

From: [REDACTED]
To: [London Resort](#)
Subject: London Resort BC080001 Comments on Responses to ExA Questions
Date: 22 January 2022 20:29:25

BEAN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Honorary Secretary, Linda Collins, [REDACTED]

Our ref: 21-22/E315

22nd January 2022

Your ref: BC080001

Our registration identification number 20026992

[F.a.o. Rynd Smith LLB MA MRTPI FRSA, Lead Member of the Examining Authority](#)

Planning Inspectorate, National Infrastructure

Dear Sir

We have noted the 47 responses to your 21st December 2021 invitation.

You have probably been supplied with an analysis, but our own findings are: -

1. The 10th Jan 2022 response from PY Gerbeau for London Resort “proposes consideration be given by the ExA to fixing the Preliminary Meeting date for June/July 2022.” This is to ‘focus minds’, but is vague on delivery. Whilst recognising “the sub-optimal impact of the delays” LRCH say documents would be incomplete in March 22. In ‘mitigation’, LRCH say their documents were also incomplete when DCO accepted for Examination a year ago. The assertion that the UK can’t do without this Theme Park in NW Kent is not supported by “Build Back Better”, March 2021. There is a mention of “Leisure”, but in Southport, with regard to levelling up the Regions. “Thames Estuary 2050 Vision”, June 2018 urged London Resort to submit a DCO by the end of 2018, or else! There is no response from the Growth Commission, but there is one, mentioned below, from EDC.
2. A concern alluded to in several stakeholder responses is about the applicant’s financial position.
 - Companies House show “**Accounts Overdue**” from KEHC (UK) and their subsidiaries that include LRCH.
 - Nature of business is “Other service activities not elsewhere classified” and finance is “small companies regime”.
 - BDB Pitmans LLP Solicitors were chasing LRCH for their own Fees in October 2021.
 - EDC and others have been unable to get LRCH to agree to pay for the time to review current and new documents.
 - Environmental Groups are concerned about the drain on resources of

protracted timetable.

3. Only the major land-owner makes a case for allowing as much time as needed to respond to the SSSI designation.
They don't mention that information is also missing, including on Infrastructure to support development.
4. Road, Rail, Water, Sewage etc.. companies suggest LRCH Withdraw as application is many months away from ready.
They doubt LRCH understand rail transport or the need to fund major improvements to it.
Hence, updating is not only because of the SSSI, but because financial commitments are awaited and meetings ceased.
5. Free-Port Authorities are doubting they can commit to accommodating Park & Glide facilities.
Their provision is assumed in the minimal infrastructure enhancements proposed.
6. Owners of Businesses trading in the established Estates near the HS1 line want a March 2022 Examination.
With the application hanging over them since 2014, they cannot plan for the future.
Relocation responsibility is denied by LRCH, so left to others (e.g., Locate in Kent) with no suitable locations.
Costs not agreed and meaningful discussions not forthcoming.
7. Environmental Groups irritated by LRCH saying SSSI doesn't need "material changes".
Clearly it does, but to admit that would probably have led to earlier Application Withdrawal.
8. Others, including Bean RA, are saying the Applicant should Withdraw the DCO. It is out of date.
The SSSI means the Applicant should start again and consider suitable sites without environmental objection.
Site Selection criteria (Dec 20, ES Vol 1, Ch 4), environmental constraints, would now rule out Swanscombe.
9. The Book of Reference includes, without reason, land at Bean adjacent to homes and the A2BE scheme.
For avoidance of doubt, the £127M A2BE scheme, under construction, does not allow for London Resort.

We hope that these further responses are helpful.

Yours faithfully

Linda Collins
Hon Sec, Bean RA