

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [London Resort](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** LRCH LETTER TO EXAMINING AUTHORITY, 10TH JANUARY 2022  
**Date:** 17 January 2022 09:25:22  
**Importance:** High

---

Dear Sirs

I refer to Paragraph 4 of the above letter, where the Applicant states...***"the Inspectorate were aware that elements of the submission would follow acceptance and that their absence may indicate that the application would not be ready for submission"***.

The statement begs several answers for clarification:

1. What elements were not submitted but would follow from the Applicant and have these been submitted?
2. The Applicant assumes that the Application would be accepted even though it is incomplete, who had advised them accordingly? *(It must be remembered that if they hadn't submitted the Application by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020, their most significant land option would expire)*
3. Why was the Application accepted by the Inspectorate when it was known that it was not ready for Examination?
4. It is normal that the Inspectorate will extend the pre-examination period by up to three months so that the Applicant can address any issues. However, this Application was submitted over TWELVE months ago. Why has the Inspectorate been so lenient with the Applicant and not insisted that they withdraw the Application or it goes straight to Examination? *(I hope this is now being addressed)*

Best wishes

*Dan*

**Dan Bramwell**  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [London Resort](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** THE LONDON RESORT - BC080001  
**Date:** 20 January 2022 09:46:36  
**Importance:** High

---

**Further Statement in Relation to Application by London Resort Company Holdings for an Order Granting Development Consent for the London Resort**

**Ref: BC080001**<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>

Further to my submission of 8th January concerning the above, I wish to make some general comments on the Applicant's letter and other representations, the contents of which reinforce my opinion that the sooner this Application proceeds to Examination, the better it will be for all parties.

APPLICANT'S LETTER

There is nothing within their representation that in my view warrants further delays to the Examination of the Application. The Applicant fails to give any reasonable and robust reasons for such and continues to suggest the project will deliver significant economic and social benefits, both of which will need detailed scrutiny at the Examination to be verified.

In general there are three key issues which are repeated in most of the submitted representations:

ENGAGEMENT

It is evident that on-going engagement with most parties has been sorely lacking. PMG and the businesses assumed they were an isolated case and the Applicant was focusing on engagement with the statutory consultees. How wrong! It is now apparent, that despite the many delays, the Applicant has failed to engage and even liaise effectively with most parties despite doors being open to them. Thus, in summary, their engagement is weak, lacks robustness and another three months will not be sufficient time for them to 'play catch-up'.

FUNDING

Several PMG businesses submitted technical relocation reports for consideration by the Applicant so that they could relocate and plan for the future. However, none of these appear to have been treated seriously so one has to ask if the Applicant ever received them. It was very apparent - and confirmed by many of the representations - that the Applicant had no readily available funds to progress these opportunities. Financial accountability and funding is still a major issue if the Applicant is to gain credibility, with Annual Accounts regularly deposited late with Companies House and, worryingly, one of its former suppliers taking legal action to recover outstanding debts. They have to prove they

have funds if they are going to move or extinguish these businesses.

#### TIMING

The Applicant suggests it will be beneficial to delay the Examination for a further few months. They have had since 2012 (when the project was first suggested) to formally engage with the businesses but little progress has been made. Much the same can be said about progress with the many other stakeholders and Interested Parties. Another three months is unlikely to make much difference and one really has to ask if there is the will to deliver The London Resort as reading the representations, there appears not!

#### SUMMARY

I stand by the contents of my previous submission that the Application must proceed to Examination at the earliest possible opportunity so that this farcical situation can be brought to a conclusion or The Planning Inspectorate should consider ways in which the current Application can be curtailed. The on-going uncertainty is damaging the businesses, the local economy and North Kent's wider industrial progress.

*Dan Bramwell*

**Dan Bramwell**  
**Former Public Affairs Consultant to**  
**Peninsular Management Group (PMG)**