

From: [Frances Robinson](#)
To: [London Resort](#)
Subject: No, the continued delay in commencement of application is not in the public interest.
Date: 07 January 2022 16:42:28
Attachments: [ThemeParkHotels_EquityBrochure.pdf](#)

Dear London Resort Project Case Team,

In the capacity of a registered IP 20027970, I write to you in answer to your question 1. about the continued delay and that I agree that the planning examination should start as soon as possible now, at least by march, and any further delay is certainly not justified.

4. Other considerations relevant to this procedural decision are:

The failings of the applicant to properly engage with environmental NGOs and threatened local businesses, which has been apparent all through the representations during this over long process.

The Applicant's approach to providing information and their conduct in enticing in more big investors. On their website it states "There is no route in the UK for investment in the project at this stage." Yet, see attached PDF brochure from a London address with its over inflated claims. Farrbury Capital.

Also, [REDACTED] invites investors to a webinar on Tuesday 16 February where she will be revealing more details about this "once-in-a-lifetime opportunity" even though she talks of her integrity credentials. Is this ethical, appropriate or even legal of LRCH, when Order Granting Development Consent has not even been granted? Making the presumptuous announcement to them, that the value of equity will significantly increase on formal granting of DCO (as if they already have permission) LRCH do not care for the environmental or pollution issues or the impact on the already fragile and overburdened local infrastructure. Their only care is money.

Their attitude to Natural England's SSSI decision, calling it "erroneous" and that their own mitigation will be "subtle changes" to their plans, when BNG, as described by Natural England is "an approach to development, and/or land management, that leaves nature in a measurably better state than beforehand." How can LRCH possibly achieve that, by having to destroy acres of rare habitat and wildlife for the 70% they say will be under cover? They say " a large proportion of the Peninsula landscape will remain undeveloped and will be enhanced" That cannot be physically possible, when on a relatively small area of land that can be walked across in half an hour they plan to have "Europe's first mega theme park with not only "50" theme park rides, including 2 roller coasters, but Europe's largest indoor water park, 4 hotels, live music venues, theatre spaces, shopping and restaurants, and an artificial lake (as if the natural waterways already there, weren't enough)

Network rail, TfL AND HS1 have all raised serious concerns in the relevant representations about the impact on their services, should this go ahead, with 20 million expected visitors annually.

Lower Thames crossing isn't opening till 2029 or 2030, yet 25% people are still anticipated to arrive by car. London Resort state that only 15% of visitors would arrive at the Resort via the river.

Lastly 5. You ask what other possible measures might the ExA lawfully and fairly decide to take in the circumstances and recognising the concern of parties.

LRCH say that they will continue engagement with local and national organisations, local communities but we are all aware this has been inadequate.

The London Resort community consultation report was a digital exercise in a short space of time in the summer of 2020 during the pandemic. With more people now aware of the theme park plan due to heightened media exposure, because of the subsequent SSSI status, related climate change issues, and also now the Dartford borough plan, it would seem appropriate, that a further inclusive consultation should ascertain the present views either for a theme park in this location or something more sympathetic to the environment.

We are living in a time when our actions now determine the future of the planet. It's no coincidence that the current satirical movie "Don't look up" is seemingly truer to life than fiction.

In the year when the UK hosted the Cop26 summit, the implications of this particular NSIP cannot be ignored purely for a few people's anticipated financial gain. Any predicted benefits of bringing short term low wage jobs, will be to the detriment of the businesses and residents already there, with disastrous traffic gridlocks and pollution and flooding contributing to climate change. Protecting what we already have remaining is imperative in the current situation.

Impacts of the development (including construction and operation) on the local community and environment, outweigh the national need for it. This is not levelling up when there are abandoned theme parks elsewhere in the UK.

Thankyou for posing these questions.

Yours sincerely

Frances Robinson