

Meeting Report

Regarding:

London Paramount Entertainment Resort Community Liaison Group Meeting

Date:

20th June 2017

Attending:

- Noreen Salway – Southfleet Parish Council (NS)
- Cllr David Mote – Dartford Borough Council (DM)
- Cllr Bryan Read – Dartford Borough Council (BR)
- Cllr Richard Lees – Dartford Borough Council (RL)
- Paul Boughen – Ebbsfleet Development Corporation (PB)
- Cllr Bryan Parry – Swanscombe & Greenhithe Town Council (BP)
- Penny Marsh - Churches together in Ebbsfleet (PM)
- Mike Breton – Southfleet Residents Association (MB)
- Linda Collins – Bean Residents Association (LC)
- Ashley Johnson – Bean Residents Association (AJ)
- Duncan Wood – Swanscombe Parish Council (DW)
- Rosemary Dymond – Cobham Parish Council (RD)
- Andy Martin – LRCH (AM)
- Richard Hutchings – WSP (RH)
- Mark Kerr – Newgate Engage (chair) (MK)
- Laura Taylor – Newgate Engage (secretariat) (LT)
- Kate Durrans – Newgate Engage (secretariat) (KD)

Apologies:

- Gary May - Northfleet Big Local
- Linda Manchester - Swanscombe & Greenhithe RA
- Peter Scollard - Gravesham Borough Council
- Cllr Mark Coxshall - Thurrock Council
- Sue Constant – Manor Community Primary School
- Amarjit Kaur Thind - Gurdwara Community Group
- Ann Duke – Walk Tall

MATTERS ARISING		Actions
1.	<p><u>Introduction</u></p> <p>AM opened the meeting and explained that since the last meeting he had left Newgate Engage and joined LRCH to become Director of Communications.</p> <p>AM introduced three new members of the project team:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Kerr – Newgate Engage (Chair) (MK) • Kate Durrans – Newgate Engage (Secretariat) (KD) <p>AM confirmed that MK from Newgate Engage would assume the role of Chair of the CLG. In addition, Laura Taylor (LT) would also be leaving Newgate Engage and KD would be taking over secretariat responsibilities.</p> <p>AM added that as the purpose of the meeting would focus on transport. The LRCH transport consultant would provide a presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard Hutchings – WSP (RH) <p>MK reminded the CLG that it had previously been agreed that all CLG meetings should aim to finish by 8pm.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Agree minutes of 4th October 2016</u> Minutes of the last meeting were agreed.</p>	
3.	<p><u>Transport presentation and discussion by WSP</u></p> <p>MK invited RH to present an update on the development’s transport links and proposals.</p> <p><u>Access route configuration</u></p> <p>RH explained that there were three key principles for the access strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be one access point connecting from the existing A2 • There will be no access from the local road network into the resort to minimize disruption • Car parking for the development will be on site <p>RH added that the proposed roundabout at Ebbsfleet junction would be ‘at grade’- meaning that the road is at ground level and there is no separation made by bridges or tunnels.</p> <p>Following earlier proposals there would be not a bridge into the resort. RH confirmed that the direct link through the eastern roundabout would be signalised. RH informed the group that these considerations were similar to those proposed by Highways England (HE).</p> <p>RH confirmed that the road to the resort would be a dual carriageway with two lanes in each direction. It will run as close as possible to HS1 rail tracks, in order to minimise impact on the local ecological surroundings and maintain one transport corridor.</p> <p>RH stated that members of the resort transport team had liaised with Historic England, Natural England and Environment Agency amongst others, when considering this route and the possible alternatives.</p> <p><u>Public Transport</u></p>	

RH outlined the proposed public transport provision by LRCH included a new bus route created from Ebbsfleet International to the resort with an electric bus. A Fast Track service would run between local community and resort

There will also be a new transport interchange at Ebbsfleet International station – this will include a booking office for the resort. The proposals also include a new public footpath and cycle way.

Junctions

RH explained that Bean junction remains within the boundary red line of the development area. This would ensure that should HE not complete upgrades to the junction, LRCH would make minor alterations to the junctions to manage resort traffic effectively.

RH added that the transport team were also factoring in the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) and how it would affect traffic in the area. It was anticipated that Eastbound traffic would be reduced by around 14%. RH confirmed that these plans were not guaranteed and LRCH were developing separate proposals should this scheme not get approval.

In response to MB, RH clarified that the resort road would be separate but the junction would be adopted by HE.

AJ stated that HE were not considering the resort in their junction improvement plans for Bean. RH explained that the resort Development Consent Order (DCO) will include the improvements to the junctions and is planned to be submitted before the HE DCO for Bean or Ebbsfleet Junctions.

RH clarified that HE has included and considered the LTC in their junction plans but not resort traffic despite both projects being given the status of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) status.

In response to LC, RH identified that the junction will be four lanes (2 in either direction) and that for local traffic there will be appropriate signage directing transport into the left hand lane.

In response to RD, RH confirmed that the roundabout would be signalised and commented that the layout was configured to accommodate the overhead pylons, local ecology and geology. RH stated there would not be any bridges at the junction.

DW commented on the capacity of the 'offslip' when approaching from the East with no plans for upgrade works. RH explained that the project was not expecting high levels of traffic from this direction with the majority of traffic approaching from the other direction of travel.

DW asked if the resort would be an international draw and questioned the possibility of traffic from Dover? RH stated that the resort will be a globally

recognised destination and that this had been taken into consideration for the resort capacity modeling.

Resort Operations

RH explained that once the resort is developed the daily opening times will be 10:30 but the closing time will vary seasonally and with the weather. There will be two theme park areas opening at different times - Gate 1 will open in 2022 – the majority of the resort and Gate 2 will open in 2027. The resort is expected to reach maturity in 2037.

RH also noted the split between UK and International visitors in 2022 it is expected that the majority of visitors would be UK based, however by 2037 LRCH expects the majority to come from overseas. In response to DW, RH stated that Gate 2 would not be a second entry point.

MK asked about origin of figures. RH clarified that these figures had been assessed by three consultants working with LRCH who specialise in global resorts and visitor profiling and in broad terms.

RH continued to explain that as part of the modelling for the resort, it is anticipated that:

- *Visitors coming within one hour drive time will travel by train or car*
- *Visitors within a two hour drive time will travel by car*
- *Visitors within the UK over this drive time will stay overnight and will travel by car and park on the resort*
- *International visitors will stay overnight and will travel by train*

RH added that there are different types of visitors and how long an average stay at each gate would be. It was modelled that visitors to Gate 1 would spend around 8 hours in the resort, compared to 6 hours for Gate 2.

RH explained that the modelling of visitor numbers was drawn from other international resorts and found that there were expected to be *c. 15 million visits per year when the park is at full maturity. On a sunny day the resort could expect c. 90,000, and c. 40,000 on site on a wet day.*

RH explained that one visitor could visit both Gate 1 & 2 parks in and as such the modelling found that by 2037:

- *2037 – c. 19.5 million visits*
- *2037 – c. 15 million visitors*

RH noted however, that 80% of visitors to the Retail, Dining and Entertainment area would already be at either Gate 1 or Gate 2

- *2028 – c. 60,000 on peak visitors and c. 46,000 off peak visitors*

- 2037 – c. 90,000 on peak visitors and c. 66,000 off peak visitors

RH stated that at Thorpe Park, Surrey – around 69% of UK visitors come by car. RH added that at that theme park there is limited public transport provided.

MB asked if the policy for the resort was to reduce the number of visitors travelling by car. RH confirmed that LRCH hoped for c. 63% of visitors travelling by public transport and were proposing to have 13,000 car parking spaces on site with the following breakdown:

- 24% by rail
- 8% by bus
- 1-2% will walk
- 3-4% by boat along the Thames

RH added that the Thames Clipper service anticipated a higher number at 5-10% and together they had discussed the introduction of new vessels from North Greenwich and ferry link from Essex.

RH highlighted that rail is the key transport option for the resort and that the team have liaised with HS1 to ensure that there is capacity on the existing and proposed network. RH added that the team has also liaised with The Department for Transport and South Eastern Rail to ensure that they will have capacity on the rail network. RH added that in 2028 – it is anticipated that approximately 11,000 people will travel by rail.

RH stated that if Crossrail was extended past Abbey Wood then it would help reduce the amount of visitors coming by car but that this was not currently included in the LRCH transport considerations.

In response to BR, RH confirmed that the team had looked at Swanscombe Rail Station but considered Greenhithe and Northfleet Station to be better alternatives for improvements.

DM added that there had been previous discussions on the development of a ferry link between Tilbury and the resort. AM commented that a meeting had been held with Thurrock Council earlier that day and there are aspirations and opportunities to link with Grays and Tilbury.

RH reminded the group that the dedicated access road would be made of four lanes (2 each way) and will have a total capacity of 8,000 vehicles per hour, which is nearly twice the number anticipated to use the access road.

Construction Timeline

RH outlined that the proposed construction timeline for the resort would be around three years. During this period up to 95% of construction material would be delivered by river – items including rollercoasters will be principally built offsite. It is anticipated that around 6,000 construction workers would be present at the peak of the construction.

In response to RL, RH confirmed that there would be a concrete batching plant on site. RH noted that the access road will be the first task and that construction engineering for the access road would begin as soon as possible.

In response to DM, RH stated that he understood that up to a 1,000 workers would stay on site but this is not confirmed. RH commented that it is normal for shuttle services to bring construction works to a large site and that there is potential for the Thames Clipper to do the same.

MB expressed concern about the high number of workers. RH reassured MB that an appropriate construction management plan would be put in place.

AJ asked whether the meeting on the 7th October 2016 with the Planning Inspectorate at which their concerns on the parking strategy had been raised, had been addressed. RH explained that all parking would be on-site during construction and into the operation of the resort.

RH said the team had done extensive parking surveys around the local area and have agreed with the local authority that the resort would support the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone if residents and the Councils felt this became necessary.

In response to DW, RH confirmed that visitors and employees would be able to access the resort from Northfleet queried and explained that there would also be a local bus and taxi services available.

DW highlighted that if people could not access the resort from London Road then offsite parking would not be a problem. In response to AJ, RH confirmed there would be no access to the resort via London Road and explained that there would be shuttle bus services for employees that would be working shifts. RH explained that employees coming from afar would travel via the dedicated access road.

MB stated that a thorough construction management plan needed to be in place before work starts.

In response to BR, RH confirmed there were plans for a number of hotels with around 3550 rooms planned.

BR enquired whether there was a transport system planned for taking visitors over to other attractions, like Bluewater. RH stated that Fast Track had plans to expand their services. In response to AJ, RH explained that the site's red line was still the same but that it may be revised before the DCO is submitted.

RD asked when HE planned to do their work to the Ebbsfleet Junction. RH said HE plan to begin work in 2019 and work would finish in 2022.

RD asked when the plans for the LTC were scheduled to take place. RH confirmed the plans were scheduled for 2025.

	<p>In response to BP, RH explained Ebbsfleet Junction would be adopted by HE and the signal control would monitor each link of the junction and reduce congestion.</p> <p>RL asked about pedestrian and cycle routes commenting that cycling would be a good mode of transport for employees. RH noted that there would be secured cycle parking at the resort and are hoping to implement a cycle hire system from Ebbsfleet International station.</p> <p>MK closed the discussion on transport and said if there were any questions to pass them on to KD.</p> <p>RH and PM left the meeting.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Update on development proposals</u></p> <p>MK opened a discussion focused on the development proposals and asked AM if there had been any update since the last meeting. AM explained that LRCH had dissolved their licensing agreement with Paramount Pictures.</p> <p>AM stated that the resort would now be called 'The London Resort'. AM explained that this decision had been made to allow LRCH to talk to other global brands and IP (Intellectual Property) to develop a multi licensing resort with numerous global brands and shows. AM noted that it was the goal of LRCH to be one of the best global entertainment resorts in the world and it was a great thing for Kent and UK.</p> <p>In response to LC, AM commented that London is a globally recognised destination and said that c. 25-33% of visitors to the resort will be international.</p> <p>AM explained that LRCH plan to submit their proposals for the resort on the 23rd November. AM added that consultation would begin in autumn and that dates were soon to be agreed. AJ said adequate time is needed between consultation and submission for LRCH to reflect on the comments.</p> <p>AM agreed and stated that by making it a statutory consultation it means that the submitted DCO needs to take into account the comments and responses. But also commented that this would be the fifth round of consultation and LRCH expected comments to build upon those already received in previous consultation rounds.</p> <p>AM added that the CLG is another forum where LRCH receive comments and feedback.</p> <p>In response to MK, MB asked about the financial plan for the project. AM stated that it is a £3.2 billion pound project and that funding would be in place if the DCO is approved.</p> <p>In response to AM, DM asked about the timeline for the DCO being determined following submission. AM explained that the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) have 28 days to accept the application once it has been received and from then a decision can come in 15/16 months.</p> <p>In response to AJ, AM understood that approximately £45 -50 million had been</p>	

LONDON RESORT

COMPANY HOLDINGS LIMITED

	<p>spent on land options, licenses, consultations and surveys.</p> <p>AJ queried whether an agreement had been reached with the 140 business that are located on site. AM stated that LRCH were still in discussion with those businesses and a meeting took place the week prior to the CLG.</p>	
5.	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>There was no other business.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Future meeting topics and speaker suggestions</u></p> <p>MK/AM commented that it might be useful for the next CLG to focus on the feedback from the statutory consultation.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Next Meeting</u></p> <p>It was suggested and agreed that the next meeting should be at the end of October 2017 (date to be agreed with members over email).</p>	<p>KD to propose date of next meeting in email with minutes</p>
8.	<p><u>END</u></p> <p>Meeting closed 7:45pm</p>	