forward.	#00003399 #00004706 #00004794 #00005047 #00004995	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
Consultation approach including webinars	13		7 respondents expressed support for the webinars. Comments included finding them informative, that they felt the project team were committed, respectful and knowledgeable, that they articulated answers to technical questions, and didn't hide from challenging questions.	#00003590 #00003574 #00004732 #00006263 #00005273 #00005216 #00003403	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			1 respondent expressed appreciation for the recorded webinar being available on the website as they were not able to attend the live events.	#00004985	N	LRCH notes and welcomes these responses.
			Conversely 1 respondent felt the team did not care about the issues.	#00003403	N	LRCH endeavoured to answer all questions during each webinar. At a number of webinars, similar questions were asked by multiple attendees. Where appropriate, questions were grouped and addressed by topic area. LRCH explained at each webinar that if anyone felt their question had not been sufficiently answered or had more detailed queries, attendees could contact the project team
			2 respondents raised that they asked a question during a webinar and it was not answered	#00004732 #00004643	N	

			1 of these also stated that some have been made to feel uncomfortable asking questions in front of others.			by email or phone. Telephone surgeries were available for anyone who wanted a more detailed discussion with a member of the project team. Contact details were provided at webinar and available online throughout the consultation period. A list of questions and comments (Appendix 5.25), and recordings of each webinar (Appendix 5.26), are available.
			2 respondents raised that it would be helpful to know what issues have been raised in previous webinars	#00004674 #00004985	N	A Webinar FAQ was produced and published on the website during the consultation period. When moderating and providing answers at webinars, the project team also acknowledged where similar topic areas / questions had been raised on previous webinars. A list of questions and comments (Appendix 5.25), and recordings of each webinar (Appendix 5.26), are available.
Approach to consultation and engagement	51	22 respondents considered that local people were not being and will not be involved in the development of the proposals	#00002727 #00002733 #00002909 #00002936 #00003288 #00003296 #00003369 #00003590 #00003620 #00004732 #00004809 #00004819 #00004829 #00004911 #00005040 #00005065 #00005088	N	As set out in this Report (document ref 5.1), LRCH has consulted with local communities, education providers, community organisations and local authorities in the surrounding area at meaningful stages in the development of the proposals, using a wide range of communications and feedback methods. LRCH has carried out multiple stages of consultation with local residents. This consisted of three non-statutory stages, over 2014-2015, and two statutory stages, one in 2015 and another in 2020. This Report (document ref 5.1) shows how responses have influenced the Proposed Development. LRCH is committed to ensuring the Resort works for the local community as well as Resort visitors. LRCH will	

				#00005142 #00005155 #00005199 #00005269 #00005288		continue to engage with local communities in the ongoing development of the proposals.
			6 respondents considered the consultation and engagement to be inadequate Some specified lack of consultation and engagement with residents in Thurrock.	#00005269 #00004657 #00005190 #00006280 #00003589 #00004732	N	As set out in this 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. Local residents both sides of the river were informed about the consultation through multiple methods, including direct mail, adverts in local newspapers and notifications online. Twenty public consultation events were held online, across weekday lunchtimes and evenings, and Saturday lunchtimes, and recordings of online events were also available, as well as tailored webinars for councils, CLG, and topic specific webinars on accessibility and land, recording of which were also available online.
			6 respondents felt that there was not enough awareness raised about the consultation.	#00003254 #00003447 #00004925 #00004917 #00004829 #00002733	N	As set out in this 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. A combination of more than 100,000 direct mail (letters, leaflets and emails), media advertising and editorial, social media activity, a dedicated website, a virtual exhibition space, multiple webinars, a freephone helpline, as well as advice sought from Local Authorities on how to consult appropriately, was used to ensure stakeholders were informed of the consultation and had the opportunity to contribute to them.

					<p>The Zone approach ensured that local residents were informed about the consultation through multiple communication methods, 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 website received 27,569 unique visitors and the virtual exhibition space received 39,265 visits. The 2020 consultation received a significantly higher volume of responses than the 2015 consultation, demonstrating that the consultation was sufficiently promoted and accessible.</p>	
			<p>10 respondents felt that there should be further, ongoing communication and engagement with the local community and organisations.</p> <p>1 stated that this would be essential in creating a sense of local pride and ownership.</p> <p>Another encouraged strong links with Dartford and Gravesham to create a sense in which local communities feel they have a stake in the enterprise and its success.</p>	<p>#00003578 #00003537 #00003367 #00005040 #00003473 #00005207 #00004809 #00004683 #00003005 #00003406</p>	N	<p>LRCH is committed to ensuring the Resort works for the local community as well as Resort visitors.</p> <p>LRCH continues to engage with local communities in the ongoing development of the proposals. This includes the continuation of the Community Liaison Group.</p>

			1 respondent expressed support for the Resort but expressed concern that it could create a “them” and “us” mentality as residents are disturbed.	#00003406	N	LRCH has always been committed to ensuring that the London Resort works for the local community as well as visitors. LRCH is committed to continuing to engage with local residents, schools, and interest groups as we continue to develop our proposals and how best to maximise benefits and mitigate potential impacts for local residents.
			1 respondent stated that LRCH’s social media had improved recently and encouraged LRCH to continue its social media activity.	#00005131	N	LRCH notes and welcomes this response. Social media will form part of ongoing communication and engagement activity.
			1 respondent suggested LRCH should explore more digital engagement tools to encourage more young people to get involved.	#00003367	N	LRCH notes this response. Digital engagement tools will form part of ongoing communication and engagement activity.
			3 respondents felt that specialist local groups either had not been engaged or should be engaged in the future. These included the local history group, disabled people and charities.	#00005199 #00004670 #00004835	N	LRCH notes these responses. LRCH notified households, businesses and community groups in the vicinity of the Proposed Development about consultation. LRCH will continue to engage with local communities, education providers, community organisations and local authorities in the ongoing development of the proposals and welcomes suggestions for organisations that LRCH could engage with.
			1 respondent expressed a desire for LRCH to work with local communities and disadvantaged children.	#00003185	N	LRCH held an Accessibility and Inclusivity webinar during the consultation period and is in the process of setting up

						<p>an Access Forum, which will focus on Accessibility and Inclusivity for the design and operation of the Resort. We will share more detail on the Access Forum in the future. In addition we developed a Consultation Strategy for Seldom Heard Groups to guide our approach to consultation.</p> <p>A list of questions and comments (Appendix 5.25), and recordings of each webinar (Appendix 5.26), are available.</p>
	Cost of consultation	2	2 respondents felt that the materials presented were wasteful.	#00005071 #00005158	N	The consultation was 'Digital first', with hard copies available to order on request. This resulted in significantly reduced print and distribution cost to the environment and minimised waste.
	Validity of consultation	15	6 respondents felt that the consultation should not have taken place during COVID-19 or that they missed the opportunity for face-to-face discussion.	#00003331 #00003269 #00005056 #00005275 #00003231 #00005065	N	<p>As set out in this 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A freepost phonenumber and postal address was available and widely advertised for anyone not comfortable with digital methods.</p>
			2 respondents felt that the consultation is irrelevant following COVID-19 and the impact on social gatherings.	#00004861 #00004670		
			4 respondents raised that engagement was only valid if the views were considered and acted upon, not just those that are favourable.	#00005077 #00003273 #00003209 #00004780	N	<p>All responses to consultation have been analysed and LRCH has had due regard to all responses, as set out in this Report (document ref 5.1).</p> <p>LRCH is grateful for all feedback received, and thanks everyone for their participation.</p>

			1 respondent expressed that the validity of the consultation could be called into question as a result of the most recent DMRB guidance not being met.	#00004657	N	LRCH notes and appreciates the comment. However as set out in this Report (document ref 5.1), LRCH believes its consultation was robust and conducted lawfully.
			1 respondent raised that information addressed to them was labelled incorrectly.	#00005065	N	LRCH apologises for any error in address data. As set out in this Report (document ref 5.1), the notification leaflets were one part of a wider range of activities to ensure people are aware that consultation is taking place and know how to get involved.
			1 respondent objected to the fact that LRCH had included a draft DCO as part of the consultation, stating they felt this was presumptuous and gave the impression that consultation was a tick box exercise.	#00006280	N	LRCH wanted to ensure as much information as possible was available at the time to help respondents provide informed feedback.
	Data gathering	1	1 respondent questioned why LRCH requested ethnicity, age and gender information.	#00003296	N	LRCH invited respondents to provide demographic information. This was optional. The intention of these questions was to help establish whether engagement was reflective of the demographics for the local area.

Usability and accessibility of the consultation and materials	16	7 respondents felt that the consultation was not accessible or easy to find.	#00003443 #00003588 #00005116 #00003340 #00003490 #00003249 #00003465	N	<p>The consultation was widely promoted, using a combination of direct mail, adverts in local newspapers, email notifications, social media and coverage in local and national press.</p> <p>The website address was widely publicised and easy to find via a search engine. The website received 27,569 unique visitors and the virtual exhibition space received 39,265 visits. A freephone telephone number was also available and widely advertised, and hard copies of materials were available to order.</p> <p>The 2020 consultation received a significantly higher volume of responses than the 2015 consultation, demonstrating that the consultation was sufficiently promoted and accessible.</p>
		5 respondents raised that the materials were not easily accessible or clear.	#00003361 #00004911 #00002989 #00002844 #00004829	N	<p>LRCH published a range of information. As part of the suite of consultation documents, LRCH produced a Guide to Consultation, which provided a summary overview of proposals, and a non-technical summary of the PEIR in addition to the full suite of technical materials.</p>
		3 respondents raised that they could not find 'The Guide'.	#00003552 #00003428 #00003422	N	<p>The Guide to Consultation was available via several areas of the website, the consultation platform and the virtual exhibition space.</p>
		1 respondent stated that it was difficult to navigate all of the documentation.	#00006280	N	<p>Additionally, contact details, including a freephone and email address were widely published should anyone need help finding specific documentation, or to order a hard copy.</p>

Usability and accessibility of the consultation materials: Questionnaire	4	1 respondent raised that it would be beneficial if they could switch between questions on the online questionnaire.	#00004956	N	The consultation questionnaire platform allowed for people to go back and forth between questions.
		1 respondent raised that the option to select two sentiments within one question (about 'how did you hear about consultation') would've been beneficial.	#00005199	N	LRCH has noted this response. The question was intended to establish the primary source, however LRCH acknowledges that multiple options could have been offered, given that people may have heard from different communication methods.
		1 respondent raised that the questionnaire was not accessible.	#00004635	N	LRCH has noted this feedback. More than 1,000 respondents used the online questionnaire, evidencing that it was accessible. LRCH also ensured that a variety of response mechanisms were available, including email and freepost, to ensure that technical issues did not prevent anyone from providing their feedback.
		1 respondent raised that the questions presented did not leave room for discussion and that some questions were too myopic.	#00004749	N	Each question included space for open responses, to ensure that people could provide feedback in their own words and on topics of their choice.
Usability and accessibility of the consultation materials: Digital	10	8 respondents raised that the virtual consultation room did not work on a mobile.	#00002989 #00002891 #00002823 #00003185 #00003165 #00003063 #00003029 #00004986	N	During the early days of consultation, LRCH received some feedback and queries, via calls or emails, specific to technical issues relating to the website or the virtual exhibition space. These were immediately investigated and resolved. Actions taken include: A lower resolution version of the virtual exhibition room was made available, with visitors able to select on entry

			2 respondents raised that the PDF plans did not load on computers due to the file size.	#00002844 #00003305	N	Compressed versions of some larger PDF files, including the Illustrative Masterplan and Land Plans, were made available on the website. Hard copies were also available to order on request.
Language used in the consultation materials	18		15 respondents raised that the language used in the questionnaire was biased and leading, several respondents believed that the information was inauthentic, confusing and political.	#00002746 #00003431 #00003439 #00004748 #00004819 #00004950 #00004990 #00005040 #00005058 #00005065 #00005071 #00005088 #00005141 #00005174 #00006272	N	As set out in this Report (document ref 5.1), LRCH considers that consultation was accurate, robust and had an appropriate reach. The 2015 and the 2020 PEIRs reflected the information that was available at the time of each consultation and was an accurate representation of information available at that time.
			3 respondents raised that there are contradicting statements in the consultation materials and plans.	#00004657 #00003537 #00005230	N	LRCH do not consider that an error on labelling of one of the maps (incorrect road labelled in Thurrock) and discrepancy in numbers on one of the digital banners this had a significant impact on the substance of consultation.
Opposition to the consultation	2		2 respondents opposed the consultation, stating that many people do not know about it, that the process was inaccurate, flawed and dishonest, resulting in lack of confidence that staff are	#00005190 #00006280	N	As set out in this Report (document ref 5.1), LRCH considers that consultation was accurate, robust and had an appropriate reach. The 2015 and the 2020 PEIRs reflected the information that was available at the time of each consultation and was an accurate representation of information available at that time.

			knowledgeable and can be trusted.			Residents were informed about the consultation through multiple methods, including direct mail, adverts in local newspapers, notifications online and social media. LRCH described the Proposed Development to a sufficient extent for the Secretary of State to enable to designate it as an NSIP.
Lack of information/ evidence presented at the consultation	59	5 respondents expressed that they were supportive of the ideas put forward, but they felt there was a lack of evidence/plans/images to support the narrative.	#00004675 #00005178 #00005174 #00002943 #00005241	N	The 2020 PEIR reflected the available information at the time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail.	
		2 respondents expressed concern at the lack of supporting evidence and detail within the PEIR.	#00006280 #00004713	N		
		1 respondent wanted less 'glossy' material in favour of a stripped back local resident impact case study.	#00002988	N	LRCH published a range of information. As part of the suite of consultation documents, LRCH produced a Guide to Consultation, which provided a summary overview of proposals, and a non- technical summary of the PEIR in addition to the full suite of technical materials.	
		7 respondents raised that there was insufficient detail about accessibility proposals to provide an informed response.	#00002941 #00003422 #00004675 #00005273 #00005018 #00004985 #00004984	N	The 2020 PEIR reflected the available information at the time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail for people to provide a response.	

			8 respondents raised that there was insufficient detail about the transport strategy to provide an informed response.	#00004952 #00003344 #00004780 #00004679 #00004952 #00005269 #00005174 #00004956	N	
			10 respondents raised that there was a lack of detail with regards to environmental enhancements and mitigation to provide an informed response.	#00003300 #00003140 #00003086 #00003446 #00004920 #00006264 #00005253 #00005158 #00004965 #00003447	N	
			6 respondents raised that there was insufficient detail of proposed cycle routes to provide an informed response.	#00003428 #00004657 #00004952 #00004920 #00005174 #00005281	N	
			6 respondents raised that there was a lack of detail regarding noise and light pollution during the construction and operation	#00004946 #00005182 #00004768 #00005281 #00003529 #00005178	N	

			1 respondent raised that there was a lack of detail regarding sustainability.	#00006264	N	
			2 respondents raised that there was insufficient detail regarding the construction plan.	#00005178 #00004952	N	
			1 respondent raised that there was a lack of detail regarding the drainage strategy.	#00003143	N	
			5 respondents raised that they could not find information about plans to protect and showcase local history and archaeological and cultural heritage features.	#00002878 #00003422 #00003592 #00002811 #00005174	N	
			1 respondent raised that there was a lack of consideration / mention of Gravesham in materials, which they believe needs community/environmental improvements.	#00004818	N	
			1 respondent raised that there was a lack of evidence to support enforcement of parking provisions.	#00004956	N	An off-site parking strategy has been developed 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). LRCH is confident that the Demand Management Plan and Ticketing Strategy will incentivise transport by active and sustainable modes and reduce travel to the Resort by car. LRCH will monitor parking on an ongoing basis and work with Local Authorities.

			3 respondents raised that there was a lack of detail with regards to Gates 1 and 2.	#00003404 #00005178 #00004713	N	LRCH's DCO application allows for flexibility around the detailed design and content of the London Resort, to enable attractions to be updated or replaced over time, in line with changing customer tastes and expectations, to ensure that it always has a fresh appeal to visitors. The detail of content of the theme parks (Gates 1 and 2) is therefore not part of the DCO application.
	References to other developments in the area	3	1 respondent welcomed LRCH acknowledging Highways England's proposed developments in the consultation materials.	#00003537	N	LRCH note this response.
			2 respondents expressed objection at the reliance on Lower Thames Crossing for this to be successful, and the lack of reference to the scheme in the consultation.	#00004829 #00004818		London Resort is not reliant on the delivery of Lower Thames Crossing (LTC). Notwithstanding this, traffic modelling has been undertaken in forecast scenarios with and without the LTC and LTC is included in the model coverage.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

Organisation	Issue Summary	Regard had to response
Northfleet Harbour Restoration Trust	NRHT was established to restore a derelict and land-locked harbour to create and provide public access to a maritime community amenity	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent also emphasised the unique qualities of the Harbour, including its capacity to integrate new and established communities via footpaths and cycleways, while providing access to heritage features archaeological features, while providing physical and viewing access to the river.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent expressed support for LRCH's transport approach, notably the use of river transport.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent indicated strong support for LRCH project site and riverside location, and to create new habitats.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent indicated strong support for LRCH's approach to sustainability.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent expressed support for LRCH proposals for accessibility and inclusivity.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment. ferry
	The respondent expressed a desire to see Broadness Marsh, which is currently beneath landfill recreated as saltings, with the extension of	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment. 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

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	Broadness Creek. This will restore a good quality natural environment and allow the established Broadness Cruising Club to remain.	wetlands and saltmarsh as set out in the ES Appendix 11.7: Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7)
	The respondent states that it is pleased to see that the potential benefits for local traders and leisure destinations are being considered. It hopes that the local environment and heritage will be acknowledged and promoted within the resort and its facilities.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
RSPB	The Swanscombe Peninsula is an outstanding mosaic of grasslands, wetlands, scrub, inter-tidal habitats and brownfield features supporting a nationally important assemblage of invertebrates and a rich birdlife. The range and breadth of surveys conducted to date, demonstrate that the Swanscombe Peninsula’s rich wildlife assemblage and supporting priority habitats are in urgent need of designating as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	<p>LRCH has been undertaking environmental surveys and assessment since 2012. As a result, we know a great deal about the environmental conditions on the Kent 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 old industrial structures. The area has been largely left, unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be 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>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>
	25 Year Environment Plan The government’s 25 Year Environment Plan commits to	LRCH has noted the comment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>“creating or restoring 500,000 hectares of wildlife-rich habitat outside the protected site network focusing on priority habitats”¹ and developing a Nature Recovery Network (NRN). The Swanscombe Peninsula should lie at the heart of such a network within the Thames Estuary.</p>	
	<p>Surveys conducted for and on behalf of the developer recognise that the project site is of national importance for its invertebrate populations. The respondent outlined the number and range of invertebrate species having been identified as located on the site.</p>	<p>LRCH is proposing a series of habitat enhancements and management interventions to ensure that 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>The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.1.11.7) identifies how visitor access to the retained habitats outside the Resort area will be carefully managed to avoid human disturbance to sensitive habitats and species, whilst allowing access to other less sensitive areas for the purposes of environmental education and awareness.</p> <p>An invertebrate mitigation strategy has been developed and included at Appendix 12.3 of Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 6.1.12.3).</p>
	<p>Appendix 4.1 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report provides an assessment of eleven reasonable alternative site options in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Directive. This comparison of environmental effects within such an assessment should be accurate. There is a clear and urgent need for the applicant to re-assess their alternative sites as a range of considerations have not been incorporated as part of the environmental effects at Swanscombe.</p>	<p>The full consideration of alternative sites and site selection process is detailed in full in Chapter 4 ‘Project development and alternatives’ (document ref 6.1., Chapter 4).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>We commend the quality of the ornithological surveys conducted to date which demonstrate the site’s significant importance.</p> <p>Surveys in 2015 recognised these as “regionally important” within the Ecological Appraisal (paragraph 1.7, page 508). These recorded 54 breeding species, eleven of these species are on the red list of Birds of Conservation Concern (BoCC)3/Species of Principal Importance4, seven are recognised as rare breeding birds5 and three are Schedule 1 species6. For context, the 10-year mean (2010-2019) for breeding bird species at RSPB Rainham Marshes is 51 species.</p> <p>The report analysing the 2015 results show that records returned from the Kent Biological Records Centre indicate 89 species have bred at least once at the project site since 1980. Paragraph 2.3.4 (page 512) indicates that such an assemblage could be considered as nationally important as it exceeds the threshold of 85 species. We recognise that this figure does not relate to the breeding bird assemblage for that year, but it does highlight the ornithological diversity of the site.</p> <p>Whilst analysis of the 2020 breeding bird surveys is awaited, Tables EDP A4.3 and EDP A4.4 (page 105) show</p>	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes the comment regarding quality of ornithological surveys.</p> <p>Breeding bird assemblage has been valued at the regional level due to the presence of 77 breeding species, in line with the 2015 report, which based the assessment on the criteria set out by Fuller (1980). Breeding bird surveys were extensive in 2020 and included targeted survey for some species, including black redstart and spotted crane. The figure of 89 breeding species was taken from desk study data spanning many years. Some of the diversity can be attributed to changes in national trends and the variability of habitats within the site over time.</p> <p>Further information can be found in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12)</p>
--	--	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	that 82 species were recorded across the site. 34 are listed as Birds of Conservation Concern and 14 as Species of Principal Importance.	
	Both the wintering bird surveys have not included the Benfleet and Southend Marshes Special Protection Area (SPA) when setting out the legislative context of their surveys. This omission should be rectified for the purpose of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).	LRCH has noted the comment. Benfleet and Southend Marshes are situated c.19km from the Project Site. European Sites included as IEFs were agreed with Natural England through consultation. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12)
	The respondent also set out details of their regard, vision and aspirations for The Greater Thames Estuary as one of the most important wildlife areas in Europe.	LRCH has noted the comment.
Kent Wildlife Trust	The respondent was concerned about the lack of reference to the Government's 25 Year Plan for the Environment and the related government targets in the consultation documents.	LRCH note this response
	The respondent expressed concern that the proposals would result in a loss of biodiversity, contrary to national and local planning policy.	ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12) provides a range of mitigation measures to ensure the Proposed Development meets national and local planning policy, and provides an overall net gain to biodiversity.
	The respondent concurred with the scoping of the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar and Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar for further assessment and highlighted the need for a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).	LRCH notes this comment and can confirm that an HRA will be undertaken as part of the project
	The respondent requested more information on the impacts and	Further information on those items is now provided within Chapter 12: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity of the ES (document ref 6.1.12). Furthermore, Appendix 12.3: Ecological

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>potential mitigation associated with noise, light, water levels and quality and breeding and wintering bird surveys.</p>	<p>Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref: 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>
	<p>The respondent does not agree with the assessment summary within Table 12.5: Ecology Impact Assessment Summary relating to the direct loss of functionally linked land as a result of construction activities.</p>	<p>The wintering wildfowl and wader assemblage within the Project Site has been valued at the international level and functionally linked land is considered within ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12) and HRA (document ref 6.2.12.4) as a part of a European Site. However, within an EclA the effect may not necessarily be significant at the level at which that IEF is valuable. Therefore, although impacts are upon an IEF valued at the international level, effects are considered to be significant at the District level only. It is true that the Proposed Development will not result in the loss of all functionally linked resources to the designated bird species populations.</p>
	<p>The respondent suggested that the information in Table 12.5 does not present an accurate reflection of impacts to functionally linked land. The existing saltmarsh, and proposed creation of salt marsh are likely to be impacted by visual, aural and lighting disturbance from the ferry port and entrance to the park. The respondent is also concerned about the impacts of lighting and noise on Botany Marsh and Blackduck Marsh, both of which lie directly adjacent to the proposed theme park footprint and associated infrastructure. The respondent requests that these impacts should be assessed using a detailed lighting assessment and noise assessment for ecological receptors and impacts should be avoided through redesigning the resort to create significant and suitable buffer zones.</p>	<p>Lighting, noise and visual disturbance effects have been considered within ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12) and HRA (document ref 6.2.12.4) upon retained habitats, including those functionally linked to European Sites.</p>
	<p>The respondent is concerned that paragraph 12.168 acknowledges that</p>	<p>To provide further detail on the application of the mitigation hierarchy a briefing note was submitted to NE on 21 August 2020 (Ecology Briefing Note - Natural England Consultation, a copy of which is</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>despite future updates to the ecological mitigation and enhancement strategy it is predicted that significant negative residual effects will remain, including “the wintering waterfowl and wading bird assemblage, wintering terrestrial bird assemblage, breeding bird assemblage”.</p>	<p>enclosed at the rear of Appendix 12.5; document ref 6.2.12.5)). In addition, Chapter 12: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12) has been updated to include information on how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied.</p>
	<p>The respondent is concerned that the North Downs SAC and Peters Pit SAC have been screened out on the basis of previous conversations with Natural England, and suggests that transport infrastructure for this scheme is likely to increase levels of air pollution, providing a potential pathway for impact to both SACs through the exceedance of critical values for air pollutants. The respondent suggests that these impact pathways are further explored and that Natural England be re-consulted, particularly given heightened focus on associated transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>The potential for traffic-generated air quality impacts on the North Downs Woodland SAC has been screened within Appendix 12.4: Habitat Regulations Assessment (document ref: 6.2.12.4). Although traffic modelling data does not extend to that distance, significant air quality effects are not considered likely because significant traffic increased (AADT >1000) are east- and northbound, towards the M25 and away from both SACs.</p>
	<p>The respondent is concerned about impacts to the Medway Estuary and Marshes SSSI and the South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI and in particular that the PEIR erroneously refers to the Inner Thames Marshes SSSI as Rainham Marshes SSSI.</p>	<p>Impacts upon Medway Estuary and Marshes SSSI and the South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI are considered under the umbrella of their respective over-arching SPA/Ramsar designations within both Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 6.1.12) and the HRA (document ref 6.2.12.4). References to 'Rainham Marshes SSSI' have been updated.</p>
	<p>The respondent advised that a construction environment management plan is required to ensure that Darenth Woods SSSI will</p>	<p>A Construction Environmental Management Plan will be secured as a requirement of the Development Consent Order (DCO). The Environmental Statement includes a thorough assessment of the potential for traffic-generated air quality impacts to Darenth Woods SSSI both during construction and operation. Chapter 16 'Air Quality' of the ES (document ref 6.1.16) concludes that</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>not be indirectly impacted by construction traffic through measures such as dust suppression, noise mitigation and light pollution mitigation. Further, operational impacts arising from air quality impacts should be assessed using an air quality assessment which accounts for increased Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT).</p>	<p>(during construction) "With implementation of recommended mitigation, it is anticipated that residual effects will be insignificant."</p>
	<p>The respondent stated that West Thurrock Lagoon & Marshes SSSI is approximately 1 km from the Kent Project Site and is designated to protect wintering waders and wildfowl that use the intertidal mudflats. Impacts from the construction of the theme park, including lighting, noise disturbance (particularly short sharp loud noises from activities such as piling), impacts to water quality and disturbance from construction vessels must be accounted for. At present, the assessment for this site only refers to functionally linked land.</p>	<p>Disturbance, water and air quality effects upon West Thurrock Lagoon and Marshes SSSI are considered within Chapter 12: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref: 6.1.12) of the ES.</p>
	<p>The respondent stated that the PEIR states that only four LWSs are scoped in for further assessment. It is acknowledged that a description of all LWSs is provided but no ecological justification is given for scoping out all but those within or adjacent to the DCO boundary. It should be assessed whether impacts will arise from associated transport infrastructure, from increased transport in the local</p>	<p>Five LWSs are scoped in to the EclA within Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 6.1.12) based on recommendations made through consultation and the scoping opinion. No effect-receptor pathways were identified for further sites and those sites are therefore scoped out of the assessment</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>area and air quality impacts (i.e. the exceedance of a sites critical load).</p>	
	<p>The respondent expressed concern about potential impacts to Botany Marsh LWS, which supports species including otter, water vole, reptiles and both breeding and wintering birds. They cited that Botany Marsh LWS is recorded to be functionally linked to nearby European sites as a high tide roost for qualifying species such as shelduck, and other species which contribute to the designated non-breeding waterbird assemblages. The Red List species Nightingale and Starling were also recorded during the breeding bird survey at Botany Marsh LWS.</p>	<p>Potential impacts on Botany Marshes LWS are discussed within the Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology & Biodiversity chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.12). The LWS itself is not considered to be functionally linked to any European Sites (based on survey work of the Project Site). Shelduck roosts were present on Botany Marsh West only.</p>
	<p>Citing paragraph 12.169 of the PEIR, which acknowledges the likely negative impacts from aural and visual disturbance to Botany Marsh LWS, the respondent disputed the assertion that these impacts will be “minor negative”. Their reason is that development is proposed directly adjacent to the LWS with no proposed buffer zone. They expressed concern about impacts arising from changes to the water table because of ditch habitat and increased hardstanding. They requested that we reduce residual impacts before considering compensation. They noted that a buffer zone will be required to mitigate impacts and advised the</p>	<p>Retention of Botany Marsh West is not considered possible. Effects upon the LWS are split into disturbance and damage effects and are assessed as between moderate and major negative. Some buffering from the development is included in the form of ditches and hedgerow planting.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	retention and enhancement of Botany Marsh west to support and enhance the LWS.	
	The respondent expressed concern about the impact of the loss of Floodplain Grazing Marsh and ditches in Botany Marsh west, citing loss of habitat linked to the LWS.	LRCH is committed to making a positive impact to local ecological habitats, while providing opportunities for public access to enjoy the space. The Landscape Strategy (Appendix 11.7 of Chapter 11 of the ES) includes the retention and enhancement of existing habitats situated outside of the construction zone, and the creation of new habitats of ecological value, both inside and outside the Resort area.
	The respondent noted a lack of impact analysis regarding ancient woodland in the PEIR, asking that direct and indirect impacts to ancient woodland are taken into account when determining the suitability of this proposal. They cited potential impacts from air quality and from construction and operational traffic.	The ES considers air quality and direct impacts upon designated sites and habitats along the A2 corridor. ASNW has been considered as part of the AQ assessment in Chapter 17 of the ES (document ref 6.1.17) and is included as an IEF within Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 6.1.12) following feedback from consultees.
	The respond expressed concern that the PEIR under-represents onsite the area classified as Open Mosaic Habitat on Previously Developed Land (OMHPDL), citing OMHPDL priority habitat classification criteria.	The extent of OMHPDL across the Project Site has been re-assessed based upon the priority habitat inventory, historic satellite data and site knowledge. The area described as OMHPDL is significantly larger than previously assessed, but does not include areas of dense scrub or obviously capped/landscaped habitat. Although the Priority Reference was used as part of the re-assessment process, professional judgement was used to include/exclude areas considered to not meet the criteria for inclusion as OMHPDL. The updated assessment is shown in Chapter 12: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).
	The respondent expressed concern about our approach to defining OMHPDL, particularly in terms of lost habitat in the northern part of the main theme park development. Citing the phase 1 habitat maps which identify a 3ha section as OMHPDL in the PEIR, they counter that the development will take approximately 25ha of the 45ha of the OMHPDL priority habitat inventory.	
	The respondent challenged our criteria for defining OMHPDL, citing the UKBAP	

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>Priority Habitat Description for OMHPDL.</p>	
	<p>Given their recommendation that we should extend the classification of OMHPDL, the respondent cited implications for the level of net biodiversity loss, and indicated that habitat compensation will required in line with the NPPF.</p>	
	<p>The respondent expressed concern about the loss of Botany Marsh west, particularly in terms of potential effects on priority Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh habitat, and on connected habitat in Botany Marsh LWS to the immediate east.</p>	<p>The BNG has been updated and now includes Botany Marsh East as part of the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic. Although the majority of CFGM will be lost, the wider wetland mosaic will be enhanced through addition of new ditches and ponds to replace those lost and scrub and reedbed management. Hydrological impacts on the LWS are considered within Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 6.1.12).</p>
	<p>The respondent recommended further work to assess impacts on Botany Marsh west and how they can be mitigated and compensated for, citing concern about loss of CFGM, and suggesting that work carried out so far would fail to comply with the mitigation hierarchy. The respondent advocated for the retention of Botany Marsh west to mitigate for indirect impacts on the LWS and loss of priority habitats and species.</p>	<p>Retention of Botany Marsh West is not considered possible. To provide further detail on the application of the mitigation hierarchy a briefing note was submitted to NE on 21 August 2020 (Ecology Briefing Note - Natural England Consultation, a copy of which is enclosed at the rear of document ref 6.2.12.5). NE have provided no further comments. In addition, Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 6.1.12) has been updated to include information on how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied. Multiple sites suitable for the delivery of the project were considered (do we have evidence of this) and it was deemed that the site being put forwarded presented the best option from a delivery, economic and ecology perspective. Therefore the process of site selection was the point at which avoidance measures were considered.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern about the loss of priority wetland features within the developed area of the site, and the further indirect impact this may have on wetland features within the DCO boundary and adjacent to the developed area. They sought reassurance that there will not</p>	<p>Hydrological impacts upon the Project Site are considered within Chapter 17 of the ES and in relation to ecological features within Chapter 12 (document ref 6.1.17 and 6.1.12). A drainage strategy has been designed in order to limit hydrological change across the Project Site.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	be impacts to the water table as the result of the development, and clarity regarding the wider impact of lost wetland habitats.	
	The respondent requested clarification about the status of the CTRL Wetlands regarding previous compensation.	We also understand that the CTRL Wetlands represent previous compensation for the Channel Tunnel Rail Link. Information on mitigation as part of HS1 is not freely available due to its age.
	The respondent noted their support of Buglife’s comments.	Covered in response to Buglife.
	The respondent requested that we account for the presence of the ‘breeding bird assemblage’ on the Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA in the HRA and subsequent mitigation, including the timing of proposed works, and encouraged us to prioritise avoidance of impacts in line with the mitigation hierarchy.	Impacts upon qualifying features of the Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar are assessed within the HRA. Timing and mitigation measures are considered within the 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3)
	Further, a detailed mitigation strategy should be drafted for further consultation which safeguards and enhances habitat for breeding and wintering birds, including red list species such as nightingale and linnet. We refer you to more detailed comments made by the RSPB for a detailed discussion of ornithological issues, which we fully support.	Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 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 the 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2. 12.3)
	The respondent recommended that we review and update bat emergence/re-entry surveys following the results of previous surveys.	Emergence/re-entry surveys have been carried out on buildings and tunnels with bat roost suitability. Full details of the surveys undertaken are provided within Appendix 12.1: Ecology Baseline Report (document ref 6.2.12.1).
	The respondent provided details of bat foraging in the local area and expressed concern that a loss of foraging habitat on the peninsula	Appendix 12.10: General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation (document ref 6.2.12.10) are provided in lieu of information on a specific site, which include providing off-site land within the Greater Thames Nature Improvement Area. Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3) of the ES establishes a framework for the long-term delivery of

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>combined with indirect impacts through increased noise and light at key foraging sites is likely to negatively impact this species. The respondent encouraged us to prioritise avoiding impacts above compensation but noted that without details of the location of proposed biodiversity offsetting, it is not possible to determine impacts to the local bat populations, or whether this offsetting will ensure sufficient access to foraging habitat.</p>	<p>ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern that key foraging sites are set to be lost under the current proposals.</p>	<p>General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation' are provided within ES Appendix 12.10, which include providing off-site land within the Greater Thames Nature Improvement Area. The 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long-term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>
	<p>The respondent encouraged LRCH to apply the mitigation hierarchy and prioritise the avoidance of impacts by retaining key foraging habitats and using sensitive lighting schemes and noise mitigation.</p>	<p>The 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>
	<p>The respondent noted that our doormouse surveys indicate the presence of a population of dormice at Blackduck Marsh and along the southern transport corridor. They expressed concern about the potential loss of suitable dormouse habitat, noting additional concern about the loss of connectivity between the population along the 'transport corridor' and that at Blackduck Marsh.</p>	<p>The 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The respondent requested a detailed mitigation strategy that maintains and enhances doormouse both across the site and with the wider landscape.</p>	
	<p>The respondent expressed concern about the loss of habitat for breeding water voles Botany Marsh east (LWS) and Botany Marsh west, and suggested that the proposals do not appear to follow best practice in the PEIR with respect to water vole and otter habitat.</p> <p>The respondent encouraged LRCH to reassess the current proposal for mitigation and compensation proposals.</p>	<p>Although Botany Marsh West will be lost to the development, Botany Marsh East will be enhanced for its potential to support water vole and otter and connected to Black Duck Marsh through a new boundary wetland. Further details of the water vole mitigation strategy can be found within the 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3).</p>
	<p>The respondent encouraged LRCH to increase opportunities for otters and water voles by both protecting and enhancing the entirety of Botany Marsh and increasing connectivity to Blackduck Marsh.</p>	<p>The 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>
	<p>The respondent recommended we submit a reptile mitigation plan should for consultation prior to DCO submission.</p>	<p>The 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>
	<p>The respondent noted the presence of eight nationally scarce plants which are classified as nationally important and expressed their concern about potential loss of vulnerable species particularly.</p> <p>They also expressed concerns about potential impacts from ditch profiling</p>	<p>The 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>and habitat management, recommending that these activities do not negatively impact this wildlife.</p>	
	<p>The respondent requested a detailed mitigation and compensation strategy to protect and enhance opportunities for these plant species and recommended the inclusion of Man Orchid. They also requested updated surveys prior to development.</p>	<p>The 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern that the PEIR underestimates the current level of biodiversity on site, and that proposed habitat creation and enhancement measures will not be sufficient to achieve biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>The BNG calculations have been updated in line with the recommendations made by consultees and are considered accurate in their portrayal of the Project Site's biodiversity value. Botany Marsh west and east have been incorporated into the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic grouping, and large areas of the peninsula and Ebbsfleet Valley have been included as OMHPDL. Condition ratings have been updated and are considered appropriate based on the guidance and detailed survey of the Project Site. Justifications and explanation of assumptions made can be found within Appendix 12.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment report (document ref 6.2.12.2).</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed the opinion that our calculations underrepresent the quantity of high distinctiveness priority habitat on site, particularly areas of Floodplain Wetland Mosaic and OMHPDL.</p>	
	<p>The respondent challenged the classification of Botany Marsh east and west as low distinctiveness modified grassland in the PEIR and suggested these should be classified as Floodplain Wetland Mosaic habitat type.</p>	
	<p>The respondent expressed the opinion that the area meets the criteria for classification as high distinctiveness Floodplain Wetland Mosaic habitat and suggests that using this habitat classification and applying a moderate condition assessment would lead to</p>	

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>the addition of 112.32 units to the overall baseline total.</p> <p>The respondent expressed the opinion that the extent of OMHPDL habitat on site has been underestimated. Although they noted that without more detailed information, they cannot provide exact estimates, their broad estimation is that at least 20 ha of OMHPDL has been wrongly classified as lower distinctiveness habitat. They suggest that were these reclassified to OMHPDL, this would significantly increase in the number of biodiversity units in the baseline total.</p> <p>The respondent expressed concern that much of the habitat across the site is classified as in poor or fairly poor condition, and suggests the condition assessment has not taken account of the condition criteria set out in the Defra Metric Technical Supplement. The respondent therefore requests a more detailed justification for applying these condition scores to correspond with Defra guidance.</p> <p>The respondent also expressed concern that the assessment does not take account of finer grain variations of condition across the site and therefore that areas of habitat in better condition have not been adequately accounted for. They recommended a finer grain assessment of habitat type and</p>	
--	---	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>condition accompanied by a detailed report explaining the condition scores.</p>	
	<p>The respondent challenged the PEIR's classification of all OMHPDL as being in fairly poor condition based on the Defra Metric Technical Supplement.</p>	
	<p>The respondent challenged the PEIR's condition classification of the site as fairly poor for any part of the site, both in terms of botany and in terms of invertebrate habitat, citing nationally important invertebrate species present on the site.</p> <p>While the respondent noted that they do not have sufficient detailed information to make give a firmer estimate for the unit value of OMHPDL on this site, they expressed the opinion that the PEIR has underestimated the condition and suggested that the unit score for this habitat type has been significantly underestimated.</p>	
	<p>The respondent noted our assessment of mixed scrub habitat types in the area as being in fairly poor condition, providing assessment criteria for being in good condition.</p>	
	<p>The respondent challenged our assessment of the scrub habitation condition as poor, and requested further clarification. They suggested that a reclassification of this habitat type to moderate condition would</p>	

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>significantly increase in the baseline total of units.</p> <p>In addition to these particular habitats, we would recommend a review of condition scores, referring closely to relevant condition assessment guidance, is made for all medium and high distinctiveness grassland habitats, high distinctiveness woodland habitats, salt marshes and reedbeds. We suspect that condition scores have been significantly underestimated for each of these habitat types.</p>	
	<p>The respondent challenged the scores given for connectivity, suggesting that they do not correspond with Defra guidance, and that we should the Defra Metric connectivity tool to amend Appendix 12.3.</p>	<p>Connectivity scores have been given using the DEFRA Metric connectivity tool where appropriate and using the interim guidance where the connectivity tool was not applicable.</p>
	<p>The respondent noted that all habitat parcels have been scored as “Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy” in the strategic significance column, and advised that Kent Nature Partnership is currently devising criteria for using this multiplier across the county. The respond recommended consulting the KNP to conform to emerging local practice.</p> <p>The respondent also noted that much of the site is located within the Thameside Green Corridors Biodiversity Opportunity Area and would therefore likely justify higher</p>	<p>The strategic significance column of the Metric has been updated to value habitats targeted within NIAs and BOAs correctly.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	strategic significance scores for some habitat types that correspond to relevant Biodiversity Opportunity Area targets.	
	The respondent expressed concern that the value of onsite habitat enhancement has been overestimated owing to underestimates of baseline condition, although they noted limited detail about onsite compensation measures meaning they were unable to make detailed comments in this respect.	Details of enhancement and management measures have been detailed within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3), which will be secured as a requirement of the Development Consent Order (DCO).
	The respondent noted that Botany Marsh east and west should be classified as Floodplain Wetland Mosaic rather than modified grassland.	Botany Marsh west and east have been incorporated into the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic grouping for the purposes of assessing Biodiversity Net Gain.
	The respondent expressed concern that we have not given enough attention to enhancing and creating habitats to support terrestrial invertebrates, and recommended that specific attention is given to restoring suitable areas of OMHPDL for invertebrates in the retained areas of habitat in Broadness Marsh.	The 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.
	The respondent expressed doubt about the feasibility of achieving some of the condition scores outlined in the habitat enhancement section of Appendix 12.3.	The condition scores given to enhanced and created habitats within the updated BNG assessment are considered appropriate.
	The respondent noted that all habitat parcels have been scored as "Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy" in the strategic significance column, and	The strategic significance column of the Metric has been updated to value habitats targeted within NIAs and BOAs correctly.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>advised that Kent Nature Partnership is currently devising criteria for using this multiplier across the county. The respond recommended consulting the KNP to conform to emerging local practice.</p> <p>The respondent also noted that much of the site is located within the Thameside Green Corridors Biodiversity Opportunity Area and would therefore likely justify higher strategic significance scores for some habitat types that correspond to relevant Biodiversity Opportunity Area targets.</p>	
	<p>The respondent expressed concern that the value of onsite habitat enhancement has been overestimated owing to underestimates of baseline condition, although they noted limited detail about onsite compensation measures meaning they were unable to make detailed comments in this respect.</p>	<p>Details of enhancement and management measures have been detailed within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3), which will be secured as a requirement of the Development Consent Order (DCO).</p>
	<p>The respondent noted that Botany Marsh east and west should be classified as Floodplain Wetland Mosaic rather than modified grassland.</p>	<p>Botany Marsh west and east have been incorporated into the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic grouping for the purposes of assessing Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern that we have not given enough attention to enhancing and creating habitats to support terrestrial invertebrates, and recommended that specific attention is given to restoring suitable areas of OMHPDL for</p>	<p>The 'Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework' (document ref 6.2.12.3) establishes a framework for the long term delivery of ecological mitigation and management, which is to be secured through the Development Consent Order.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>invertebrates in the retained areas of habitat in Broadness Marsh.</p>	
	<p>The respondent expressed doubt about the feasibility of achieving some of the condition scores outlined in the habitat enhancement section of Appendix 12.3.</p>	<p>The condition scores given to enhanced and created habitats within the updated BNG assessment are considered appropriate.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed doubt about the feasibility of achieving a fairly good target condition score for salt marsh habitat enhancement and creation against the condition criteria set out in the Defra Metric Intertidal Habitat Technical Guidance for Intertidal Habitats. They recommended reviewing target condition criteria and either amending or providing detailed justification as appropriate.</p>	
	<p>While the respondent supported our commitment to funding and delivering an offsite habitat creation and enhancement compensation scheme, they expressed doubt that this will be achieved.</p>	<p>General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation' (document ref 6.2.12.10) are provided in lieu of information on a specific site, which include providing off-site land within the Greater Thames Nature Improvement Area.</p>
	<p>The respondent suggested that given their comments around biodiversity loss, habitat, distinctiveness and condition are taken into account, the biodiversity net loss of 335.2 units or 15.01% outlined in Appendix 12.3 is likely to double.</p>	<p>The amount of off-site habitat creation required has been updated following the update to the BNG assessment, the details of theoretical scenarios for off-site mitigation have been given in the BNG Assessment report (document ref 6.2.12.2).</p>
	<p>The respondent recommends that the following considerations are taken into account in developing an offsite compensation and net gain project:</p>	<p>General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation' (document ref 6.2.12.10) are provided in lieu of information on a specific site, which include providing off-site land within the Greater Thames Nature Improvement Area (NIA). The spatial risk multiplier allows for no reduction in value when habitat is created within the same National Character Area (NCA) or LPA. The Greater Thames NIA lies within the Greater Thames NCA.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be adequate compensation for loss of OMHPDL and associated habitats supporting invertebrate communities • Any offsite compensation should be located outside nationally and internationally designated areas where maintaining good condition is an obligation under relevant legislation and are therefore inapplicable as habitat compensation and biodiversity net gain receptor sites • Metric calculations should exclude any species-specific compensation for negative impacts on legislatively protected species. <p>If compensation needs to take place at a significant distance from the proposed development site, then metric calculations should be appropriately discounted using the spatial risk multiplier in line with Defra guidance</p>	
	<p>The respondent commented on, and challenged, a number of issues relating to the assessment, selection and underlying policy support for the Swanscombe site as selected by LRCH.</p>	<p>The full consideration of alternative sites and site selection process is detailed in full in Chapter 4: Project development and alternatives (document ref 6.1.4), and within Chapter 12: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern that Lower Thames Crossing and</p>	<p>A cumulative assessment has been included within Chapter 12 of the ES (document ref 6.1.12) and the HRA (document ref 6.2.12.4) and includes both the Lower Thames Crossing and residential development around Ebbsfleet.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	Ebbfleet Central are not included in Appendix 20.1.	
--	---	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

<p>KENEX Tram</p>	<p>The respondent expressed the view that the transport solutions proposed are short term, and shortcomings include risk of not meeting targets on air quality, carbon efficiency, sustainability and other environmental impacts.</p> <p>They also proposed an alternative sustainable transport strategy centred around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 2km heavy rail link between the London Resort and Ebbsfleet International Station. • Construction of a supply consolidation hub adjacent to the A2 providing a rail link to the London Resort. The installation of a tramway link from the London Resort to the proposed Grays station to Ebbsfleet International station cross river tramway. <p>Respondent expressed interest in their proposal being included in LRCH's planning application.</p> <p>Respondent submitted a 24 page proposal, which has been reviewed by our technical team, who have met with Kenex on numerous occasions.</p>	<p>The Transport Strategy 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.</p> <p>LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>LRCH will continue to liaise with the KenEx tram service promoters to understand how their proposals could link to the London Resort. However, London Resort's transport proposals are not reliant on KenEx.</p>
--------------------------	--	---

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

--	--	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

<p>iSec the developers of Thames Enterprise Park (TEP)</p>	<p>Whilst supportive of the principle of development and regeneration, iSec's current position is to oppose The London Resort, subject to further discussion to understand how our concerns can be addressed and hopefully overcome</p>	<p>LRCH notes this comment.</p>
	<p>The respondent highlighted that a planning application (reference no. 18/01404/OUT) is currently being considered by Thurrock Council for Thames Enterprise Park (TEP), which is located on the site of the former Coryton oil refinery. The application is for up to 480,000sq.m of B2 and B8 employment floorspace and could employ circa 4,500 people, was submitted in 2018. The application is currently being considered by Thurrock Council.</p>	<p>LRCH notes this response and can confirm that this application has been taken into considered as part of the Planning Statement (document ref 7.4).</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed general concern about the impact of London Resort on the transport network north of the River Thames and is concerned that the potential impacts are properly assessed and mitigation provided.</p> <p>The respondent is particularly concerned about the impact of 2,500 car parking spaces in Tilbury. There is concern that this is properly considered as part of the assessment.</p>	<p>A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Following further assessment work, and as identified in the Transport Assessment, improvements are proposed to the Asda roundabout at Tilbury to improve access to the Resort car park located on land at the Port of Tilbury and to ensure that potential impacts can be effectively managed.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The assessment of the proposals at Tilbury should include the potential effect of The London Resort on the sustainable transport network in South Essex, and the potential effect of the strategic and local highway network, including M25 Junction 30, A13, A13/A1089 Junction and A13/A1014 Junction. The impact of vehicles accessing Tilbury from the north via LTC and being required to u-turn at A13/A1014 Roundabout – the roundabout which provides access to TEP – needs to be considered.</p>	<p>A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Consideration of sustainable travel routes in South Essex is available at Figure 10.3 of the Transport Assessment.</p>
	<p>The assessment work should consider the position with and without Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) in place. The assessment work should also include the cumulative effects of development at TEP and DP World.</p>	<p>A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Traffic modelling has been undertaken in forecast scenarios with and without the LTC and LTC is included in the model coverage. Cumulative impact assessments have also been conducted.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern that the proposed the Tilbury car park will not support or encourage sustainable travel to and from The London Resort.</p> <p>Will visitors be incentivised to use the Tilbury car park to prevent them travelling further round the M25 to access the Site?</p>	<p>A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (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 they will be looking to promote public transport as the main travel option to The London Resort.</p>
	<p>Tilbury railway station primarily serves a local east-west catchment through South Essex, and with no improvements to the sustainable</p>	<p>LRCH notes the comment.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	travel network this would not be an attractive option for visitors.	
	Due consideration should be made to make the Tilbury ferry terminal as accessible as possible by non-car modes, to provide travel choice for both visitors and staff travelling from north of the river.	LRCH noted the comment. A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Cycle provision will be made available on the ferry and active / public transport mechanisms will be in place south of the river to link with the Resort.
	It is unclear how staff who live north of the river would access The London Resort, and what provisions would be made to encourage sustainable, affordable journeys, and to deter car use. It is unclear whether any car parking would be provided for staff north of the river.	Since consultation a Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). This covers transport for both staff and visitors.
River Thames Society	The respondent expressed general objections to the Project based on overdevelopment of the site, increased traffic, destruction of valuable habitats and the potential impacts on noise and pollution. The respondent's preferences would be to regenerate the site to create green space with open access and cited the RSPB site at Purfleet/ Rainham as an example	<p>LRCH noted the comments regarding objections to the project and a preference for the site to be regenerated into green space. From the initial phase of the project, the location of London Resort has been carefully considered based upon a range of criteria, considering how benefits can be maximised and any negative impacts mitigated. Further information on the process of site selection is available in the ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4).</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 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>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		<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>
CPRE Kent	<p>The respondent express support for the principles of sustainability for further use of the river for freight, passengers and recreation</p> <p>The respondent raised concerns that the Application and associated documents do not provide enough information to adequately assess environmental impacts of the Resort.</p>	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes the comment.</p> <p>LRCH has been undertaking environmental surveys and assessment since 2012. As a result, we know a great deal about the environmental conditions on the Kent 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 old industrial structures. The area has been largely left, unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be unmanaged, it will eventually turn to scrub and the precious habitats will be lost.</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. More detail can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The Outline Sustainability Strategy considers both construction and operational phases of the Resort, including sustainable design and construction materials.</p> <p>LRCH has established an Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2) which identifies the approaches that will be followed to reduce the potential impacts of construction upon the environment.</p> <p>A DCO, if approved, means that comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will then be in place. This includes noise, air quality and visuals impact, which LRCH must adhere to.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The respondent raised concerns that forecasting for car park use is inadequate and doesn't account for an increase in visitors once Gate 2 opens in 2038 or for regular staff commuting.</p> <p>The respondent is concerned that traffic estimates do not reflect a 'worst case' scenario, such as during school holidays or at weekends.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (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 they will be looking to promote public transport as the main travel option to The London Resort.</p> <p>LRCH's Transport Assessments are based on operational days for 2025 (first full year of operation), 2029 (opening of Gate 2) and 2038 (Maturity), covering different times of day, including peak travel (am and pm) and peak arrival times. The 2020 PEIR reflected the available information at the time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail for consultation. Further detail is now available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information.</p> <p>The Public Transport Strategy sets out the baseline mode shares and distribution of visitors and staff and is summarised in the table below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Mode</th> <th>Gate 1 (2024)</th> <th>Gate 2 (2029)</th> <th>Maturity (2038)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Car</td> <td>55-60%</td> <td>45-50%</td> <td>35-40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rail</td> <td>25-30%</td> <td>28-33%</td> <td>30-35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>River</td> <td>10%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coach</td> <td>5%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Mode	Gate 1 (2024)	Gate 2 (2029)	Maturity (2038)	Car	55-60%	45-50%	35-40%	Rail	25-30%	28-33%	30-35%	River	10%	12%	15%	Coach	5%	9%	12%				
Mode	Gate 1 (2024)	Gate 2 (2029)	Maturity (2038)																							
Car	55-60%	45-50%	35-40%																							
Rail	25-30%	28-33%	30-35%																							
River	10%	12%	15%																							
Coach	5%	9%	12%																							
	<p>The respondent is concerned that forecasts for anticipated use of public transport for visiting the Resort may not be accurate, raising the following issues specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River transport services and slow and inadequate for increased traffic to the Resort. • There is no evidence that HS1 or the North Kent Line have capacity for increased traffic. 	<p>The Transport Strategy 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. Since consultation we have developed an enhanced Travel Demand Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1), we are working with rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy; details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) acknowledges that COVID-19 has the potential to impact a variety of health, social, economic and demographic indicators. This notes that 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 opening year of Gate One).</p> <p>LRCH is in discussion with local authorities and local transport operators to monitor 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. In cooperation with the above we are</p>																								

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COVID-19 restrictions are reducing operations on Eurostar services. • The respondent is not confident the estimated modal shift to public transport is correct. • The data underpinning forecasting may not represent peak period travel. 	<p>investigating the development of upgrades on the local network as well as investigating ways to reduce impacts on the local transport network.</p>																				
	<p>The respondent shares its disappointment that there are no plans to improve Swanscombe Station given its proximity to the Resort.</p>	<p>Discussions with network rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe.</p>																				
	<p>The respondent does not know if current train and bus timetables will enable Resort staff to travel to and from work by public transport according to their shifts.</p>	<p>LRCH has identified potential options for staff to use existing bus services, including the provision of staff shuttle buses. Staff travel is under consideration as part of the Travel Demand Management Strategy. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>																				
	<p>The respondent believes that there is little consideration for the cumulative traffic impact on the SRN and local roads from the construction and operation of the Resort alongside the development of Ebbsfleet Garden City and Lower Thames Crossing.</p>	<p>A robust assessment of traffic volumes has been considered based on scenarios with and without the Lower Thames Crossing and giving due consideration for emerging proposals at Ebbsfleet Garden City. Traffic modelling has been agreed with the local highway authorities and Highways England and a comprehensive Transport Assessment undertaken (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The Traffic Flows (document ref 6.2.9.2) associated with the London Resort have been fully considered as part of the Transport Assessment. As can be seen in this document, as a result of opening hours, it is considered that most traffic generated by the scheme would be generally outside of the conventional network peak hours. The Table below provides a breakdown on the numbers of vehicles expected into the London Resort on the Kent side.</p> <p>Table 9-7: The London Resort, Trip Generation (Kent Project Site)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Assessment Year</th> <th>AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)</th> <th></th> <th>PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)</th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2025</td> <td>107</td> <td>20</td> <td>199</td> <td>499</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2029</td> <td>111</td> <td>26</td> <td>288</td> <td>679</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)			Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	2025	107	20	199	499	2029	111	26	288	679
Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)																			
	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures																		
2025	107	20	199	499																		
2029	111	26	288	679																		

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		2038	112	26	347	978
		<p>To take account of these figures the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, could be upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. In addition, the Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.</p> <p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p> <p>LRCH are assessing the impacts of The London Resort and not LTC. The proposed development has been assessed using models that include LTC as well as without.</p>				
	The respondent agrees with Gravesham Borough Council's view that the traffic assessment needs to accommodate additional traffic in the A226 Galley Hill Road.	LRCH notes and appreciates this comment.				
	The respondent suggests incentives for the use of public transport, such as discounted tickets when arriving by public transport, and requests the applicant to assess their potential effectiveness.	A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). However, it is not feasible to offer free travel; this is discussed more within the Travel Demand Management Plan chapter of the Transport Assessment. The applicant is assessing alternative ideas to further incentivise active and sustainable travel.				
	The respondent is concerned about additional traffic and congestion on the A2.	<p>A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>Since consultation we have developed an enhanced Travel Demand Strategy (document ref 6.2.9.1), we are working with rail operators to develop a Rail Strategy; details are summarised within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and supporting information.</p>				

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The respondent is concerned about visitors parking cars on local streets or car parking spaces away from the Resort, including Bluewater.</p>	<p>Since consultation we have developed 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).</p>
	<p>The respondent believes there is a lack of information on ecological and wildlife impacts from the Resort.</p>	<p>The peninsula suffers from extensive areas of historical waste disposal, contamination and old industrial structures. The area has been largely left, unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be 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>The habitats present on the Swanscombe Peninsula are described in detail within ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p> <p>The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7) identifies how visitor access to the retained habitats outside the Resort area will be carefully managed to avoid human disturbance to sensitive habitats and species, whilst allowing access to other less sensitive areas for the purposes of environmental education and awareness.</p> <p>A specific invertebrate mitigation strategy has been developed and included in the Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (document ref 6.2.12.3).</p>
	<p>The respondent suggests an Ecological Construction Method Statement (ECMS) to outline proposed mitigation methods during construction phases.</p>	<p>LRCH notes and appreciates this suggestion.</p>
	<p>The respondent states that the Guide provides no detail on the biodiversity in the Peninsula and therefore the potential impact of the Resort cannot be estimated. Specific considerations include:</p>	<p>The peninsula suffers from extensive areas of historical waste disposal, contamination and old industrial structures. The area has been largely left, unmanaged for decades and if it continues to be unmanaged, it will eventually turn to scrub and the precious habitats will be lost.</p> <p>LRCH is committed to net gain in biodiversity. Retained habitat will be enhanced and managed in the long term to ensure biodiversity commitments are met.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development near the marshes. • Reduction of open space on the Peninsula in relation to foraging patterns • Noise disruption. • Light pollution impacting nocturnal wildlife. 	<p>A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits. Further information is available in the Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.2.11.7).</p> <p>The habitats present on the Swanscombe Peninsula are described in detail within ES Chapter 12 Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (document ref 6.1.12).</p> <p>The results of invertebrate surveys carried out in 2015 and 2020 are contained within the Ecology Baseline Report (document ref 6.2.12.1).</p> <p>The noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development (including surrounding wildlife) have been fully assessed and the results, along with any mitigation measures, are identified within ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (doc ref 6.1.15).</p> <p>The Lighting Strategy (doc ref 7.9) ensures that lighting through construction to post completion of the Proposed Development is in accordance with best practice industry guidance.</p>
	<p>The respondent is concerned about noise from the Resort disturbing local people visiting the Peninsula.</p>	<p>The noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development (including surrounding wildlife and local residents) have been fully assessed and the results, along with any mitigation measures, are identified within ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (doc ref 6.1.15).</p> <p>A large proportion of the Kent Project Site landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings. Further information is available in the Landscape Strategy (6.2.11.7).</p>
	<p>The respondent does not believe enough information is provided regarding the applicants approach to habitat compensation.</p>	<p>LRCH is committed to a net gain in biodiversity as a result of the development with habitat creation and enhancement included as part of a comprehensive strategy which considers the health and well-being benefits of Green Infrastructure. More information can be found in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (document ref 6.2.12.2).</p>
	<p>The respondent welcomes commitments to use earth shaping to provide a floor resilient design.</p>	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes this response.</p>
	<p>The respondent requests more information regarding potential flood impacts in relation to proposed</p>	<p>A comprehensive flood risk assessment has been undertaken and is included in the Flood Risk Assessment (document ref 6.2.17.1). This considers flood risk to the proposed development and any potential increase in flooding to other areas, along with appropriate mitigation measures.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	development in Dartford and Gravesham.	Surface water drainage relating to the London Resort is considered in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy (document ref 6.2.17.2) submitted with the application.
	The respondent questions whether there is sufficient water infrastructure to support the Resort and developments in Dartford and Gravesham.	LRCH is working closely with Thames Water and Southern Water to ensure water supply for the development can be provided sustainably and without impact on other local users. The impact of the proposed development in terms of water pollution, water supply and flooding are assessed in the ES Chapter 17 Water Resources and Flood Risk (document ref 6.1.17).
	The respondent does not believe there is enough evidence to have a complete understanding of the Resort	LRCH published a range of information. As part of the suite of consultation documents, LRCH produced a Guide to Consultation, which provided a summary overview of proposals, and a non-technical summary of the PEIR in addition to the full suite of technical materials.
	The respondent requests designs of the proposed cycling route enhancements for comment.	The Development Proposals include dedicated walking and cycle ways and are detailed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Active Travel Strategy reviews the opportunities and recommendations for proposed walking and cycling improvements.
	The respondent notes that it is important to retain public access to the River as shown in the Guide.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent wishes for more information regarding enhancement of Pilgrims' Way.	<p>Pilgrims Way, the pedestrian route that runs along the chalk spine from the top of Swanscombe High Street to the centre of the peninsula, will be a key feature in the masterplan, not only connecting Swanscombe to the London Resort and Ferry Terminal Beyond, but also connecting the Visitor Centre, Staff Training Facility and the London Resort Academy to the London Resort. It will become a significantly improved and much valued pedestrian route.</p> <p>The Development Proposals include dedicated walking and cycle ways and are detailed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
	The respondent states that there is insufficient evidence to estimate the impact of noise and light pollution on local communities.	<p>The noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development (including surrounding wildlife) have been fully assessed and the results, along with any mitigation measures, are identified within ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (doc ref 6.1.15).</p> <p>Since consultation we have developed a Lighting Strategy (doc ref 7.9) ensuring that lighting through construction to post completion of the Proposed Development is in accordance with best practice industry guidance.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The respondent does not believe the Parameter Plan contains sufficient information to assess the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The visual impact of the Resort on local communities. • Noise or light pollution from Resort buildings. 	<p>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 which have been identified to ensure that London Resort is able to reduce potential negative impacts.</p> <p>The noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development (including surrounding wildlife) have been fully assessed and the results, along with any mitigation measures, are identified within ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (doc ref 6.1.15).</p> <p>The Lighting Strategy (doc ref 7.9) ensures that lighting through construction to post completion of the Proposed Development is in accordance with best practice industry guidance.</p>
	<p>The respondent notes that the Parameter Plans need to be adhered to during construction and further development of the Resort.</p>	<p>LRCH notes and appreciates this response.</p>
	<p>The respondent requests additional viewpoint locations including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential development on the eastern side of Ingress Park. • The Flats on Gunn Road. Caspian Way. 	<p>LRCH notes and will consider this suggestion during the examination phase.</p>
	<p>The respondent is concerned that additional jobs from the Resort, as well as from Ebbsfleet Garden City, could impact the local economy and result in more congestion for commuters and local journeys.</p>	<p>LRCH has given careful consideration to ways in which it can maximise the positive socio-economic impacts of the project, while minimising potentially negative impacts.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) consider both the negative and positive impacts of the regeneration associated with the London Resort. These conclude that the benefits in terms of creating new jobs, positively contributing towards reversing entrenched problems of low skills and deprivation, providing business opportunities to local firms, and local spending (among others) are expected to far outweigh adverse impacts.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		<p>LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport, designed to relieve impacts on the road network. This includes investment in enhanced rail, river and road transport infrastructure. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken and is available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
	The respondent is concerned that data on commuting patterns are from the 2011 Census and so may not reflect current commuting patterns.	LRCH appreciates and notes this comment. LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport, designed to relieve impacts on the road network. We used the most appropriate data to create this Strategy. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	The respondent is concerned that the Resort could displace existing jobs through competition. Due to a lack of information around this the respondent cannot estimate how many existing jobs will be affected.	<p>London Resort will bring a significant range of benefits to the local, regional and national economy. This includes the creation of a significant number of direct and indirect jobs during construction and operation, investment in infrastructure and world class facilities, many of which will be accessible outside the payline.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the assessed impacts of displaced jobs and the many ways in which local residents would have the opportunity to benefit from London Resort.</p>
	The respondent questions whether firework displays will be used in the Resort and whether they will impact residents and wildlife.	<p>The noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development (including local residents) are assessed within ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (Chapter 15).</p> <p>With regard to fireworks, LRCH consider that these are not very environmentally friendly and we are looking at alternatives once the Resort is in operation. We are not planning on parades (as had been suggested in our 2015 consultation) and there will not be nightclubs.</p>
	The respondent requests more information regarding site assessment and alternatives.	From the initial phase of the project, the location of London Resort has been carefully considered based upon a range of criteria, considering how benefits can be maximised and any negative impacts mitigated. Further information on the process of site selection is available in ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4).
	The respondent queries why the Resort will have a negative benefit for the M11 corridor, Ashford and Kent,	<p>London Resort will bring a significant range of benefits to the local, regional and national economy. This includes the creation of a significant number of direct and indirect jobs during construction and</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>and neutral benefit for Northamptonshire, Marston Vale, M25 corridor and Cliffe, north Kent, given the generation of jobs in relation to the Resort.</p>	<p>operation, investment in infrastructure and world class facilities, many of which will be accessible outside the payline.</p> <p>Further information on the process of site selection is available in ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4).</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the many ways in which local residents would have the opportunity to benefit from London Resort..</p> <p>Overall, LRCH concludes that the benefits are expected to far outweigh any adverse impacts, both locally and across the UK.</p>
	<p>The respondent questions whether major changes to the project will be required as more assessments are made.</p>	<p>LRCH notes and appreciates this comment. We are open to all feedback and will consider any new information during the detailed design phase.</p>
<p>Dartford & Gravesham Cycling Forum</p>	<p>It is encouraging to see many references in the PEIR to a wide variety of Planning policy documents across a wide spectrum of Government from national to local government highlighting the requirement to include Active Travel options in all major projects</p>	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.</p>
	<p>The respondent highlighted that the Ebbsfleet A2 junction is the meeting point between two significant routes on the National Cycle Network – the NCN1 and NCN177, which provide important resource to long distance cyclists, tourists and local leisure / commuting users. The Cycle Forum would look to both Highways England and the London Resort to design a scheme that seeks to protect the</p>	<p>An Active Travel Strategy has been developed to help reduce reliance on private vehicle and to create a cohesive network of existing and proposed walking and cycling routes. Increased uptake in active or sustainable travel will help to mitigate the impacts on the highway network. A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The development proposals include plans to provide a dedicated off-road, walking and cycle way between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier. Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>integrity of both routes throughout the design and construction stages of the new junction.</p> <p>To accommodate the junction improvements the Forum would expect to see alternative routes planned in advance and constructed prior to work on the junction commencing thereby maintaining the routes during these periods of disruption.</p> <p>Any new alignments should be designed in accordance with the principles detailed LTN 1/20 to provide routes that are Coherent, Direct, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive. They should also feature measures to active travel, including safe and effective crossing points. Consideration should therefore be given to the provision of subways or bridges as a means of safely segregating cyclists and walkers from fast moving traffic.</p>	<p>Cycle and pedestrian routes are proposed to create a cohesive network between the existing and proposed routes, in order to facilitate increased active travel - benefiting visitors and staff to The London Resort, and the local area.</p> <p>The DCO and associated planning materials do not set out any indication that paths will be destroyed. Where possible all routes will be included within the proposals, and suitable diversions / alternatives put in place where required.</p>
	<p>The London Resort Active Travel network within the park will also need to link to the existing local Active Travel network and in doing so will need to create new links or enhancements to existing routes to achieve this.</p> <p>The Cycle Forum has identified 3 possible routes which would in their opinion, enhance the Active Travel</p>	<p>LRCH has noted the comments. A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>connectivity of the London Resort to the existing local Active Travel infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An east - west route from Tiltman Avenue along the alignment of Galley Hill and London Road but within or next to the Resort boundary as far as the planned walking and cycling route running between Ebbsfleet Station and Swanscombe Pier. • Extension of the Swanscombe Pier to Ebbsfleet Walking and Cycling route beyond Ebbsfleet south to the A2 / Ebbsfleet junction. • The east - west diverted path see plan LR PEIR Fig 11.8 for details as a possible route that should be opened up to cyclists as well as walkers. 	
	<p>The Dartford & Gravesham Cycling Forum exists to promote Active Travel within the boroughs of Dartford & Gravesham. It seeks to maximise the opportunities to expand and improve the local Active Travel Infrastructure in the two boroughs and in doing so expand local residents travel choices within their localities. The Forum therefore sees the London Resort development as an opportunity to achieve the objectives stated above and is very keen to work with the London Resort to achieve significant</p>	<p>The LRCH has noted and welcomes the comments. It will be willing to maintain engagement with Dartford & Gravesham Cycling Forum at appropriate points as the project progresses.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	improvements in the active travel infrastructure within the locality	
Bean Residents Association	The respondent claims there is no evidence that Highways England agree with Ebbsfleet junction layout or with the omission of works at Bean junction. Ebbsfleet junction proposal is not compared with design under construction.	LRCH has given full consideration to the potential impacts of the development on the local strategic road network, including the proposed upgrades to A2 junctions, and there has been extensive engagement with Highways England. A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	Design basis (85th percentile) contradicts evidence to Planning Inspectorate at A2BE Inquiry.	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 includes the relevant AM and PM peak modelling for the 85th percentile periods. The Travel Demand Management Plan (Appendix TA-AC) has been developed in order to manage those time periods where impacts could be seen, including when Bluewater operates.
	No attention to A2 between junctions. WSP said dual 5 lane needed in TA for NG site.	LRCH has given full consideration to the potential impacts of the development on the local strategic road network, including the A2. A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	Design assumes Lower Thames Crossing open in 2027, but check for it being delayed.	LRCH noted the comment. A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Traffic modelling has been undertaken in forecast scenarios with and without the LTC and LTC is included in the model coverage.
	Traffic assessment needs to allow for Eurostar non-stopping in Kent. Rail should support Network Rail Ebbsfleet Southern Link and protect route/connections.	LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). HS1 via Ebbsfleet station forms an integral part of that strategy and will link effectively with the Resort via a People Mover. LRCH supports the need principle of effective public transport, notably rail, and 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.
	Design and agreement with Tilbury should not prevent KenEx Tram system being built.	LRCH noted the comment.
	Clarity needed on People Mover and access points for visitors and use by non-visiting public.	A people mover will be provided between Ebbsfleet International Station, The London Resort and Swanscombe pier. Detailed information is included within the Bus Strategy of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	Claim that design separates resort from local traffic is false. Conflicts both	The transport proposals for the Resort have 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

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>in and out of resort. Low cost at-grade junctions cause conflicts especially pm peak. There is a clash between Garden City access and resort access.</p>	<p>to Highways England’s improvements at the Bean and Ebbsfleet junctions. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) and includes assessment of the development using strategic modelling outputs, within a VISSIM microsimulation model and local junction models.</p>
	<p>There is no consideration of vehicle arrivals from the east.</p>	<p>A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), including consideration of vehicles arriving from the east.</p>
	<p>There are important industrial units on dedicated access road but no evidence of attempt to avoid.</p> <p>The existing industry is hard to relocate and approval should be conditional on alternative sites.</p>	<p>The Statement of Reasons (document ref 4.1) 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 Land Use and Socio-Economic effects (document ref 6.1.7)</p> <p>LRCH has extended an enhanced proposal to all PILs and will continue to work with PILs regarding their claims and assist with their relocation. LRCH’s application is in accordance with the guidelines provided within the Planning Act 2008.</p>
	<p>Conflicting information of provision for staff and deliveries; via access road or London Road."</p>	<p>LRCH notes the comments and further information will be available in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
	<p>Unclear how existing riverside footpaths are retained and how resort and open spaces can be shared.</p>	<p>It is the intention of LRCH that existing rights of way and active travel routes will be maintained or enhanced wherever possible. The development proposals include plans to provide a dedicated off-road, walking and cycle way between Ebbsfleet International, The London Resort and the pier. Additional proposals have been outlined within the Walking and Cycling Strategy, more information can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>Cycle and pedestrian routes are proposed to create a cohesive network between the existing and proposed routes, in order to facilitate increased active travel - benefiting visitors and staff to The London Resort, and the local area.</p> <p>The DCO and associated planning materials do not set out any indication that paths will be destroyed. Where possible all routes will be included within the proposals, and suitable diversions / alternatives placed if required.</p>
	<p>Clash between new Kent Ferry Terminal N-S traffic and E-W public</p>	<p>These issues have been noted.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	footpath and between People Mover for visitors only and Ferry use by non-visitors.	
	New Essex Terminal at Thurrock will need access to Kent Terminal.	LRCH has noted this comment.
	How will Low and Zero carbon be achieved and measured?	<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>Since consultation LRCH has developed an Outline Sustainability Strategy (document ref 7.7), which considers both construction and operational phases of the Resort, including sustainable design and construction materials</p>
	It is misleading to say public access currently limited. Groups regularly walk Ingress Park to Pylon. Need to show proposals and how E-W access is maintained over N-S development.	LRCH notes the comment. For further information please see the Public Rights of Way Assessment (document ref 6.3.11.17) and the Public Rights of Way and Public Access Strategy (document ref 6.3.11.18)
	The location is not ideal. Whilst other sites considered, one suggested in East Kent wasn't. Traffic is still a primary concern at this location and mitigation is cost minimised.	LRCH notes the comment. Extensive consideration was given to a wide range of potential alternative locations. Further information is available in ES Chapter 4 Project Development and Alternatives (document ref 6.1.4).
	Concern that LRCH might sell on rather than develop London Resort.	<p>LRCH is committed to creating the first entertainment destination of this scale and profile in the UK and a unique opportunity to bring a major attraction and entertainment-led regeneration scheme to the UK.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the ES also describes how there is significant demand for tourism and entertainment in the region and UK generally. The London Resort will be a unique global attraction and as such is expected to result in overall market growth.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		LRCH has always been committed to ensuring that the London Resort works for local communities as well as our visitors.
	The respondent expressed concern regarding the amount of flexibility retained within the DCO	The DCO application allows for flexibility around the detailed design and content of the London Resort, to enable attractions to be updated or replaced over time, in line with changing customer tastes and expectations, to ensure that it always has a fresh appeal to visitors.
	The attempt to use the river and a connection to Tilbury to reduce traffic is understood. However, the travel and arrival/departure profile looks optimistic.	LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). This includes utilising demand management to enable maximum uptake of public transport, including on the river.
	A light rail/ tramway tunnel (i.e. KenEx) would be a more robust Essex-Kent connection. The solution of winding ferry route and transfer to People Mover is complex.	LRCH notes the comment. Transport options have been considered within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	The Conferention Centre is interesting, and presumably designed for non-resort visitors?	<p>LRCH revised scheme content following the 2015 consultation, to ensure a diverse range of amenities is accessible to local communities and businesses outside the 'payline' of the theme parks.</p> <p>The proposed entertainment and amenities on offer outside the park gates includes The Market, the eSports Centre, the Conferention Centre (Conference and Convention Centre), and a variety of hotels, retail and dining.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the ES and supporting documentation details the many ways in which the local area and communities would benefit, including: thousands of direct and indirect jobs created during construction and operation, spending in the local area, catalyst for investment in the area, new infrastructure, green networks, supply chain opportunities and access to high quality retail and entertainment outside the payline.</p>
	Water Park. Caution on this as a facility nearby in Dartford commercially failed.	LRCH has noted this comment.
	Not clear which facilities are weather proof/ under a 'dome'.	The UK climate and the particular characteristics of the Resort's riverside setting are being factored into the design.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		Circa 70% of the attractions will be covered. Outside of the payline there will significant shelter, enclosed facilities and attractions.
	Details are still vague and not yet comprehensive for DCO application. The wish for flexibility is a concern.	<p>The ES and supporting documentation considers both the positive benefits and negative impacts associated with the London Resort. Where there are adverse impacts, mitigation measures are proposed, and these are detailed in the relevant topic chapters of the ES and supporting documentation.</p> <p>Overall, LRCH concludes that the benefits are expected to far outweigh any adverse impacts.</p> <p>While LRCH’s DCO application allows for flexibility around the detailed design and content of the London Resort, to enable attractions to be updated or replaced over time, the DCO also ensures comprehensive and legally enforceable requirements will be in place, which includes noise, air quality and visuals impacts to which LRCH must adhere.</p>
	Integration/separation around Ebbsfleet Garden City looks difficult.	LRCH has noted the comment.
	Inclusion of 500 'homes' may be misleading as these are dwellings in multiple occupation (HMO)	LRCH has noted the comment.
	Parking control should be in application and not left to monitoring. Resort visitor use of the 13,000 free spaces at Bluewater needs discouraging (unless shopping).	LRCH has noted the comment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

<p>Jetstream Tours</p>	<p>The respondent supports the use of the River to maximise its use providing that it has no detriment to its current users and provides little negative impact. States that no assessment has been provided with regard to how it may affect other river users and local businesses. Respondent has met with LRCH to raise specific concerns about berthing operation and the new pontoon.</p>	<p>LRCH has met with Jetstream Tours and been in dialogue with the Port of London Authority and other existing river operators. It has been agreed with Port of Tilbury, Kent County Council and the current Gravesend - Tilbury ferry operator, Jetstream Tours, that the proposals will not prevent continued operation of that ferry service.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern over lack of adequate information to mitigate the operation.</p>	<p>The River Strategy and impacts have been included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). River Strategy has looked at all existing services and this will be monitored in the detailed design stage.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern over impacts of additional traffic and the car park at Tilbury landing stage, which is currently free. Concern over whether ferry users will be charged to use the car park, which will impact business.</p>	<p>A full highway impact assessment has been undertaken within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Following further assessment work, and as identified in the Transport Assessment, improvements are proposed to the Asda roundabout at Tilbury to improve access to the Resort car park located on land at the Port of Tilbury and to ensure that potential impacts can be effectively managed.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern about the volume of diesel-powered boats, which would negate any environmental benefits, questioning whether this is the best solution for sustainable transport.</p>	<p>The River Strategy and impacts have been included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</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>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The respondent stated that Gravesend-Tilbury ferry is investigating a fully electric option and encouraged LRCH to explore this.</p>	<p>LRCH will continue dialogue with the Port of London Authority and existing river operators who have indicated the ability to serve the resort by both barge for construction / operation and passenger service vehicles.</p> <p>A Navigational 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.</p>
	<p>The respondent suggested a new pier linking Grays train station with the Resort.</p>	<p>LRCH does not consider this is required as part of London Resort. LRCH is however working closely with Grays Town Board and Thurrock Council to investigate the opportunity.</p>
	<p>The respondent states there is a lack of information about local pedestrian and cycle routes</p>	<p>The Development Proposals include dedicated walking and cycle ways and are detailed within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). The Active Travel Strategy reviews the opportunities and recommendations for proposed walking and cycling improvements</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed that the Resort will provide a negative impact on the socio-economics of Tilbury Town.</p>	<p>Extensive consideration has been given regarding the socio-economic impacts of London Resort, and how the benefits can be extended and any negative impacts mitigated. Further detail about socio economic modelling and evaluation is contained within Chapter 7 of the ES, Land use and socioeconomic effects. Evidence suggests that benefits will far outweigh negative impacts.</p>
	<p>The respondent stated that most Tilbury residents are users of the 99 bus, which is currently supplied free to holders of the English national Concessionary Bus Pass Scheme.</p>	<p>LRCH notes this comment.</p> <p>Active Travel and Public Transport Strategies have been developed to facilitate more sustainable travel and a Travel Demand Management Plan incentivises this travel. More detail can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
	<p>The respondent requested LRCH review business engagement process.</p>	<p>LRCH will continue to engage with local businesses.</p>
	<p>The respondent support the river use, cycling, bus and pedestrian traffic. More work is needed to make it harmonious and sustainable.</p>	<p>Active Travel and Public Transport Strategies have been developed to facilitate more sustainable travel and a Travel Demand Management Plan incentivises this travel. More detail can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
	<p>The respondent stated that Kent County Council/Thurrock retains the contract and reserves the right to be able to offer this contract out to open market tender. Any development must not impede this requirement.</p>	<p>LRCH notes this comment.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

The Billericay Tree Wardens - A subgroup of the Billericay Town Council	The respondent supported the mix of transport options as potentially reducing congestion	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent expressed concern about the impact on the local road networks.	<p>The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) reviews the highway impact of the proposed development. This ensures that wider trips as well as local impacts are reviewed and assessed.</p> <p>LRCH’s conclusion is that the transport network can cope, underpinned by modal shift strategies. For more information, please refer to LRCH’s Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
	The respondent expressed support for LRCH’s principle of biodiversity net gain but concerns that these aspirations would not be achieved owing to budget constraints.	<p>LRCH noted and welcomes the comment, and 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 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>
	The respondent expressed concerns about how visitors will be guided round the wildlife areas and suggested signage and display boards would not be enough and suggested nature	LHRC notes and welcomes this comment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	wardens could be employed to monitor wildlife and visitor behaviour	
	The respondent suggested that membership of the Kent Wildlife Trust and/or Buglife could be subsidised by the Resort	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	Support for the principle of carbon neutrality	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent suggested that there should be dedicated area for wildlife only, particularly for migrating birds, and free of dogs	A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings. For further information see the Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.3.3.4)
	The respondent supported the focus on reflecting local cultural heritage	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent asked if jobs will be ring-fenced for local people?	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment. The London Resort will have a long-term need to recruit from within the local community. Since consultation LRCH has developed and enhanced the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) which explains how the Applicant will maximise the number of local jobs during construction and once the Resort is operational. Where appropriate and possible, employment opportunities will be advertised to residents proactively for two weeks (via a jobs brokerage service) before being offered to a wider audience. The Employment and Skills taskforce has been set up with representative members from local authorities, local education institutions and community groups, to ensure that local knowledge and best practise can be built upon.
	The respondent asked if there would be parking for those people visiting the wildlife areas	LRCH is seeking to drive a modal shift away from cars and towards active and public transport. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	The respondent made a general enquiry about the landscape strategy.	LRCH has established a landscape strategy (document ref Landscape Strategy Appendix 11.7 of Chapter 11 of the ES).
	The respondent suggested environmental improvements be made to the Essex Site, particularly through further tree planting.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
St Leonards and Hastings Rail Improvement	The respondent expressed general support for the London Resort as part of wider regeneration of the area	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The respondent suggested the site would benefit from a direct connection to HS1 via Ebbsfleet International. The respondent suggested that in order to support the wider region (for example Rye, Hastings, Bexhill) there needs to be better high-speed rail links</p>	<p>LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). HS1 via Ebbsfleet station forms an integral part of that strategy and will link effectively with the Resort via a People Mover.</p> <p>LRCH supports the need principle of effective public transport, notably rail, and 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.</p>
	<p>The respondent expressed concern for local wildlife and habitats</p>	<p>LRCH notes this comment. LRCH carried out a thorough assessment in order to select the Project Site location, as set out in Chapter 4 of the ES (document ref 6.1.4).</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 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>The respondent supported cycling, where practical in the terrain, access to the site</p>	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

North Kent College	The respondent was keen for jobs to be ring-fenced for local people.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment. The London Resort will have a long-term need to recruit from within the local community. Since consultation LRCH has developed and enhanced the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) which explains how the Applicant will maximise the number of local jobs during construction and once the Resort is operational. Where appropriate and possible, employment opportunities will be advertised to residents proactively for two weeks (via a jobs brokerage service) before being offered to a wider audience. The Employment and Skills taskforce has been set up with representative members from local authorities, local education institutions and community groups, to ensure that local knowledge and best practise can be built upon.
	The respondent identified The Learning Shop in Bluewater as an example of how the Resort could integrate training and recruit local people.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment. A recruitment and staff training facility is proposed at the head of Swanscombe High Street and Pilgrims Way, close to and easily accessed by the surrounding communities. The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how the Applicant will maximise the number of local jobs during construction and once the Resort is operational.
Inland Waterways Association	The respondent strongly supports the proposals with specific reference to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access from the north bank of the Thames (at Tilbury). • Floating jetty with "Park and Glide". • The 'Clipper' connections. • The intention to move over 90% of construction materials and waste by water. 	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment, and will work to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is in place to support the development and ensure that we can meet our stated aim of using the river as an integral element of the construction programme. See the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2). A clear strategy for use of the river and explanation of its effects are provided in ES Chapter 10 River Transport (document ref: 6.1.10).
	The respondent expressed agreement with the reasons described in the "Harnessing natural landscape and riverside location" in the "Our Vision" document.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent strongly supports use of the River as a sustainable method of transport construction materials and waste.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	The respondent strongly supports riverside access. This includes the newly-designated Thames Estuary Path that runs through the site.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The existing heritage of the area includes the boating community at Broadness Harbour (Broadness Cruising Club). Safe moorings on the River Thames are in short supply and are a very valuable resource. Broadness Cruising Club has a slipway that could, given wider access, become available for greater public use	LRCH welcomes these comments and acknowledges the role that Broadness Cruising Club plays. As such, we are actively engaging with the Club and believe that through restoration of habitats and support for public access to the Swanscombe Peninsular, it will be possible to have a positive impact.
	The respondent supports greater employment opportunity, including for river-based jobs.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment.
	The respondent raised concerns that wording of the Draft DCO could imply the creation of by-laws that conflict with the Port of London Authority powers under its acts, specifically closure of parts of the River for recreational use.	<p>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, of divers, surfers, water skiers and other persons engaged in similar recreational pursuits it does not intend to prohibit the use for navigation of vessels. Further information is provided within the Draft Development Consent Order (document ref 3.1)</p> <p>As a result of this consultation response the Applicant recognises the concern of the IWA not to make permanent changes to river access through byelaws and has accordingly added ‘temporarily’ to the start of what is now article 50(2)(e) that sets out the scope of such byelaws.</p>
Thames Crossing Action Group	Concerns that the London Resort will have negative impact on the road network and pollution levels and that the additional parking facilities to the North of the River will make this worse.	<p>LRCH is in discussion with local authorities and local transport operators to 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. In cooperation with the above we are developing upgrades for the local network as well as investigating ways to reduce impacts on the local transport network.</p> <p>The Transport Strategy 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.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		<p>In the development of proposals for London Resort LRCH has given careful consideration to issues and potential impacts in relation to air quality and emissions.</p> <p>The emissions from the proposed development and the proposed mitigation measures during construction and operation are outlined within the ES Chapter 16 Air Quality (document ref 6.1.16).</p> <p>Measures have also been identified to govern the construction phase of the project in the Outline Construction and Environment Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2), reducing</p> <p>Active Travel and Public Transport Strategies have been developed to facilitate more sustainable travel and a Travel Demand Management Plan incentivises this travel. These will play an important part in mitigating potential impacts from transport within the local area. More detail can be found in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Human Health (document ref 6.1.8) also considers and addresses possible impacts on the health of local people, while addressing potential mitigation measures.</p>
	<p>Considers lack of labelling, and incorrect labelling of multiple maps in PEIR as inadequacy of the consultation materials, and proof of lack of clear and informative materials</p>	<p>As set out in this Report (document ref 5.1), LRCH considers that consultation was accurate, robust and had an appropriate reach.</p> <p>The 2015 and the 2020 PEIRs reflected the information that was available at the time of each consultation and was an accurate representation of information available at that time.</p> <p>Residents were informed about the consultation through multiple methods, including direct mail, adverts in local newspapers, notifications online and social media.</p> <p>LRCH described the Proposed Development to a sufficient extent for the Secretary of State to enable to designate it as an NSIP.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The respondent states that it cannot support a scheme that brings more traffic to areas that are already facing heavy congestion. Concerns about high traffic volumes on SRN and local road network and surrounding areas north and south of the river and that London Resort will make this worse.</p>	<p>A robust assessment of traffic volumes has been assessed based on scenarios with and without the London Resort. Traffic modelling has been agreed with the local highway authorities and Highways England and a comprehensive Transport Assessment undertaken (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (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 they will be looking to promote public transport as the main travel option to The London Resort.</p> <p>The traffic flows (document ref 6.2.9.2) associated with the London Resort have been fully considered as part of the Transport Assessment. As can be seen in this document, it is considered that most traffic generated by the scheme would be generally outside of the conventional network peak hours. However, there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks.</p> <p>To take account of these figures the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. In addition, the Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.</p> <p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p>
	<p>The respondent raises significant concerns relating to the impacts of the proposed LTC or road network north and south of the river, and that Highways England have not considered or planned for how traffic would migrate between the two crossings. Does not consider the proposed LTC to be fit for purpose, and the proposed London Resort will add to those problems.</p>	<p>LRCH have been in dialogue with Highways England about the Lower Thames Crossing scheme about its potential implications for London Resort and will continue to do so throughout the Development Consent Order process.</p> <p>LRCH believe these are comments in relation to the LTC modelling assessment and not The London Resort.</p> <p>LRCH are assessing the impacts of The London Resort and not LTC. The proposed development has been assessed using models that include LTC.</p>
	<p>The respondent raises concern about travel volumes coming from north of the river, and notes a lack of detail about the impacts of potential street</p>	<p>As identified in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) LRCH has undertaken a worst-case private vehicle assessment using a mode share calculated from car parking accumulation. The Travel Demand Management Plan therefore incentivises transport by active and sustainable modes.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	parking to the north of the river as well as the new parking facility in Tilbury.	<p>An off-site parking strategy has been developed to outline the management of people parking locally. This is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>LRCH will monitor parking on both sides of the river on an ongoing basis and work with Local Authorities.</p>
	The respondent shared concerns about increased litter.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment. The assessment of waste generation within the proposed development is included within ES Chapter 18 Waste and Materials (document ref 6.1.18).
	The respondent raises a concern about increase in River traffic on an already busy shipping lane. Concern about what happens to boat crossing during bad weather.	<p>LRCH is in discussions with Tilbury, who have confirmed they don't expect an increase in sailings due to the Resort and the existing Port can accommodate additional demand associated with The London Resort park and glide.</p> <p>Thames Clipper operational statistics show it was only not operational 4 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).</p>
	The respondent raised a concern about impacts of overlapping timeline for construction of London Resort and LTC.	LRCH have been in dialogue with Highways England about the Lower Thames Crossing scheme about its potential implications for London Resort and will continue to do so throughout the Development Consent Order process. Cumulative impacts have been considered.
	The respondent appreciated that majority of construction materials will come via the river, which will reduce road traffic, but notes that river transport is not free from air pollution.	<p>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> <p>The Environmental Statement (ES) has specific chapters on Air Quality (Chapter 16, document ref 6.1.16) and the associated impacts from the Site.</p>
	The respondent requests a response to the claims made by the Buglife campaign in relation to the application.	The impacts upon the invertebrate assemblage are assessed within the Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology & Biodiversity chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.12). 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

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		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 ref 6.1.12) concludes that there would be no significant residual effects on important ecological features. Detail of the invertebrate mitigation strategy can be found within Annex 9 of the EMMF (document ref 6.2.12.3).
	The respondent claims that the applicant has failed to accurately calculate the extend of open mosaic habitats on previously developed land (OMHPDL) and the impact on the Resort in this regard.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment. As a result of consultation feedback, the BNG has been updated and now includes Botany Marsh East as part of the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic. Although the majority of CFGM will be lost, the wider wetland mosaic will be enhanced through addition of new ditches and ponds to replace those lost and scrub and reedbed management. Hydrological impacts upon the Project Site are considered within Chapter 17 of the ES and in relation to ecological features within Chapter 12 (document ref 6.1.17 and 6.1.12). A drainage strategy has been designed in order to limit hydrological change across the Project Site.
	The respondent questions the impact of the Resort on aquatic invertebrates.	The impacts upon the invertebrate assemblage are assessed within the Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology & Biodiversity chapter of the ES (document ref 6.1.12). 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 ref 6.1.12) concludes that there would be no significant residual effects on important ecological features. Detail of the invertebrate mitigation strategy can be found within Annex 9 of the EMMF (document ref 6.2.12.3).
	The respondent questions how the development could impact site-wide hydrology	The BNG has been updated and now includes Botany Marsh East as part of the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic. Although the majority of CFGM will be lost, the wider wetland mosaic will be enhanced through addition of new ditches and ponds to replace those lost and scrub and reedbed management. Hydrological impacts upon the Project Site are considered within Chapter 17 of the ES and in relation to ecological features within Chapter 12 (document ref 6.1.17 and 12). A drainage strategy has been designed in order to limit hydrological change across the Project Site.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The respondent claims that appropriate mitigation for wildlife within the Swanscombe Peninsula are not accounted for.</p>	<p>Details of the invertebrate mitigation strategy can be found within Annex 9 of the EMMF (document ref 6.2.12.3). Whilst it is acknowledged that creation of OMHPDL is difficult, the proposed mitigation strategy draws upon existing examples of habitat creation, such as the Port of Tilbury's London Distribution Park project. Enhancement works are proposed to retained areas of the Broadness Grasslands, which have a history of disturbance but have started to progress towards a more closed habitat mosaic.</p>
	<p>The respondent claims that information about off-site compensation land is limited.</p>	<p>Off-site compensation land is in the process of acquisition and further details will be made available once it is secured. Natural England will be consulted on the scope of mitigation land being proposed. For the purpose of the DCO application, a set of general principles for the creation of off-site mitigation is included as an Appendix to the ES (document ref 6.2.12.10).</p>
	<p>The respondent questions the Biodiversity Net Gain calculations.</p>	<p>The BNG calculations have been updated in line with the recommendations made by consultees and is considered to be accurate in its portrayal of the Project Site's biodiversity value. Botany Marsh west and east have been incorporated into the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic grouping, and large areas of the peninsula and Ebbsfleet Valley have been included as OMHPDL. Condition ratings have been updated and are considered appropriate based on the guidance and detailed survey of the Project Site. Justifications and explanation of assumptions made can be found within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment report (document ref 6.2.12.2).</p>
	<p>The respondent challenges whether the development is compliant with the National Policy Statement (NPS) for business or commercial Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) planning applications.</p>	<p>The Proposed Development is considered compliant with the requirements of the NPPF and relevant NPS.</p>
	<p>The respondent further highlights the Buglife campaign and requests further evaluation of important OMHPDL within the development area.</p>	<p>The valuation and assessment of impacts on Priority Habitats and Species has been reviewed and updated in the ES following feedback from Buglife and other consultees. This included reviewing the extent of OMHPDL on the Project Site. A suite of on-site mitigation measures are provided to mitigate effects on priority habitats and species, with additional off-site mitigation to be provided to address any residual effects remaining after the application of on-site measures.</p>
	<p>The respondent states that complex OMHPDL sites are irreplaceable.</p>	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that creation of OMHPDL is difficult, the proposed mitigation strategy draws upon existing examples of habitat creation, such as the Port of Tilbury's London Distribution Park project. Enhancement works are proposed to retained areas of the Broadness Grasslands, which have a history of disturbance but have started to progress towards a more closed habitat mosaic.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	The respondent challenges the applicants claims of delivering a net biodiversity gain.	Overall, it is considered that the Proposed Development is capable of delivering a net biodiversity gain subject to the adherence to impact avoidance and mitigation measures on-site, along with the enhancement and long-term management of the mosaic of habitats as currently present, and the delivery of off-site ecological mitigation. The Proposed Development is considered compliant with the requirements of the NPPF and relevant RNPS.
Thames Gateway Kent Partnership	Respondent has been engaging with LRCH since 2012/13. Recognise the positive and transformative potential, particularly regarding jobs. Are supportive of the proposals in principle subject to any potentially negative impacts and infrastructure requirements of the Resort being satisfactorily addressed.	LRCH notes and welcomes the comments.
	The latest consultation highlights the large volume of work that has been done to assess the impact of the resort proposals across the wide range of factors required for a preliminary environmental information report (PEIR). However, are concerned about how many questions remain unanswered at this stage.	The 2020 PEIR reflected the available information at the time and LRCH considers it contained an appropriate level of detail for people to provide a response.
	Whilst we remain positive about the scheme and are keen for the Resort to achieve the most beneficial impact that it can for North Kent, we are concerned that there is not enough information about a number of critical issues to enable a fully informed response.	LRCH noted the comments

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>North Kent partners stand ready to engage constructively with LRCH and urges LRCH to increase engagement on these priority issues</p>	<p>LRCH has valued the engagement with North Kent partners and welcomes its continuation.</p>
	<p>The respondent opposes sustainable transport proposals, stating that at present, they do not represent a sustainable transport strategy or one that will minimise car usage. Too heavily weighted to car users. The anticipated mode share of 66% visitors arriving by car is significantly above what would be understood as a 'green' transport strategy, or one that would contribute positively towards the achievement of net zero carbon.</p>	<p>The Transport Strategy 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.</p> <p>LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>Following consultation a Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1 – Appendix TA-AC).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>Not enough information, particularly on traffic modelling, to understand the impacts of resort-related traffic, and limited time to carry out and analyse modelling work prior to submission.</p>	<p>A robust assessment of traffic volumes has been assessed based on scenarios with and without the London Resort. Traffic modelling has been agreed with the local highway authorities and Highways England and a comprehensive Transport Assessment undertaken (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The Traffic Flows (document ref 6.2.9.2) associated with the London Resort have been fully considered as part of the Transport Assessment. As can be seen in this document, it is considered that most traffic generated by the scheme would be generally outside of the conventional network peak hours. However, there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks. The Table below provides a breakdown on the numbers of vehicles expected into the London Resort on the Kent side.</p> <p>Table 9-7: The London Resort, Trip Generation (Kent Project Site)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Assessment Year</th> <th>AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)</th> <th></th> <th>PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)</th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2025</td> <td>107</td> <td>20</td> <td>199</td> <td>499</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2029</td> <td>111</td> <td>26</td> <td>288</td> <td>679</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2038</td> <td>112</td> <td>26</td> <td>347</td> <td>978</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>To take account of these figures the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. In addition, the Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.</p> <p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p> <p>LRCH are assessing the impacts of The London Resort and not LTC. The proposed development has been assessed using models that include LTC.</p>	Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)			Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	2025	107	20	199	499	2029	111	26	288	679	2038	112	26	347	978
Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)																								
	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures																							
2025	107	20	199	499																							
2029	111	26	288	679																							
2038	112	26	347	978																							
	<p>Concern expressed regarding designing the transport access approach around an “85th percentile day”, the consultation documents and lack of</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment includes the relevant AM and PM peak modelling for the 85% percentile periods. The Travel Demand Management Plan (Appendix TA-AC) has been developed in order to manage those time periods where impacts could be seen, including when Bluewater operates.</p>																									

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	information about how peak days – estimated at 54 in number – would be managed sustainably.	
	Considers impacts could arise several years before maturity.	LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. The Transport Strategy 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. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).
	Keen to see greater analysis of how Resort-related rail travel could affect network capacity. Suggest that a more comprehensive analysis of rail access options and potential should be carried out in closer consultation with TGKP partner bodies, Network Rail, Southeastern Railways and HS1.	LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). HS1 via Ebbsfleet station forms an integral part of that strategy and will link effectively with the Resort via a People Mover. LRCH supports the need principle of effective public transport, notably rail, and 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.
	Suggests improvements needed at Swanscombe Station, helping to reduce pressure on Greenhithe and positive opportunity to help deliver a benefit that would serve both staff and visitors to the Resort and the wider community. Encourages LRCH to explore this potential further with Network Rail.	Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing regarding future improvements at Swanscombe.
	Regarding HS1, the analysis does not fully consider the pressure additional journeys could place on the network given existing severe peak and non-peak capacity constraints.	LRCH has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). HS1 via Ebbsfleet station forms an integral part of that strategy and will link effectively with the Resort via a People Mover. LRCH supports the need principle of effective public transport, notably rail, and 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.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>Referenced the AW2E Study team, who are looking into options for enhancing connectivity between Abbey Wood and Ebbsfleet</p> <p>LRCH has not demonstrated any consideration of the additional benefits and access implications of connectivity to visitor and labour markets that such an intervention could unlock.</p> <p>Could offer synergies between interventions in this corridor to support housing and economic growth and helping deliver a more sustainable transport access strategy for the Resort.</p>	<p>LRCH supports the extension of the Elizabeth Line to Ebbsfleet, though this does not form part of the Development Consent Order.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the ES and supporting documentation details the many ways in which the local area and communities would benefit, including: thousands of direct and indirect jobs created during construction and operation, spending in the local area, catalyst for investment in the area, new infrastructure, green networks, supply chain opportunities and access to high quality retail and entertainment outside the payline.</p> <p>LRCH has for some years been working closely with Locate in Kent and Visit Kent and will continue to develop strategies to maximise benefits within the region.</p>
	<p>The transport strategy (in particular the ‘People Mover’ proposal) makes assumptions about extension of Fastrack services that do not seem to be substantiated by detailed engagement to date with Kent County Council over the specifics or consideration of how this relates to the phased expansion of Fastrack already planned.</p>	<p>LRCH welcomes and notes this comment. Since consultation we have met with the Fastrack team and further discussed the role of the People Mover as well as Fastrack.</p> <p>A people mover will be provided between Ebbsfleet International Station, The London Resort and Swanscombe pier. Detailed information is included within the Bus Strategy of the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>
	<p>Welcome in principle the proposals for greater use of the River Thames, but there is a lack of detail to demonstrate how the envisaged mode share might be achieved.</p>	<p>Since consultation a Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed and enhanced to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1 – Appendix TA-AC).</p>
	<p>Neutral regarding road access proposals, stating there is not yet enough information to understand the</p>	<p>LRCH notes and appreciates your feedback.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	effects of Resort traffic on local networks.																										
	Would like more detail on staff travel	Staff travel is under consideration as part of the Travel Demand Management Strategy. For more information, please refer to the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).																									
	Lack of detail about how much development will be outside the Resort ‘pay line’ and the likely quantum and journey patterns of both staff and visitors to these facilities	The Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) contains the breakdown of visitors (and staff) journeys relating to development within and outside the payline.																									
	Unclear how the proposed changes to the A2 Ebbsfleet Junction relate to the modifications to which Highways England is already committed. The proposed signalisation of the junctions could impede local traffic flows, particularly at peak times.	<p>A robust assessment of traffic volumes has been assessed based on scenarios with and without the London Resort. Traffic modelling has been agreed with the local highway authorities and Highways England and a comprehensive Transport Assessment undertaken (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p> <p>The Traffic Flows (document ref 6.2.9.2) associated with the London Resort have been fully considered as part of the Transport Assessment. As can be seen in this document, it is considered that most traffic generated by the scheme would be generally outside of the conventional network peak hours. However, there will be some impact upon the morning and evening peaks. The Table below provides a breakdown on the numbers of vehicles expected into the London Resort on the Kent side.</p> <p>Table 9-7: The London Resort, Trip Generation (Kent Project Site)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Assessment Year</th> <th>AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)</th> <th></th> <th>PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)</th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> <th>Arrivals</th> <th>Departures</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2025</td> <td>107</td> <td>20</td> <td>199</td> <td>499</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2029</td> <td>111</td> <td>26</td> <td>288</td> <td>679</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2038</td> <td>112</td> <td>26</td> <td>347</td> <td>978</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>To take account of these figures the design of the A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvement scheme, which has recently begun, will be slightly upgraded to accommodate Resort traffic. In addition, the Asda roundabout at Tilbury will also be improved to accommodate Resort traffic.</p>	Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)			Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	2025	107	20	199	499	2029	111	26	288	679	2038	112	26	347	978
Assessment Year	AM Peak (08:00 – 09:00)		PM Peak (17:00 – 18:00)																								
	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures																							
2025	107	20	199	499																							
2029	111	26	288	679																							
2038	112	26	347	978																							

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		<p>As a result of these changes and as detailed in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1), it is considered the highway network can accommodate any additional traffic associated with the London Resort.</p> <p>LRCH are assessing the impacts of The London Resort and not LTC. The proposed development has been assessed using models that include LTC.</p>
	<p>Concern the access road could have negative impacts the potential developable land in Central Ebbsfleet. It also potentially increases severance as the Masterplan design suggests an open road (no enclosure) and compromises the functionality of the important installed bridge over the high-speed rail lines south of the international station</p>	<p>The Design and Access Statement (document ref 7.1) shows how there is no conflict with the ability to deliver new development at Ebbsfleet Central. LRCH has been cognisant of the extant permission. LRCH has not seen any emerging masterplan from the EDC.</p>
	<p>Believe the access road will increase noise and air pollution affecting local residential areas as well as the proposed commercial centre</p>	<p>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 which have been identified to ensure that London Resort is able to reduce potential negative impacts.</p> <p>The noise and vibration impacts from the proposed development (including surrounding wildlife) have been fully assessed and the results, along with any mitigation measures, are identified within ES Chapter 15 Noise and Vibration (doc ref 6.1.15).</p> <p>Since consultation LRCH has developed a Lighting Strategy (doc ref 7.9) ensuring that lighting through construction to post completion of the Proposed Development is in accordance with best practice industry guidance.</p>
	<p>Parking strategy does not align with visitor forecasts, particularly on peak days and at maturity. Suggests</p>	<p>As identified in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1) LRCH has undertaken a worst-case private vehicle assessment using a mode share calculated from car parking accumulation. In line with this respondents argument, LRCH have, since consultation developed and enhanced the Travel Demand Management Plan which incentivises transport by active and sustainable modes.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>proactive management of mode shift away from car use.</p>	
	<p>One site identified for car parking (including temporary possession of land and permanent access rights) encroaches on Northfleet Rise which is a designated Enterprise Zone (part of the North Kent Enterprise Zone) effective until 2042. Every effort should be made to avoid interfering with delivery of the enterprise zone.</p>	<p>LRCH notes this response.</p>
	<p>Neutral regarding approach to the environment and biodiversity and sustainability. Offers the potential to improve aspects of the environment and biodiversity of the Swanscombe Peninsula, but insufficient information to comment on the impacts.</p>	<p>LRCH notes this response.</p>
	<p>Neutral regarding sustainability proposals. The consultation signals positive ambitions in pursuit of sustainability, but insufficient detail and inconsistent messaging to assess the proposals.</p> <p>The reference to off-site methods of offsetting carbon emissions raises further questions about where geographically such measures could be implemented and to what extent these might benefit the communities impacted by the Resort</p>	<p>LRCH notes the comment and welcomes the support for London Resort’s aspirations regarding sustainability.</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 LRCH 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>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		Further information is available in the outline sustainability strategy (document ref 7.7)
	Neutral regarding pedestrian and cycle routes. Welcome measures to improve active travel and defer to Kent County Council on ensuring that enhanced access is matched by measures to protect wildlife.	<p>RHC has sought to simultaneously address the requirements for enhanced ecological habitats and natural spaces, with the requirement for public access and enhanced transport infrastructure.</p> <p>A large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced, principally for wildlife and biodiversity benefits, with quiet zones for visitors and the public to relax in natural surroundings. The Landscape Strategy (document ref 6.1.11.7) identifies how visitor access to the retained habitats outside the Resort area will be carefully managed to avoid human disturbance to sensitive habitats and species, whilst allowing access to other less sensitive areas for the purposes of environmental education and awareness.</p> <p>Impacts of increased recreational access on wildlife and habitats, and the approach to mitigation are addressed in Chapter 12 of the ES. (document ref 6.1.12)</p>
	Neutral regarding cultural heritage proposals. Encourages LRCH to continue working with “Creative Estuary” and the Thames Estuary Production Corridor, to maximise the Resort’s cultural, creative and heritage benefits to North Kent.	LRCH notes and welcomes this comment, and will continue to engage with a range of organisations.
	Neutral regarding benefits and problems, stating that the issues are complex and not binary as the question seems to imply.	<p>LRCH acknowledges this is complex. London Resort will bring a significant range of benefits to the local, regional and national economy. This includes the creation of a significant number of direct and indirect jobs during construction and operation, investment in infrastructure and world class facilities, many of which will be accessible outside the payline.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) provides further information regarding the many ways in which locals would have the opportunity to benefit from London Resort..</p> <p>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 which have been identified to ensure that London Resort is able to reduce potential negative impacts</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

		Overall, LRCH concludes that the benefits are expected to far outweigh any adverse impacts, both locally and across the UK.
	No detail about the nature of employment opportunities, thus hard to assess how many of these would be higher skilled, higher value jobs that would contribute qualitatively, as opposed to quantitatively, to the jobs market.	Further information about the socio economic impacts of London Resort can be found in ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7). The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (document ref 6.2.7.7) explains how the Applicant will maximise the number of local jobs during construction and once the Resort is operational.
	The Resort will directly displace several businesses, many of which will not find alternative premises or locations and will thus be lost from the North Kent economy.	The Statement of Reasons (document ref 4.1) 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 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7). LRCH has extended an enhanced proposal to all PILs and will continue to work with PILs regarding their claims and assist with their relocation. LRCH’s application is in accordance with the guidelines provided within the Planning Act 2008. Potential socio-economic impacts, including the potential to create a significant positive impact for the local and regional economy has been carefully considered, and shown to have an overwhelmingly positive net outcome.
	The Resort would give rise to a substantial demand for additional housing for its workforce within a reasonable (and sustainable) travel-to-work area which is already under severe pressure to meet forecast demand and affordability challenges. That in turn will increase pressures on other infrastructure required to support housing uplift.	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) considers the impact of the London Resort on the housing market. It considers the additional demand created by the visitors and workers to the area. The assessment finds that there would be additional demand in the area and whilst this would be mitigated to some extent by provision of hotels and worker accommodation within the Resort, and by the likely development response in the local area, it conservatively assumes that the additional demand will exceed supply. The London Resort will make the area more attractive for investment and is likely to make new development more viable. The development response is likely to be a key factor on prices – if the response is greater, the impact on prices will be smaller. However, the extent to which there will be new development is uncertain. The ES chapter therefore assumes a reasonable worst case where prices increase. To an extent.
	The scale of dining, retail and entertainment development in front of	ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) describes how there is significant demand for tourism and entertainment in the region and UK generally. The London Resort

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>the pay line could introduce direct competition for other centres in North Kent it would be useful to understand how they could complement rather than compete with existing provision across Kent and Medway.</p>	<p>will be a unique global attraction and as such is expected to result in overall market growth, rather than displacing existing tourism.</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7) and the Economic and Regeneration Statement (document ref 7.5) find that the local area, and wider Thames Estuary, have pockets of deprivation and low skills and education attainment. The documents explain how - together with other investments in the area - the London Resort is an opportunity to provide local jobs and training, spending opportunities, stimulate business opportunities to local firms (including the growing creative sector) and be a catalyst to kick start growth in the area.</p>
	<p>An interim report on research carried out for Visit Kent and Locate In Kent in 2019 showed significant unmet demand for hotel accommodation in Kent and Medway</p> <p>It would be useful to understand how LRCH could help to increase the provision of hotel bed space across Kent and Medway.</p>	<p>Potential socio-economic impacts, including the potential to create a significant positive impact for the local and regional economy has been carefully considered.</p> <p>Further information is available in ES Chapter 7 Land Use and Socio-Economic Effects (document ref 6.1.7)</p>
	<p>Neutral regarding the approach to accessibility and inclusivity, as not enough information to comment. Commend the headline ambition to create an inclusive and accessible environment: this should extend to both visitors and the workforce.</p>	<p>LRCH notes and welcomes the comment.</p>
	<p>There are potential risks to accessibility during the construction of the Gate 2 development, as it appears that this will run in parallel with Gate 1 operations: this will see Bell's Wharf used for both passengers and construction traffic. We would welcome more information here to enable a fuller assessment.</p>	<p>The Outline Sustainability Strategy considers both construction and operational phases of the Resort, including sustainable design and construction materials.</p> <p>LRCH has established an Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (document ref 6.2.3.2) which identifies the approaches that will be followed to reduce the potential impacts of construction upon the environment.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	Concern that Ebbsfleet Central, becomes a transport interchange geared to the Resort rather than the broader commercial centre of the Garden City.	LRCH is working closely with EDC as part of its proposals.
	The transport access strategy, and its influence on masterplanning, is too heavily weighted towards car users.	The Transport Strategy 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 has developed a comprehensive Transport Strategy involving multiple modes of transport. Detail is provided in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). Following consultation a Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1 – Appendix TA-AC).
	The draft DCO schedules set out a framework for consented development that leans heavily towards flexibility and gives little precision about the footprint and design of development. Until the detailed design statement is available it is hard to make an informed assessment of the mix proposed.	LRCH’s DCO application allows for flexibility around the detailed design and content of the London Resort, to enable attractions to be updated or replaced over time, in line with changing customer tastes and expectations, to ensure that it always has a fresh appeal to visitors.
	TGKP welcome the proposals from LRCH but believe that more information is required before it can fully assess the proposals. It has urged that positive engagement is maintained.	LRCH notes and welcomes this response and will endeavour to maintain ongoing engagement at appropriate points in the development.
Visit Kent	The respondent expressed excitement at the opportunities presented by the Resort. It specifically noted the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent’s location being beneficial for the development. 	LRCH notes and welcomes this response.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to generate economic opportunities to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic. • Increasing accommodation for tourists in the County. • Opportunities to boost the tourism industry in Kent. 	
Merlin	The respondent outlined its experience in operating similar attractions to London Resort and reserved the right to comment further following the submission of the DCO.	LRCH notes and welcomes this response.
Rail Future	The respondent urged the applicant to commit to close collaboration with Network Rail and rail operators to ensure that rail travel to the Resort is well managed and maintained.	LRCH notes and appreciates this comment. The applicant is continuing its liaison with Network Rail regarding maintaining the local rail network as well as opportunities to collaborate.
	The respondent raised concerns that a focus on facilitating car transport to the Resort would overcrowd local roads.	<p>LRCH is in discussion with local authorities and local transport operators to 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. In cooperation with the above we are developing upgrades for the local network as well as investigating ways to reduce impacts on the local transport network.</p> <p>The Transport Strategy 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.</p>
	The respondent raised concerns about transportation to the Resort without proper consideration of public transport options.	<p>LRCH has fully considered the transport aspects of the scheme and this is included in the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1). LRCH believes the plans are fully achievable.</p> <p>A Travel Demand Management Strategy has been developed to incentivise active and sustainable travel and is included within the Transport Assessment (document ref 6.2.9.1).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

<p>Buglife</p>	<p>The proposed London Resort development would likely have significant impacts on the diverse assemblage of nationally rare and scarce species recorded on site. Many of the species recorded in previous surveys are dependent on the small habitat features associated with the flower-rich, dry, brownfield areas of the site which are entirely lost. The diverse life cycles of invertebrates, many of which require a number of different habitat types in close proximity, would be significantly interrupted by the proposed development, leading to complete losses of species from the site. More mobile species will also suffer from the loss of habitat on the Swanscombe Peninsula as they rely on large patches of scattered habitat throughout the landscape.</p>	<p>The impacts upon the invertebrate assemblage are assessed within the Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology & Biodiversity chapter of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.12). 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.</p> <p>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. Detail of the invertebrate mitigation strategy can be found within Annex 9 of the EMMF (Document Reference 6.2.12.3).</p>
	<p>Considering the exceptional assemblage identified and the extent of direct habitat loss, Buglife strongly counters the proposal of the Environmental Impact Assessment that residual impacts will be only 'Moderate Negative' and significant at the County level only. The site can only be considered to be of national importance, as confirmed by the data, and the direct loss of the core area for invertebrates must therefore be identified as being highly significant at the national level.</p>	

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>The PEIR and Phase 1 habitat maps have failed to accurately calculate the extent of OMHPDL in the application, which prevents any meaningful assessment of the impact on the habitat type from being made. The Priority Habitat description for OMHPDL clearly identifies that only small, localised areas of bare ground are required, alongside spatial variation, a history of disturbance, a mosaic of habitats which can include open grasslands and even allows for open water and scattered scrub over 10-15% of the area. Buglife considers the vast majority of the habitat area being directly lost to the footprint of the proposed development to meet the OMHPDL criteria. However, the PEIR suggests that the site supports only 3ha, as a result of a misinterpretation of the OMHPDL criteria in the Phase 1 habitat assessments which have focused the obviously bare ground and early successional areas of the site, which is far too narrow an assessment of the habitat. Incorrectly identifying and assessing the individual habitat types within the site mosaic, rather than assessing in combination as OMHPDL can lead to extremely different assessments of the value of sites for invertebrates, as individual habitat areas are assessed as being small and</p>	<p>The extent of OMHPDL across the Project Site has been re-assessed based upon the priority habitat inventory, historic satellite data and site knowledge. The area described as OMHPDL is significantly larger than previously assessed, but does not include areas of dense scrub or obviously capped/landscaped habitat. Although the Priority Reference was used as part of the re-assessment process, professional judgement was used to include/exclude areas considered to not meet the criteria for inclusion as OMHPDL.</p> <p>The assessment of potential effects upon the OMHPDL and associated invertebrate population has been reviewed and updated following consideration of comments from consultees. A range of inherent mitigation measures, as well as additional onsite and off-site mitigation, are provided as part of the Proposed Development. Full details are provided in Chapter 12: Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology and Biodiversity (Document Reference 6.1.12). Specifically, in regard to invertebrates, mitigation is detailed within the 'Invertebrate Mitigation Strategy' enclosed within Appendix 12.3: Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (Document Reference: 6.2.12.3). Principles for the off-site mitigation are provided within Appendix 12.10: General Principles for Offsite Ecological Mitigation (Document Reference 6.2.12.10).</p>
--	---	--

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	of lower value than the overarching mosaic created.	
	The failure to accurately map and assess OMHPDL has led to the Environmental Impact Assessment outlining the impacts as only being 'Moderate Negative' and significant at the Local level only. Considering the clear importance of the invertebrate fauna associated with this habitat type, this represent a gross under-estimation of the impacts of the proposals on a Priority Habitat which is already suffering from ongoing declines in the Thames Estuary. Buglife is of the view that the OMHPDL resource on site is of national importance and that the more or less complete loss of those habitats represents a highly significant permanent loss of biodiversity.	
	The proposed London Resort development would lead to the loss of the entire resource of OMHPDL on the Swanscombe Peninsula, a significant loss for biodiversity in the Thames Estuary. The difficulty in successfully recreating brownfield and OMHPDL habitats must also be a consideration in the value of the habitats, which due to the complexity in their creation, following from decades of diverse industrial activity, make them irreplaceable.	
	Although much of the direct habitat loss occurs in areas which Buglife	The BNG has been updated and now includes Botany Marsh East as part of the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic. Although the majority of CFGM will be lost, the wider wetland mosaic will be enhanced

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>consider to meet the criteria for OMHPDL, the development has the potential to impact on an extensive area of Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh Priority Habitat, much of which is within or connected to the Botany Marsh Local Wildlife Site (LWS) adjacent to the application site. Across the wider site, the complex network of ponds, wet grasslands, reedbed, swamp and fine-scale wetland features are hydrologically dependent on the site's current ditch network. The proposed development would lead to the loss of much of the ditch network in the west of the peninsula and the introduction of extensive areas of hardstanding, with the potential to significantly impact on the site's aquatic invertebrate populations. The site-wide changes in drainage and hydrology has the potential to permanently alter the nature of the habitats across the wider peninsula due to changes in the water table.</p>	<p>through addition of new ditches and ponds to replace those lost and scrub and reedbed management. Hydrological impacts upon the Project Site are considered within Chapter 17 of the ES and in relation to ecological features within Chapter 12 (Document Reference 6.1.17 and 6.1.12). A drainage strategy has been designed in order to limit hydrological change across the Project Site.</p>
	<p>There are also expected to be direct losses, with some wetland features within the development area itself and as a result of other activities within the Development Consent Order (DCO) boundaries.</p>	
	<p>The Swanscombe Peninsula also supports an assemblage of aquatic invertebrates of significance at the county and regional level. Previous surveys referred to have recorded an</p>	<p>The impacts upon the invertebrate assemblage are assessed within the Terrestrial and Freshwater Ecology & Biodiversity chapter of the ES (Document Reference 6.1.12). 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</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>impressive 199 species of aquatic macroinvertebrate, including the Vulnerable water beetle <i>Graphoderus cinereus</i>, 3 Near Threatened water beetle species, 11 Nationally Scarce species and 51 Local Species. Across the site, two thirds of sites were assessed as being of Very High Conservation Value using the Community Conservation Index (CCI). For water beetles alone, the Water Beetle Species Quality Index produced a score of 2.9, with grazing marshes of a similar score being placed between county and regional status, and county importance being defined as a candidate SSSI.</p>	<p>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. Detail of the invertebrate mitigation strategy can be found within Annex 9 of the EMMF (Document Reference 6.2.12.3).</p>
	<p>The proposed development would likely lead to significant changes to the site's hydrology as outlined as well as some habitat features being directly lost to development, which could significantly alter the habitats available on site for this significant assemblage. Considering the direct loss of features and the potential to impact on the site-wide hydrology, it is unclear how the Environmental Impact Assessment has assessed the residual impacts as being 'Minor positive'.</p>	<p>The BNG has been updated and now includes Botany Marsh East as part of the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic. Although the majority of CFGM will be lost, the wider wetland mosaic will be enhanced through addition of new ditches and ponds to replace those lost and scrub and reedbed management. Hydrological impacts upon the Project Site are considered within Chapter 17 of the ES and in relation to ecological features within Chapter 12 (Document Reference 6.1.17 and 12). A drainage strategy has been designed in order to limit hydrological change across the Project Site.</p>
	<p>The habitats on the Swanscombe Peninsula have developed as a result of its complicated history, with its coastal grazing marsh and grassland habitats subject to landfill and the dumping of cement waste over many</p>	<p>Details of the invertebrate mitigation strategy can be found within Annex 9 of the EMMF (Document Reference 6.2.12.3). Whilst it is acknowledged that creation of OMHPDL is difficult, the proposed mitigation strategy draws upon existing examples of habitat creation, such as the Port of Tilbury's London Distribution Park project. Enhancement works are proposed to retained areas of the Broadness Grasslands, which have a history of disturbance but have started to progress towards a more closed habitat mosaic.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>decades. It also play host to water treatment works, the HS1 railway and jetties, creating a diverse range of habitats in a mosaic across the site established on the varying underlying substrates, hydrologies and topographies. It is often incorrectly stated that because brownfield habitats are artificial in their origin, that they are therefore easily replicated. However, there has yet to be any evidenced, large-scale replication of a diverse and complex brownfield habitat, effectively meaning that OMHPDL habitats of this type should be considered as irreplaceable. The failure of the PEIR to accurately survey, assess and quantify the habitats on site due to their complicated nature is evidence of the inherent difficulties.</p>	
	<p>It is also notable that the mitigation proposals on-site focus almost entirely on maintaining the value of the wetland features on site, leading to a significant net loss of dry, terrestrial habitats of key important for invertebrates. Considering the national significance of the terrestrial invertebrate fauna and by association the Priority OMHPDL habitat, this represents an unacceptable outcome</p>	
	<p>The information available for the offsite compensation is currently so limited as to prevent a meaningful assessment being made, however, the</p>	<p>Off-site compensation land is in the process of acquisition and further details will be made available once it is secured. Natural England will be consulted on the scope of mitigation land being proposed. For the purpose of the DCO application, a set of general principles for the creation of off-site mitigation is included as an Appendix to the ES (Document Reference 6.2.12.10).</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	difficulty in recreating OMHPDL habitats must be addressed appropriately.	
	Buglife is also concerned about the Biodiversity Net Gain metric calculations, as outlined in detail by the Kent Wildlife Trust and would like to support their position that the application significantly underestimates the net losses associated with the development. The value of the onsite enhancements is over-estimated due to the failure of the initial baseline assessments to accurately capture the onsite habitats and their value. This includes the failure to correctly identify the extensive on-site OMHPDL resources properly.	The BNG calculations have been updated in line with the recommendations made by consultees and is considered to be accurate in its portrayal of the Project Site's biodiversity value. Botany Marsh west and east have been incorporated into the Floodplain Wetland Mosaic grouping, and large areas of the peninsula and Ebbsfleet Valley have been included as OMHPDL. Condition ratings have been updated and are considered appropriate based on the guidance and detailed survey of the Project Site. Justifications and explanation of assumptions made can be found within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment report (Document Reference 6.2.12.2).
	As there is no National Policy Statement (NPS) for business or commercial Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) applications, the PEIR states that regard is given to the National Networks NPS, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and relevant local plans. However, Buglife consider the application to fail to meet the guidance laid out in both the NPS and the NPPF	The Proposed Development is considered compliant with the requirements of the NPPF and relevant NPS.
	Buglife has outlined the inaccuracies in both assessing the value and impacts of the application on Priority habitats and species. Paragraph 5.22 states within the 'Applicant's assessment'	The valuation and assessment of impacts on Priority Habitats and Species has been reviewed and updated in the ES following feedback from Buglife and other consultees. This included reviewing the extent of OMHPDL on the Project Site. A suite of on-site mitigation measures are provided to mitigate effects on priority habitats and species, with additional off-site mitigation to be provided to address any residual effects remaining after the application of on-site measures.

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>that “Where the project is subject to EIA the applicant should ensure that the environmental statement clearly sets out any likely significant effects ... on habitats and other species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity and that the statement considers the full range of potential impacts on ecosystems”. However, the current failure to adequately assess or consider areas of nationally important OMHPDL and the Species of Principal Importance that it supports, prevents such a position from being reached. Paragraph 5.35 also confirms that the “The Secretary of State should ensure that applicants have taken measures to ensure these species and habitats are protected from the adverse effects of development”, however, this application represent the permanent loss of one of the best remaining areas of Priority OMHPDL habitat.</p>	
	<p>Paragraph 5.32 also outlines how “The Secretary of State should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the national need for and benefits of the development, in that location, clearly outweigh the loss.” Buglife views complex OMHPDL sites</p>	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that creation of OMHPDL is difficult, the proposed mitigation strategy draws upon existing examples of habitat creation, such as the Port of Tilbury's London Distribution Park project. Enhancement works are proposed to retained areas of the Broadness Grasslands, which have a history of disturbance but have started to progress towards a more closed habitat mosaic.</p>

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>as irreplaceable, despite their artificial origins, due to the complex nature of their creation, particularly with sites such as Swanscombe due to the diverse and long-term nature of their creation. There is little evidence available to suggest that such habitat is replicable and as such, it should be considered irreplaceable.</p>	
	<p>Although the NPPF is subordinate to the NPS, it may still be considered as a material consideration. Buglife consider the application to also fail to meet the biodiversity requirements of the NPPF. Paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.” The current proposals would lead to direct losses of habitat for nationally rare and scarce invertebrate assemblages and threaten the viability of the invertebrate populations in the area</p>	<p>Overall, it is considered that the Proposed Development is capable of delivering a net biodiversity gain subject to the adherence to impact avoidance and mitigation measures on-site, along with the enhancement and long-term management of the mosaic of habitats as currently present, and the delivery of off-site ecological mitigation. The Proposed Development is considered compliant with the requirements of the NPPF and relevant NPS.</p>
	<p>Paragraph 174 states “To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should... promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection</p>	

Consultation Report Appendix 5.31 – Summary Table of Issues from Organisations

	<p>and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.” The current proposals include the loss of OMHPD Land demonstrate a clear net loss for biodiversity in the area, despite surveys indicating an invertebrate population of national importance.</p>	
	<p>Buglife is of the view that at present, the application fails to meet the requirements of the National Networks NPS and NPPF in the absence of a relevant NPS for business or commercial NSIPs, due to the unacceptable losses of biodiversity, with current restoration and mitigation proposals unlikely to prevent net losses</p>	