



## Meeting note

<b>File reference</b>	BC080001
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	Mark Wilson
<b>Date</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> October 2016, 11am
<b>Meeting with</b>	LRCH, Local Authorities and Ebbsfleet Development Corporation
<b>Venue</b>	Savills, 33 Margaret Street, London, W1G 0JD
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>London Resort company Holdings (LRCH)</b> David Testa – LRCH, CEO Chris Potts – Savills Andy Martin – PPS Richard Hutchings – WSP Transport Shabana Anwar – Bircham Dyson Bell Alex Lepez – Faithful & Gould  <b>Relevant Authorities</b> Sonia Bunn – Dartford Borough Council (DBC) Peter Price – Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) Mark Pullin – Ebbsfleet Development Corporation (EDC) Stephen Dukes – Kent County Council (KCC)  <b>The Planning Inspectorate</b> Mark Wilson – Infrastructure Planning Lead Helen Lancaster – Senior EIA Advisor
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Update on London Paramount Resort project
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees.

### Summary of key points discussed and advice given:

LRCH updated the group on their progress towards submitting an application.

### Land

LRCH noted that the DCO boundary as shown in the consultation material has been drawn quite widely. In particular, with reference to the A2 junctions and more generally. This was to allow LRCH to explore options and to deal with uncertainty about Highways England's forward programme for development in these locations. As the timescales and proposals at these junctions are firmed up LRCH hope to "pull

back” the red line boundary. The current red line boundary around the Ebbsfleet junction takes account of the potential need for a construction compound to the south of the junction.

LRCH noted that those affected by the wider boundary have questions about the extent of the land that is actually required for the London Paramount project. LRCH noted examples of land take at other comparable resorts and consider that, in general terms, the land they are seeking to acquire for the Project will be of a similar scale.

LRCH also commented that questions about separating out the different component parts of the wider resort project, and seeking separate consenting processes for them had been put to them. LRCH responded that there were functional dependencies between different areas of the resort project (such as retail/hotels and theme park areas) that meant the project should be considered as a whole.

There was a brief discussion about the Peninsula Management Group, its membership and how they were being consulted.

## **Programme**

The revised submission date is the “end of 2017”. PINS said it would update the London Paramount project page on the National Infrastructure Planning website accordingly.

Work was ongoing about the traffic baseline, taking account of the very dynamic situation around the Paramount site. In particular, the expansion of the Bluewater Shopping Centre, the Highways England works for Bean & Ebbsfleet Junctions and the emerging proposals on the Lower Thames Crossing. The 2028 reference case for the traffic data has been largely agreed with the local authorities and Highways England.

LRCH noted the delay to the EDC Implementation Framework (masterplan) and how Swanscombe Peninsula would be dealt with, and the importance of the London Paramount scheme being included in this.

These strategic transport issues are being coordinated by the EDC as part of the Multi-Agency Strategic Transport (MAST) group ensuring that common approaches are adopted to baseline data and modelling and also liaising about consultation activities.

## **Consultation**

LRCH described the consultation undertaken to date and their commitment to keeping communities and stakeholders up to date with the progress of the project.

A Community Liaison Group has been set up and there are a number of workshop events planned or taken place. The first was on skills and jobs and PINS commented that experience showed that it was important when consulting on skills and employment aspects of the project that developers are clear about what they mean by “local” in terms of potential employment opportunities.

The next workshop would focus on transport issues.

LRCH took on board advice previously given about a further consultation stage that is planned for later in 2017 and confirmed this would be a statutory (formal) consultation stage, rather than informal consultation. PINS advised that LRCH should ensure that there would be sufficient time between the proposed statutory consultation and the submission of the application, in order to allow time for LRCH to respond to the views put to them during the consultation.

LRCH commented that the exact timings of the next statutory consultation had not been determined but committed to ensuring there would be time to absorb and respond to consultees' views. The statutory consultation would allow consultees to comment on an updated draft DCO and Masterplan. There would be a new SoCC to cover the additional stage of formal consultation.

## **Transport**

LRCH have actively considered an eastern and western access route to the Resort site from the A2 Ebbsfleet junction. Their assessment work of the options had confirmed their earlier choice of the eastern access route because it was further away from homes and communities, did not have a significant impact on the landfill site, was mostly "at grade". LRCH confirmed they would progress the project on the basis of a dedicated eastern route and this would work better to direct the majority of traffic smoothly on a slip road and dual carriageway from the direction of the M25.

GBC commented that previous proposals referred to 30% international visitors, suggesting a significant number of visitors would come from the direction of the Channel Tunnel / Ports. LRCH commented that the 30% figure included all modes of travel and include a significant number of international visitors arriving via Eurostar and from London Airports via the M25.

LRCH described the route of the land train and the relationship of the eastern access route and land train route to Ebbsfleet International Station. They noted that although the land train route could affect archaeological deposits and the Site of Special Scientific Interest the proposed design and construction techniques will minimise the impacts. The area of the SSSI that would be affected has already been disturbed by HS 1.

LRCH presented the ongoing work they have undertaken or is planned in relation to transport and forecast modelling. They are also working on construction strategies including an accommodation strategy for workers. No 'campus' accommodation is planned for workers on the site.

GBC queried what work was being done on the parking strategy. PINS also commented that there was a strong possibility that parking could become a significant issue at the examination unless proposals were developed in consultation with the communities that were likely to be affected, at the pre application stage. LRCH described their parking proposals but noted these points and concerns. PINS advised that if mitigation measures are required then it may be necessary to secure them through the DCO.

## **EDC Implementation Framework**

EDC confirmed that the Framework should be in place by the end of 2016, subject to the final outcome of the current exhibitions and approvals by the local authorities. The provision of utilities and in particular waste water infrastructure to serve the Garden City had proved challenging. LRCH said that the Masterplan for the Swanscombe Peninsula shows the London Paramount proposals, and the eastern access route to the A2 Ebbsfleet Junction.

The Garden City Framework would be endorsed by GBC and DBC. EDC do not have plan making powers and so the Masterplan would **not** be in the form of a development plan document such as a SPD.

**AOB**

LRCH offered attendees to go on a "walk-over" of the site. Attendees to advise LRCH.