



Meeting note

Project name	The London Resort
File reference	BC080001
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	9 March 2018
Meeting with	London Resort Company Holdings (LRCH)
Venue	Planning Inspectorate offices
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Richard Price – Case Manager Kathryn Dunne – Infrastructure Planning Lead Helen Lancaster – Senior EIA and Land Rights Advisor James Bunten – Case Officer The Applicant Chris Potts (Savills) Kevin Doyle (LRCH) Andy Martin (LRCH)
Meeting objectives	Project update meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Project update

The Applicant provided an overview of the evolution of the scheme to date. In June 2017 LRCH had announced that it was no longer in partnership with Paramount. The Applicant explained that it decided to redesign the park in line with its updated business plan, it now proposes to have a variety of 'intellectual property' (IP) partners, leading to a range of themed 'lands' within the park.

The Applicant explained that the park would be delivered in two phases by splitting the park up into two 'gates': Gate 1 (G1) being a stand-alone theme park would comprise approximately two thirds of the complete scheme and would be operational first. Gate 2 (G2) would follow later, providing further hotel accommodation and new IP-partnered lands.

The Applicant explained that works for G1 and G2 would be secured within one Development Consent Order (DCO) with the proposals for G2 being parameters based, as opposed to including the same level as detail as for G1. The Applicant noted the contracts with the current six IP partners for G1 were close to being completed and

would be formally announced later. The Applicant noted it wished to delay the procurement of the G2 IP partners until after G1 was operational. This was to ensure those partners would still be desirable by the time G2 opened.

The Inspectorate queried how the phased development of G1 and G2 would be secured within the DCO. The Applicant stated that the infrastructure for G2 would be constructed in preparation for the IP partners, noting that the timescales for opening G2 would depend on the success of G1.

The Inspectorate queried how the phased delivery of the scheme would be secured within the DCO and advised the Applicant to be consistent with the terminology used ('phases'/'gates'/'land'). The Applicant confirmed it would be looking into how the works would be set out and defined within the DCO and noted that it had begun work on defining the parameters for both gates.

The Inspectorate queried whether the hotels were all part of the G1 phase. The Applicant explained that it would be assessing a total of 3550 rooms within the scheme, with the majority of hotels to be included in G1, and noted access to all the hotels would be available from outside the park. The Applicant also stated that it had established safe access routes to and from the park.

The Applicant stated that the G1 site is located on contaminated land and, following discussion with the Environment Agency (EA), agreed to tweak some of the pedestrian network to reduce any potential effects. The Applicant set out the ongoing dialogue with Historic England (HE) and Natural England (NE) and noted that it was looking to begin drafting initial Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with key Statutory Consultees.

The Applicant noted ongoing dialogue with NE with regards to ecological mitigation and enhancement, which lead to discussion regarding proposed off-site enhancement agreements with Statutory Consultees and how it should be assessed. The Applicant briefly outlined the areas within the site that had potential to be ecologically enhanced.

The Inspectorate queried whether there were any works defined as Associated Development (AD) that could be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) in their own right. The Applicant confirmed it was looking into whether the AD works, (including works to junctions on the A2) could constitute separate NSIPs.

The Applicant explained that a set of draft introductory documents had been circulated to the relevant Local Authorities and stakeholders for feedback on the proposed scheme and to gauge whether the description was clear. The Inspectorate stated that it could provide advice to the Applicant on specific queries they have regarding the current version of the draft DCO at this stage, and that it would welcome the opportunity to comment further on a later version the draft DCO before the application is submitted.

The Applicant highlighted ongoing dialogue with Highways England (HE) with regard to the schemes' interrelationship with the Lower Thames Crossing and A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet Improvement schemes. The Applicant advised that it may delay its transport assessment until it has receipt of the applicable traffic model data from HE. The Inspectorate noted that as for the London Resort, the Scoping Opinion issued by the Inspectorate for the A2 scheme had highlighted the need to ensure that any cumulative

effects assessment was comprehensive in its scope and considered the potential for cumulative effects with the London Resorts proposal.

The Applicant has identified, through dialogue with consultees, potential ecological receptors and designated wildlife and geological sites that are within or near to the site (including potential opportunities to utilise existing schemes).

Stakeholder engagement

The Applicant provided an update on its ongoing engagement with the Community Liaison Group (CLG) made up of representatives from Dartford Borough Council (DBC), Gravesham Borough Council (GBC), Thurrock Council and members of the local community. The Applicant summarised the matters that the CLG discussed during its bi-annual meetings.

The Applicant provided a brief explanation of the other groups/ bodies it had been engaging with, which included the Peninsular Management Group, local interest groups and tenant and landowner representatives. The Applicant also noted good ongoing dialogue with the relevant Local Authorities - DBC, GBC and Kent County Council - and Ebbsfleet Development Corporation.

The Applicant acknowledged that it had remained in dialogue with all stakeholders and Statutory Consultees during the latest programme realignment.

Project programme

The Applicant confirmed the anticipated submission date would be in 2019. The Inspectorate requested that it is updated when the particular quarter of 2019 is known.

The Inspectorate queried how the Applicant could effectively consult if the IP partners for G2 had not been confirmed. The Applicant explained that the consultation material would include a parameters plan identifying the worse-case scenario for those buildings that were to be occupied by future IP partners.

The Applicant stated that the Statutory Consultation suite of documents would include the draft DCO and Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), as well as information on the IP partners for G1.

Next steps and AOB

The Applicant's attention was drawn to the latest example documents published to the Planning Inspectorate's website: [National Grid's 'Guide to the application' and 'Statement of Commonality'](#). All applicants were being advised to prepare equivalent documents as part of their applications for development consent.

It was agreed that the next meeting will be held before the next phase of Statutory Consultation is carried out in order for the Applicant to explain its proposed approach to consultation. The Applicant advised it would provide suitable dates in due course.

The Inspectorate queried if the Applicant would be pursuing a variation to the 2014 s35 Direction as it refers to 'London Paramount'. The Applicant stated that had considered

this point and taken their own legal advice and believed that a variation or new Direction would not be necessary.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The Inspectorate to update the project webpage on the National Infrastructure Planning website with the updated submission date.
- The Applicant to provide convenient dates for the next meeting before Statutory Consultation.