



Meeting note

File reference	BC080001 - London Paramount
Status	Final
Author	Patrycja Pikniczka
Date	14 January 2015
Meeting with	London Resort Holdings Company (LRHC)
Venue	Savills Offices, 33 Margaret Street, London
Attendees	Chris Potts (Savills) Karl Cradick (Savills) Holly Rhoades (Savills) Andy Martin (PPS) Sonia Bunn (Dartford BC) Peter Price (Gravesham Borough Council) Abby Raymond (Kent County Council) Liz Shier (Kent County Council) Kevin Doyle (LRCH) Graciela Moreno (Farrells) Richard Hutchings (RH) Mark Wilson (PINS) Patrycja Pikniczka (PINS) Will Spencer (PINS)
Meeting objectives	Project update.
Circulation	All attendees.

The applicant was advised on its openness policy, that any advice given will be recorded and placed on the Planning Inspectorates' (PINS) website under s.51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act) and also to note that any advice given under s.51 does not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) can rely.

Summary of key points discussed

Land update

LRHC advised that option agreements which constitute 80-85% of the land needed for the proposed development (the Peninsula) are now secured by signed agreements between the applicant and the landowners.

PINS was informed that a Head of Terms agreement in respect of the EIGP land needed for the main access route has also been signed off. LRHC advised that approximately 50 properties are still to be acquired. LRHC explained that all landowners were advised and informed about applicant's intention.

LRHC explained that CA may be needed if the applicant cannot come to agreement with 1 or 2 outstanding landowners but that it would not constitute a significant element of the application.

EIA next steps

LRHC explained that regular meetings with key stakeholders being held. All consultees, including those who did not respond to initial consultation, are contacted at each stage.

LRHC explained that baseline assessment is continuing for the purpose of Preliminary Environmental Information Report ('PEIR') in discussion with key stakeholders.

LRHC explained that a table with responses from key consultees has been produced to keep a log of responses and comments. The Planning Inspectorate asked whether that table will be updated as issues are coming through. LRHC confirmed it would be.

PINS explained that on the status of HS1 Ltd. as a statutory consultee for the project has not yet been confirmed. Further discussions are planned with the Office of Rail Regulation to confirm the status of the company. It is understood however that HS1 Ltd. continue to be consulted by the project team regarding the scope of the EIA.

Consultation

LRHC explained that stage three non-statutory consultations will commence in February/March 2015. It was explained that stage three consultations will be based on workshops based on topic areas.

LRHC advised that transport has emerged as a key issue during initial stages of non-statutory consultation.

PINS was advised that non-statutory consultation with local communities had gone well so far. In addition, LRHC meets with key stakeholders such as the Environment Agency ('EA'), Natural England ('NE'), English Heritage ('EH') and Highways Agency ('HA') on regular basis.

Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC)

LRHC advised that is currently undertaking work on draft SOCC in consultation with local planning authorities (informally). PINS commented that if LRHC intended to publish a summary of the full SoCC then that should also be made available to the Councils to ensure they are content with the summary. LRHC stated that it was

intended to publish the full SOCC to ensure that local communities are aware of proposed consultation activities.

LRHC confirmed that it intends to send draft SOCC to PINS for comment once finalised informally with the Councils.

Design deliverables & Transport

LRHC confirmed that design is still a subject to on-going discussions. LRHC informed that the intention is to use Rochdale Envelope approach for the purpose of the EIA, based on various development scenarios and an assessment of the worst case. PINS noted the difficulties of defining the worst case in this approach but noted that this had been used in EIAs for other NSIPs.

PINS asked what type of security is proposed to restrict access to the site from non-paying visitors. LRHC explained that security fencing will be provided around the 'pay-zone' area for the resort but that this would be surrounded by planting and other landscaping to reduce its visual impact where possible.

LRHC explained the proposal for the transport assessment to be based on the assumption that 60% of visitors would travel to the development by private car, with the remainder by rail or other method of transport. PINS sought clarity on whether it would be appropriate to assess a potential worst case scenario when all visitors would travel to the site by road/private car (e.g. should the train station/s be closed for any reason). It was agreed that this issue would need to be subject to further discussion and agreement (where possible) with relevant consultees.

LRHC is in discussions with the LPAs regarding local transport issues and a range of matters will be considered to control off-site parking. PINS asked whether a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) is currently a topic considered during the non-statutory stage of consultation. LRHC confirmed the matter had been raised informally in consultation and would be reviewed.

PINS advised the applicant to be open about the potential for establishing a CPZ to ensure that this did not flare up as an issue at the examination. CPZs in residential areas are usually controversial. It is advisable to seek the views of affected communities about the extent and operating hours of any CPZ. LRHC commented that in their view the surrounding communities were aware of the potential for the imposition of a CPZ and views expressed at consultation events were generally positive about CPZs in principle.

PINS asked about Swanscombe train station and observed that it was closer to the main entrance than Ebbsfleet International Station, which was intended to be the main rail station serving the development. PINS asked, given that many journeys were likely to be made from within London to Swanscombe station, had LRHC discussed with Network Rail about any capacity constraints at the station? LRHC stated that the issue was being considered and that early discussions with Network Rail had taken place. Further discussions were planned.

LRHC asked whether there is a possibility to move bigger structures if the needed to be moved once the application is submitted to PINS. PINS advised that worst case scenarios and possibilities must be assessed within the ES. Should the applicant propose changes to the application once submitted, it will be for the Examining

Authority ('ExA') to decide whether these scenarios have been assessed within the ES and constitute non-material or material changes to the application.

LRHC advised that there are regular meetings with Highways Agency to discuss transport matters. PINS was advised by LRHC that the local highways authorities are supportive of the transport strategy in principle. LRHC advised that the Thames Clipper commuter boat service is also being consulted about extending the service to the peninsula. It's estimated that up to 5% of journeys could be by boat.

Any other business

PINS asked whether the applicant is currently aware of any transboundary issues with other EEA member states. LRHC confirmed that there is more work to be done before it will engage with other states.

PINS asked what form of transport will be used for construction purposes. LRHC explained that a large proportion of construction materials are intended to be delivered using the river.

LRHC explained that heritage is a big challenge due to number of scheduled monuments and archaeological remains on the site. LRHC confirmed that there are on-going discussions with English Heritage and other specialists such as Wessex Archaeologists regarding that matter.

LRHC advised that transport, socio-economics, archaeology, noise and environment are key issues for the project. LRHC advised that there are also on-going discussions with EA and NE regarding water and flood risks.

LRHC advised that a small Combined Heat and Power station is also part of the project.

Action and follow up

PINS asked LRHC and present local authorities whether they feel there is a need for an outreach event with key parties during the on-going non-statutory consultation. LRHC and local authorities agreed to follow this up and suggest dates around the same time as the planned evening workshop events in February.