

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 Rhys Govier [RG] – Savills Apologies None
Hannah Clement [HC] – Buro Happold
Hugh Mallett [HM] – Buro Happold
Nina Sopp – Buro Happold
Debbie Wilders – Gravesham BC
James Fox [JF] – Dartford BC
Peter Pisarczykoski – Gravesham BC
Alison Pugh [AP] – Ebbsfleet DC / Arcadis
Caroline Soubry-Smith – Ebbsfleet DC /
Arcadis
Tony Chadwick – 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.

Minutes

Subject London Resort - Environment Agency Consultation Job no 0047730

Place via Teams Date 02 June 2021

Present EA - Karolina Allu Michelle Waterman-Gay Apologies EDP - Fiona McKenzie LRCH – Andrew Comer BH – Simon Pilkington

Buro Happold - Christine Cambrook
Nilani Venn
Hugh Mallet

APEM - Rachel Antill
Marc Hubble

EDP – James Bird
Emily Williams

Distribution As present + wider project teams.

Objective of meeting: To discuss the Environment Agency Relevant Representation on the London Resort project and identify priority areas for follow up discussion.

| Item | Action |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1.0 General | |
| 1.1 CC gave a brief update on project status following the notification of the site as a SSSI by Natural England; the project team are working through a number of the ES chapters in order to assess the impact of the SSSI notification on the assessment. There is therefore to be a delay in the start of the examination, and a re-consultation in August. | Note |
| 1.2 WWTP – KA confirmed that the EA permitting team will be able to use the existing EA charging agreement with LRCH for the purposes of providing advice on the WWTP design. | |
| 1.3 Generally, there was a view that the EA RR comments require a level of detail that is not currently available. There is a need for all to understand the timeline for producing detailed design and how the approvals for detailed design can be integrated into the DCO process, through the DCO Requirements / CEMP, and how these interface with the Environmental Permitting process. | Enquire with legal teams |
| 2.0 EA Relevant Representation | |
| 2.1 Ground Investigation - HM highlighted that while the EA are happy with the GI strategy which has been developed, it applies to the resort area only. A | |

| | | |
|------|---|-------|
| | similar strategy document is under development for the Access Road corridor. | |
| 2.2 | WFD – the EA confirmed that they are happy with the WFD for the Thames, the comment in the RR relating to WFD is in relation to assessment for Main Rivers on the Essex project site. It was commented that although main rivers on the Tilbury project site are not WFD water bodies that they should be included within the WFD Assessment e.g. Pincocks Trough, East Tilbury Dock Sewer, Chadwell Cross Sewer. RA to coordinate following information from CC. | RA/CC |
| 2.3 | Surface Water Quality – HM noted that the ongoing water quality monitoring which has been undertaken since October 2020 could be incorporated in the updated ES. Initial review of the data has not found anything unexpected. | HM |
| 2.4 | Flood Risk Assessment – KA will continue to try and get hold of the draft water levels from the EA’s updated TE2100 flood model, the full model is not available for use by the project team (estimated date for EA approval of the model is July ‘21). Once levels are available NV can compare these to the levels used in the current flood modelling and understand the impact of any changes. The implications of later changes in data / models need to be discussed and agreed as part of a technical flood risk meeting (see next steps). | KA |
| 2.5 | NV will go through the RRs on Flood Risk Assessment and Flood Defences in detail and set out a road map as to which comments can be addressed now and which require detailed design. | NV |
| 2.6 | Biodiversity – JB stated that EDP are currently working at pace to update the ES in light of the SSSI notification, and have been engaging extensively with NE. This includes assessing if any of the on-site ecological interventions should be removed, and further development to offsite mitigation proposals. EDP to invite EA to next meeting with NE, such that the EA biodiversity team are coordinated with NE requirements. (Tom Cooke + Karolina Allu). | JB |
| 2.7 | Freshwater Fish – EW queried the EA’s plans / requirements for enhancement of the Ebbsfleet, as the flood defences are a major barrier to real improvements for freshwater fish, in addition to requiring a strategic approach with the EA given the River Ebbsfleet role in food defence. KA to clarify comments with relevant EA officers. It is understood there are currently no known strategic proposals in place for enhancement /restoration of the Ebbsfleet. | KA |
| 2.8 | Access Road – EA comment re: justification for Access Road positioning adjacent to Ebbsfleet to be passed for WSP for comment. | CC |
| 2.9 | Essex Site – Surveys – KA to clarify the comment from the Essex team in relation to surveys on the Essex site, the project team consider that appropriate surveys have been undertaken. | KA |
| 2.10 | Tidal environment – RA highlighted that the comments relate to detailed design / construction design of items such as cofferdams and booms. A mechanism is therefore needed for this detail to be incorporated later. | KA/CC |
| 2.11 | Scour from marine traffic, cofferdams and outfall. It was discussed that hydrodynamic modelling should include assessment of vessel wake/scour, cofferdam and outfall scour. MH queried the importance of modelling, as | |

| | |
|--|----|
| per the RR, as compared to professional judgement based on examples. KA pass to EA technical specialists. | KA |
| 2.12 It was agreed that the project team would provide a tabulated response to the EA RRs stating where clarification is required, where updates will be provided to the ES, and where the comment requires detailed / construction design information and hence will be addressed further in the process. CC to coordinate. | CC |
| <hr/> | |
| 3.0 Next Steps | |
| 3.1 It was agreed to hold regular fortnightly meetings between the EA and project team, covering different technical areas. | |
| 3.2 The first meeting will be on Flood Risk and will be on 16 th June. | NV |

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.