

THE LONDON RESORT

The London Resort Development Consent Order

BC080001

Environmental Statement Volume 2: Appendices

Appendix 18.14 – Minutes from meetings with Environment Agency and local authority regulators

Document reference: 6.2.18.14

Revision: 00

December 2020

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Regulation 5(2)(a)

The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

Regulation 12(1)

[This page is intentionally left blank]

Minutes

Subject London Resort – Contaminated Land Job no 0042936
Place Microsoft Teams Date 21 October 2020
Present ██████████ [RG] – Savills Apologies None
██████████ [HC] – Buro Happold
██████████ [HM] – Buro Happold
██████████ – Buro Happold
██████████ – Gravesham BC
██████████ [JF] – Dartford BC
██████████ – Gravesham BC
██████████ [AP] – Ebbsfleet DC / Arcadis
██████████ – Ebbsfleet DC /
Arcadis
██████████ – Gravesham BC
Distribution All

Objective of meeting: Outline proposals with regards to land affected by contamination at London Resort

Item	Action
1.0 Introductions / aim of meeting	
1.1 HC welcomed everyone and described the purpose of the meeting – to discuss proposals with regards to potential contaminated land at London Resort.	
1.2 All: introduced themselves, organisation and remit with respect to the project.	
2.0 Outline description of the scheme	
2.1 RG provided an outline of the proposed development and described progress since 2015, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Investment since 2013;• Appointment of PY Gerbeau as Chief Executive;• Business plan review (desire for inclusion of Resort Cores, hotel capacity, water park, conferention centre, e-sports facilities, related housing, 'Park-and-glide' from Port of Tilbury);• Development Consent Order Limits have been refined - reduced in size since publication of PEIR;• Statutory Consultation ended in September 2020 (5th round of consultation since the project's inception). Engagement was up despite consultation being held entirely remotely; and• DCO submission will be in Q4 of 2020, with examination through 2021.	

3.0 Studies to date

- 3.1 HM described studies related to ground conditions that have been undertaken to date:
- Desk Studies for Swanscombe Peninsula (Atkins, 2014) and A2 Access Corridor (Atkins, 2015)
 - Exploratory level GI specified by Atkins and undertaken by Geotechnical Engineering during 2015 – noted that coverage was extremely sporadic due to access constraints;
 - Outline Remediation and Earthworks Strategy (Atkins, 2015)
 - Buro Happold updated Desk Studies for the Swanscombe Peninsula and A2 Access Corridor during 2020 – reflecting new/refined DCO Limits – should be read in conjunction with the Desk Studies prepared by Atkins;
 - Buro Happold prepared new, standalone Desk Study for Essex Project Site;
 - Received 2019 annual monitoring reports for permitted landfills: South Pit (CMS Enviro), Northfleet Landfill (CMS Enviro), Bamber Quarry Landfill (WSP).
 - HS1 Impact Assessment (Buro Happold, 2020)
 - Contaminated Land Management Strategy (Buro Happold, 2020)
 - New Groundsure GeoInsight datasets available for both Kent Project Site and Essex Project Site.
- 3.2 Atkins reports / investigations divided the Kent Project Site into a number of zones to facilitate assessment. These have been re-adopted by Buro Happold.
- 3.3 HM noted that exploratory holes from 2015 GI were mostly installed with groundwater monitoring wells. These were located and dipped in July 2020 and resampled in September 2020. A programme of groundwater monitoring is now underway – sampling on a monthly basis for the next 12 months. The first round of data will be included as a technical appendix to the ES.
- 3.4 It has been agreed with the EA that updating the Desk Studies plus obtaining groundwater data from existing wells will be acceptable for the DCO submission.

4.0 Conceptual site model (CSM) of the Kent Project Site

- 4.1 HM described the CSM for the Swanscombe Peninsula (Zones 1-5) – land uses, topography, geology, hydrogeology, hydrology, ecology.
- 4.2 Presented the earthworks plan for the Swanscombe Peninsula. Noted that the EA want the proposed development to reflect current topography as much as possible. HM noted that this has been strived for, but current proposals do include areas of cut within landfilled / permitted areas.
- 4.3 HM described the CSM for the A2 Access Corridor (Zones 6-9) – land uses, geology, hydrogeology, hydrology, ecology.

5.0 Environmental Statement

- 5.1 HM outlined the structure and approach to the Ground Conditions ES Chapter:
- Introduction, methodology and data – including response to scoping, record of liaison undertaken, assessment criteria and data sources.
 - Law, policy and guidance.

- Baseline, receptors and sensitivity – described separately for the Essex Project Site, Swanscombe Peninsula and A2 Highway Works.
- Assessment of significant effects (construction and operation) – separate assessment for the Essex Project Site, Swanscombe Peninsula and A2 Highway Works.
- Mitigation – measures described separately for Essex Project Site, Swanscombe Peninsula and A2 Highway Works.
- Noted that the majority of potential effects will be mitigated by adopting generic / good practice measures secured via the Remediation Strategy and CEMP.
- Additional specific mitigation measures are required in particular areas: CKD deposits, landfills (leachate and gas control systems), areas subjected to Environmental Permits. These measures are outlined within the ES Chapter and described fully within the Contaminated Land Management Strategy (included as a technical appendix). The CLMS sets out:
 - Assumptions for spoil re-use (40% re-use/treatment, 60% disposal);
 - Subtle capping strategy required in areas of sensitive ecology (Broadness Marsh);
 - Assumed that gas protection measures will be required in buildings;
 - Presence of soil hospital on Swanscombe Peninsula (possible due to sequential construction of Gate 1 and Gate 2);
 - Initial research into potential re-use of CKD;
 - Management of existing leachate and gas controls in areas that could be affected by construction;
 - Regulatory issues related to investigation and construction in areas managed under Environmental Permits.
- Residual effects.
- Climate change.
- Cumulative effects.
- Summary and conclusions.

6.0 Planned future work

- 6.1 HM described that a 1-year programme of monthly groundwater (from existing groundwater wells), surface water and sediment sampling is being undertaken.
- 6.2 Ground investigations will be undertaken across the Project Site (Kent Project Site [all zones] and Essex Project Site) during 2021. These will have combined geotechnical and geoenvironmental objectives with contribution from archaeology / ecology specialists as required.
- 6.3 Specification of the ground investigations will include liaison with key stakeholders (e.g. regulators, HS1).

7.0 Questions and discussion

- 7.1 HC facilitated Q&A.
- 7.2 JF referred to HM statement that the capping strategy (Swanscombe Peninsula) will take into account sensitive ecology and queried the proposed end-use. HM described the intention to reclaim and restore areas of marshland with public
-

access. This will include a new waterbody (an area of excavation), which will be lined to prevent infiltration and leachate generation.

- 7.3 AP referred to a table of previous ground investigations included in the PEIR and asked whether this data will be incorporated into the baseline description. HM confirmed that this data will be incorporated (the data and exploratory hole logs are available), but it is limited / sporadic. HM noted that this makes the data obtained from re-sampling of groundwater wells particularly useful.
- 7.4 AP asked whether Natural England and Historic England are involved with discussions regarding Baker's Hole. RG confirmed that this is the case and that discussions are progressing between WSP, Wessex Archaeology and Buro Happold.
-

The minutes detailed herein reflect the author's recollection of the discussions held during the meeting detailed above. If you feel that these minutes are inaccurate; proposed additions, corrections and/or comments must be submitted to the author in writing within five working days of the date of these minutes. If no written responses are received within this period, these minutes will be deemed the official record of the meeting.