

ID. No.	Organisation name or individual	Area 6, 7, 8.	Map Ref	Schedule ref	Site name or issue	Consultee Comments	LVRPA Response	Proposed Amendment
LA1.0	Broxbourne Borough Council	6	Wharf Rd Inset	6.A.4.1	Wharf Road report	Broxbourne Council originally supported that environmental strategy and was indeed relying on it to support the planning case for the public inquiry to enforce against the occupation of the traveller plots. However, the outcome of the first stage of that Public Inquiry was to find that the plots were lawfully occupied as caravan sites. The situation of lawful occupation is something that none of us can change and led to the Broxbourne Local Plan policy to establish a permanent travellers site at Wharf Road – the fall back being the status quo should that policy fall at Inquiry. Regrettably, Broxbourne cannot therefore support the environmental strategy as it is incapable of implementation in full. It would however support partial implementation which the establishment of a permanent travellers site could achieve. I am doubtful that much could be achieved through the status quo but that is something that we can discuss at the examination hearings for the Broxbourne Local Plan.	Comments noted, this is a matter that will be discussed at the Local Plan Examination	No change
LA2.0	East Herts DC	8				Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Park Development Framework Consultation. Overall, East Herts Council supports the proposals in the Park Development Framework and thanks the team for their response to the Council's previous comments.	Support welcomed	No change
LA2.1	East Herts DC	8		8.A.1	Ryegate Farm	There is only one area which the Council feels would warrant further explanation in order to ensure the objectives of the PDF are maintained. This is in relation to the proposal to "explore development opportunities at Ryegate Farm". Previous text has been deleted which explained that this site was being explored for sustainable camping and an outdoor activity base suitable for cub/scout groups and similar organisations. Without these limitations, the new text leaves the intention of the development open to interpretation. If the proposal is to explore general residential development then the PDF should specify this or provide new text which clarifies the type of development that would be considered acceptable.	Comments noted. The Authority has not yet determined the future use of this site, the wording - "Explore development potential of Ryegate Farm and its curtilage" keeps options open.	No change
LA2.2	East Herts DC	8		8.A.2	Amwell Nature Reserve	In terms of the proposed small scale visitor centre and car park at Amwell Nature Reserve, the Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss these proposals further with the Park Authority. Such facilities will need to ensure their compatibility with the Green Belt, the open nature of the site and the need to preserve the tranquillity of the environment surrounding the nature reserve.	Comments noted and agreed. Proposals identify the need for any proposals to be of a high quality, sustainable design, to respond appropriately to the greenbelt and proximity of protected sites of national and international importance.	No change

LA3.0	EFDC	6, 7 and 8				The Council welcomes many of the policies and proposals contained within the draft amended Park Development Framework and notes the amendments made in respect of concerns raised in February 2015 to an earlier draft of the Area Proposals. Please see attached the background report and formal Portfolio Holder decision which sets out the Council's formal response to the consultations above.	Comments noted.	No change
LA3.1	EFDC	6, 7 and 8				This report outlines the current proposals from the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) followed by a synopsis of the Council's earlier response to a previous consultation and the manner in which the LVRPA dealt with this response. The report then gives a view of the current proposals including matters of concern. Area Proposals. - In respect of the current consultation - for the purpose of the management plans the Park has been split into 8 areas with 1 being the southern end at East India Dock on the River Thames and 8 being the northern end at Ware in Hertfordshire. The Area Proposals are divided into six themes - Visitors, Sport and Recreation, Biodiversity, Community, Landscape and Heritage, and Environment.	Noted.	No change
LA3.2	EFDC	6				Area 6 (Waltham Abbey to Broxbourne) runs north from the M25 and the A121 at Waltham Abbey to Nazeing Road and Nazeing New Road (8194) at Lower Nazeing. It includes four sub areas - Town Mead (6.A.1); Royal Gunpowder Mills (6.A.2); Lee Valley White Water Centre (6.A.3); and River Lee Country Park (6.A.4) which includes all of Area 6 (including 'NAZE. E1 The Old Waterworks' employment allocation in the EFDC Q Local Plan Submission Version (LPSV)) except for Town Mead and Wharf Road Inset (6.A.4.1). The latter is entirely within Broxbourne Borough. Significant parts of Area 6 are formally designated for their heritage and wildlife importance. It also includes areas of glasshouses on Paynes Lane & Stubbins Hall Lane, Nazeing.	Noted.	No change
LA3.3	EFDC	7				Area 7 (Spitalbrook to Reydon) runs north from the B194 to the London to Cambridge rail line west of Reydon. It is divided into three sub areas - Spitalbrook, Admiral Walk Lake, Dobbs Weir (7.A.1) - almost all of this is west of the River Lee Navigation and is therefore mostly in Broxbourne Borough; Nazeing Meads and Carthage (7.A.2) - the northern boundary is Dobbs Weir Road and the eastern boundary is Sedge Green and the rear garden boundaries of properties on the west side of North Street Nazeing. The sub area therefore includes two LPSV employment sites: NAZE. E3 Bridge Works and Glassworks New Road and NAZE. E4 The Hillgrove Business Park on Nazeing Road, together with a glasshouse area off Nursery Road to the west of Peck's Hill;	Noted.	No change

LA3.4	EFDC	7				Glen Faba and Reydon (7.A.3) - the eastern boundary includes parts of Sedge Green (including NAZE. E 2 Land West of Sedge Green employment allocation in the EFDC LPSV), Netherall Road, Low Hill Road and the western edge of Reydon. Glasshouses are also present here, including on the outside edge of the Park boundary. The description of Area 7 contained in the consultation document includes "The area suffers from a fragmented character caused by plant nurseries and extensive glasshouse development (particularly to the east) and suburban and industrial development and pylons that pass through the centre of the area." (p 2). Area 8 runs north from Rye Meads to Ware and is therefore within East Herts District	Noted	No change
LA3.5	EFDC	6, 7 and 8				The area proposals in the consultation document are generally in line with the statutory duties of the Park Authority e.g. (i) encouraging access to the Park with segregated & enhanced routes for pedestrians & cyclists, improved signage, & connectivity and public transport provision; (ii) developing and enhancing sport and recreation facilities including canoe trails, coarse angling, sailing & rowing; (iii) working with the EA the C&RT, the Royal Gunpowder Mills & NE to manage & enhance designated wildlife areas & the wide mosaic of other habitats in the Park. Also involving the removal of non - native invasive species; (iv) supporting community uses and local events in various locations throughout the Park, making ongoing improvements to the educational offer within the Park in line with the national curriculum, and continuing to support & encourage development of volunteer activities & programmes; (v) conserving & enhancing the many heritage features, particularly associated with the RGM & the general landscape of the Park; (vi) exploring opportunities for heritage based theme trails base on the industrial past, wartime and the gravel extraction and glasshouse industries; & (vii) resolving land contamination issues throughout the Park resulting from previous land uses.	Noted	No change
LA3.6	EFDC	6, 7 & 8				Subject to the details of individual projects that may require planning permission in which regard the Council as local planning authority cannot prejudice a decision, the Council is supportive of these proposals, as they are in line with the original purposes of the Park and relevant policies of the LPSV.	Comments and support welcomed	No change

LA3.7	EFDC	6, 7 and 8			<p>The Council responded to a consultation on the Area Proposals in February 2015. A report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee led to a representation noting the matters below. The Italic text is the response to the concerns raised documented in the Draft Consultee Responses proposed amendments March 2018:</p> <p>a. Support for the overall approach - <i>noted and welcomed</i>. b. Concern about the possible extent of new building proposed in the Green Belt especially in area 6 - <i>concerns noted, no change</i> .</p> <p>c. Objection to proposals to use CP powers in relation to a number of glasshouse sites and other long standing commercial uses within the Park - <i>noted &amp; refer to amendments</i>. d. Encouragement for the Park Authority to work more closely with the Lea Valley Growers Association and individual Growers to advance schemes for land swaps to benefit the Park and the glasshouse industry - <i>noted dealing direct with growers, refer to amendments</i> Continued below</p>	Description of the consultation process and the Council's responses noted	No change
LA3.8	EFDC	6, 7 and 8			<p>e) Encouragement for the Park Authority to reconsider its attitude towards the glasshouse industry in the light of the NPPF, the ongoing work of the Lea Valley Food Task Force, the Authority's stated support for continued agricultural use of land, and the potential educational and heritage resource which the industry could represent within the Park -<i>noted dealing direct with growers, refer to amendments</i>. The Council appreciates the efforts made to resolve some of the concerns expressed previously through amendments to the framework proposals. However with respect to the current proposals there remain matters where there may be conflicts in the implementation of policy objectives between the LPA and LVRPA.</p>	Comments noted as above	No change

LA3.9	EFDC	6, 7		6.A.4 & 7.A.3	Glasshouses	Second, in respect of the Area Proposals. In response to the Councils previous comments (2015) regarding glasshouses the current version shows the deletion of the references to specific sites being compulsorily purchased, and resistance to major redevelopment or expansion for new large scale glasshouses. This has been replaced with a statement in 6.A.4 (duplicated in 7.A.3 except for place names): <i>"The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within and adjacent to the River Lee Country Park Area 6.A.4 will be considered in relation to how the development impacts upon the openness of the Regional Park, the quality of its landscape character and visitor enjoyment. Cumulative impacts will also be a factor where large scale expansion has already taken place. The following issues will need to be addressed: .....Where development is proposed on land outside the ownership of the Authority it will seek planning obligations in line with the above proposal to mitigate adverse impacts."</i> .. text copied from draft Proposals schedule	Noted	No change
LA3.10	EFDC	6, 7		6.A.4 & 7.A.3		Whilst this approach is not as harsh as indicating the use of compulsory purchase powers to remove glasshouses and commercial activity it is still considered to indicate a negative approach to the glasshouse industry in and adjacent to the Park which is not supported by the LPA. The criteria identified are largely those that would be considered in respect of a planning application but the reliance on the openness of the Park is not considered sufficiently material to outweigh the benefits of food production as noted above. The Council recognises the potential conflict between the statutory duties of the Park Authority and the economic pressures facing growers. It is considered however, that the stance with respect to glasshouses is not appropriate.	The detailed Glasshouse proposal identifies the key issues in relation to the Regional Park, its landscape, protected ecological assets and visitor enjoyment. Fundamentally the Regional Park is not the most appropriate location for large scale industrial activity but owing to the history of the glasshouse industry in the Lee Valley there is a need to stike a balance between allowing local business to thrive whilst providing an attractive, peaceful and rich visitor experience. Openness is a key quality for those enjoying the Park, hence it is a matter for consideration when new development is proposed. It should also be noted that this draft proposal was presented to and discussed with the Growers (July 2017) - but no formal comments or concerns were raised.	No change except for additional criteria as requested by Environment Agency - see OA 10.2

LA3.11	EFDC	7		7.A.2 Landscape	In addition the approach to local businesses for Nazeing Meads and Nazeing Lagoon (7.A.2) is proposed to be in line with the criteria included for glasshouses (noted in paragraph 20 of this report) and the Park Authority states it will " <i>Work with stakeholders to improve the impact on the Regional Park of industrial sites (and their intensification), structures and buildings through measures that contribute to a reduction in noise, traffic generation, visual impact and intrusion. High quality development to be sought and particular attention to be paid to enhancing the boundaries with open space. It is intended that, in the long term, all such sites should be brought into leisure and recreational use where this would be compatible with the function of this Area</i> ". The Council would not wish to lose valuable employment land it is seeking to protect through allocations in the LPSV namely NAZE. E1-4.	Comments noted and agreed. The last sentence will be deleted from this proposal.	Amend text under 7.A.2 Landscape and Heritage last paragraph as follows: Work with stakeholders to improve the impact on the Regional Park of industrial sites.....High quality development to be sought and particular attention to be paid to enhancing the boundaries with open space. <del>It is intended that, in the long term, all such sites should be brought into leisure and recreational use where this would be compatible with the function of this Area</del>
LA3.12	EFDC	6		6.A.4	23. Two further matters of note are: a. Area 6.A.4 proposal Nazeing Marsh, the old Chimes Nursery site & Rushymead to "work with EFDC, landowners and other stakeholders to bring this area of the Park into a recreational or leisure use in accordance with the Park's remit. This may require use of the Authority's land purchasing powers to consolidate existing land ownership, improve access & widen options for future use... "	The existing developed area of the Chimes Nursery site has permission for residential development. Proposal text will be amended to reflect the current position in this area.	Amend text under 6.A.4 Nazeing Marsh, the old Chimes Nursery site and Rushymead as follows:  "Work with EFDC, landowners and other stakeholders to bring this area of the Park into a recreational or leisure use in accordance with the Park's remit. <del>This may require use of the Authority's land purchasing powers to consolidate existing land ownership, improve access and widen options for future use. Opportunities for equestrian activities or centre to be explored with horse rides and hacking routes.</del>
LA3.13	EFDC	7		7.A.2 Environment	b. Area 7.A.2 Wetland Park Central and East; Nazeing Meads and Cathagena to "work with Epping Forest District Council and other stakeholders to identify sites which have been abandoned or are likely to be surplus to production in the next 10-15 years & carry out feasibility studies to identify development & design proposals that would be compatible with the remit of the Park.... The Authority may consider proposals for land swaps which would allow expansion of glasshouses providing there is an overall increase in land devoted to Park compatible uses & other PDF objectives are not prejudiced" In respect of these matters the Council would not wish to see any existing approved commercial enterprise including food production jeopardised.	Comments noted, this proposal is informed by the more detailed work - the Carthagene Environmental Strategy (part of the evidence base) and has been drafted as a positive proposal to help resolve issues of dereliction or abandonment	No change

Responses to Draft Area Proposals and Final Proposed Amendments Authority April 2019

LA3.14	EFDC	6, 7 and 8				<p>The response can be summarised as follows: a) to support the overall approach of the proposals in the context of the statutory functions of the Park Authority i.e. in relation to (i) sport and recreation, (ii) leisure, (iii) education, and (iv) landscape, heritage and nature conservation.</p> <p>b) To express concern regarding the possible extent of new building in the Green Belt but to recognise the Local Planning Authority's role in managing such development and responding to applications within the national policy context.</p>	Comments noted	No change
LA3.15	EFDC	6, 7				<p>c) To express concern regarding the proposed approach to glasshouse development in the Park but to recognise the Local Authority's role in managing such development and responding to applications within the national and local policy context together with the Councils' aim to support the vitality and expansion of protected horticulture in the District.</p> <p>d) To express concern regarding the desire to ultimately remove valuable industrial and commercial uses from the Park, and the Councils' aim to protect employment uses in the District.</p>	Comments noted	No change
LA3.16	EFDC	6, 7 and 8				<p>The Council responds to the consultation in general support but expressing concerns relating to the treatment of commercial and glasshouse development in the Park as noted in the attached draft letter.</p>	Comments noted	No change
LA4.0	Essex CC Spatial Planning	6, 7 and 8				<p>Essex County Council welcomes many of the policies and proposals contained within the draft amended Park Development Framework (PDF) and notes and acknowledges the amendments made in respect of concerns raised in February 2015 to an earlier draft of the Area Proposals.</p>	Comments noted	No change

LA4.1	Essex CC Spatial Planning	6, 7 and 8				In 2014/15, the LVRPA consulted on proposals for Areas 6, 7 & 8 in the PDF. ECC provided a response to the Authority which is summarised below. □ The proposals put forward cover land in economic use (essentially large glasshouses used for horticultural uses) & they propose to see their removal (so the park is purely for recreation & leisure use) through acquisition. □ ECC questions the use of CPO powers on the sites, & considers that park proposals should be consistent with wider strategic economic objectives. □ The proposals are considered to undermine business owner confidence. □ ECC queries whether the Authority fully understands the financial implications involved in the acquisition of the glasshouses, & the viability of the Park Framework. □ ECC recommends that consideration be given to ensuring delivery of sustainable drainage systems as part of any new development and that the Authority ensures development integrates water management, biodiversity & amenity. □ ECC emphasises that proposals set out by the Authority should be consistent with national & local planning policy & guidance, & recommends the Authority liaise with EFDC as it prepares its new Local Plan to ensure a consistent and viable approach to the 'glasshouse issue'.	Recap on previous comments made by Essex CC noted	No change
LA4.2	Essex CC Spatial Planning	6, 7 and 8			Glasshouses	ECC note and acknowledge the amendments which seek to address the two main issues raised in the ECC 2015 consultation response. The new text relating to sustainable drainage is supported. (note ECC letter duplicates the amended text produced by the Authority)	Comments welcomed	No change
LA4.3	Essex CC Spatial Planning	6, 7 and 8			Glasshouses	In terms of 'glasshouses' it should be recognised by the Authority that EFDC as the Local Planning Authority manages such development and responds to planning applications within the national and local policy context together with EFDC's aim to support the vitality and expansion of protected horticulture in the District. ECC maintains its position that it seeks to protect employment uses. It is recommended that the Authority ensures the economic role played by industry and employment uses in the park is acknowledged and not jeopardised. Further discussion should take place with Epping Forest District Council to ensure the Area Proposals related to glasshouses provide consistency with the EFDC LPSV.	Comments noted, the Authority has met with EFDC and the Lea Valley Growers to discuss proposals for glasshouses. The draft wording included in the proposals was shared with both prior to formal consultation and no amendments were sought at that time.	No change



LA4.4	Essex CC Spatial Planning	7		7.A.2		In addition the approach to local businesses for Nazeing Meads and Nazeing Lagoon (7.A.2) is proposed to be in line with the criteria included for glasshouses and the Authority states it will <i>“Work with stakeholders to improve the impact on the Regional Park of industrial sites (and their intensification), structures and buildings through measures that contribute to a reduction in noise, traffic generation, visual impact and intrusion. High quality development to be sought and particular attention to be paid to enhancing the boundaries with open space. It is intended that, in the long term, all such sites should be brought into leisure and recreational use where this would be compatible with the function of this Area”</i> . It is recommended that the Authority work with EFDC as the above approach may adversely impact on employment land the District Council is seeking to protect through allocations in the LPSV. ECC would not wish to see any existing approved commercial enterprise including food production jeopardised.	Comments noted, this is a similar point to that made by EFDC, proposal will be amended as stated under LA3.11	Amend text under 7.A.2 Landscape and Heritage last paragraph as follows: Work with stakeholders to improve the impact on the Regional Park of industrial sites.....High quality development to be sought and particular attention to be paid to enhancing the boundaries with open space. <del>It is intended that, in the long term, all such sites should be brought into leisure and recreational use where this would be compatible with the function of this Area</del>
LA5.0	Herts CC Environment & Infrastructure					Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above. This letter relates to the services of the Environment & Infrastructure Department, which also incorporates other services provided by the county council where relevant.	Comments noted	No change
LA5.1	Herts CC Environment & Infrastructure	6 7 & 8			SHIP GI	Park Development Framework. The reference to the SHIP GI proposals is fully supported.	Support welcomed	No change
LA5.2	Herts CC Environment & Infrastructure	6 7 & 8			Landscape & Heritage	In this context, <i>(Chapter 6 of the Evidence Base - see response to Strategic Policies)</i> it is noted that the draft amended Area Proposals for the Regional Park Areas 6, 7 and 8 include Landscape and Heritage as one of the themes examined in relation to each proposal, and the proposals demonstrate a clear recognition of the value of several important heritage assets within the Park, such as the Royal Gunpowder Mills, Waltham Abbey, Rye House Gatehouse, Emma’s Well, the New River, and the Lee Navigation.	Comments noted	No change
LA5.3	Herts CC Environment & Infrastructure	6, 7 & 8			Landscape & Heritage	The county council also notes that since, in addition to these known heritage assets, new sites are identified on a regular basis throughout the county, it is highly likely that currently unknown heritage assets are present within areas of the Park that have not been subject to prior disturbance/mineral extraction etc.. It is also possible that some of these assets may be of comparable significance to already designated assets, such as Scheduled Monuments, and should be treated as such (NPPF paragraph 39). The draft proposals have not been amended in this regard.	Noted and agreed, but as stated in response to the Strategic Policy consultation the Authority does not have the expertise or resources to identify these 'hidden' assets. Development proposals will be required through the local authority planning application process to carry out all necessary surveys with regard to heritage assets. Draft Strategic Policy H1 has been amended and makes reference to conserving and enhancing the Park's 'historic environment' including its 'landscapes' and their settings.	No change to proposals

LA5.4	Herts CC Environment & Infrastructure	6, 7, & 8			Landscape & Heritage	<u>Refers to SEA.</u> Furthermore, in meeting the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations, the environmental report should examine the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan, in its identification and evaluation of a range of issues. Among these is cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage. The SEA Framework (Table 3.1) however solely includes, as Strategic Environmental Assessment 10, the intention 'To maintain and enhance existing known heritage while seeking their full potential as visitor attractions or stimuli for regeneration'. This again demonstrates that the draft proposals do not recognise the potential for the Park to contain currently unknown heritage assets, or indeed the varied nature of the undesignated heritage assets known to be present within the Park.	This matter was considered in relation to the Strategic Policy document and as stated above unfortunately the Authority does not have the expertise or resources to identify these 'hidden' assets. Development proposals will be required through the local authority planning application process to carry out all necessary surveys with regard to heritage assets. Policy H1 has been amended in response to other comments and makes reference to conserving and enhancing the Park's 'historic environment' including its 'landscapes' and their settings.	No change to proposals
LA5.5	Herts CC Environment & Infrastructure	6, 7 & 8		7.A.3	Landscape & Heritage	The draft proposals do not therefore fully represent heritage assets with archaeological interest, or reflect the current policy framework provided by the NPPF and supporting guidance. The county council recommends that the proposals should be revised to ensure the conservation and enhancement of both designated and undesignated heritage assets and to provide for the potential impact of intended development and land management proposals upon such assets (e.g. construction of visitor facilities, remediation of contaminated land, the introduction of short term rotation coppice, etc.), via appropriate mitigation. It is also recommended that 'landscape heritage assets' should be referred to as heritage assets.	This matter was also covered in relation to the Strategic Policies. Development proposals will be required through the local authority planning application process to carry out all necessary surveys with regard to heritage assets. Proposal text will be amended to refer to heritage assets as recommended under Proposal 7.A.3.	Amend Proposal 7.A.3 Landscape & Heritage as follows: "Work with stakeholders to protect and preserve the distinctive <del>landscape</del> -heritage assets in the area....."
OA9.0	Canal & River Trust	6, 7 & 8				Where the proposals in these sections involve or may impact upon the Trust's land, a formal agreement from the Trust may be required before it is delivered. This may include compliance with the Trust's Code of Practice for Works Affecting the Canal & River Trust and, in some circumstances, the payment of a premium to the Trust for use of its land (or air rights in the case of a bridge, for example). The Trust is also a statutory consultee in the planning process and we would encourage the authority (or a third party developer) to undertake pre-application consultation with us on proposals that require planning permission within our notified area.	Comments noted, the Authority is aware of the Trust's requirements	no change
OA9.1	Canal & River Trust	6, 7		7.A.1 Environment 6.A.4 Environment	Crossrail 2	Through one of these processes, we may wish to comment further on the area proposals prior to their implementation. We would like to make comments on the following area proposals at this stage: Crossrail 2 Mitigation – we suggest that it would be beneficial to work together on a plan that we would like to see implemented to mitigate any adverse impacts of Crossrail 2.	Proposal for joint working noted and agreed	No change

OA9.2	Canal & River Trust	7		7.A.1 Visitors		Dobbs Weir – we would support making this more of a visitor attraction and working with the local businesses. We would like to be a key stakeholder in this. Boater facilities may also help to make the area more of a destination.	Comments noted and support welcomed. Please note an update to the Visitor proposals; it is not now proposed to refurbish the toilets as these are being removed. The Sport & Recreation proposals 7.A.1 identifies the need to explore options with stakeholders - which would include the C&RT - for canoe access and wider improvements in the recreational use of the Navigation	Update proposal 7.A.1 Visitors "Prepare a feasibility study for visitor infrastructure improvements at Dobbs Weir. This will include.....(under fourth bullet point) <b>refurbishment of existing toilets and</b> provision of cycle parking and possible cycle hire in association with Dobbs Weir Cafe....
OA10.0	Environment Agency	6, 7 & 8				We have reviewed the proposed amendments in response to our comments in February 2015. Thank you for taking our previous comments on board. We are satisfied with the proposed amendments to the proposals which will support reducing and managing flood risk, protecting and enhancing biodiversity and seeking to improve water bodies in line with the Thames River Basin Management Plan (2015). However, we have identified some additional amendments required to strengthen and clarify wording in relation to flood risk and glasshouses.	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
OA10.1	Environment Agency	6, 7 & 8	Environment Baseline		Flood zones	The thematic maps for the environment for all three areas include the flood zones, but these could be made clearer as there is a confusing contrast between the two flood zones and the allotments layer.	Comments noted and agreed. The mapping will be revised to improve the contrast.	Check and amend mapping on Environment Baseline for all areas to improve contrast between the two flood zones and the allotments layer
OA10.2	Environment Agency	6		6.A.4 Environment	Glasshouses	For Area 6 & 7 proposals the 'Glasshouses' sections should be amended as follows (additional text in bold): "The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located and designed so as -To protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the River Lee Country Park. - Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park, - Enhance landscape character & preserve existing positive features such as wildlife areas, trees & woodland belts, attractive water edges. - Maintain the existing level & quality of pedestrian and cycle access within the River Lee Country Park. - Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution - Protect & maintain water quantity and quality - <b>To avoid increased flood risk by reducing the capacity of the floodplain or impacting upon existing flood defences.</b> Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, <b>flood risk</b> , biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access."	Comments noted and agreed. Text will be added to cover flood risk as recommended.	Amend text under 6.A.4 7.A.2 and 7.A.3 Environment by adding under the section titled 'Glasshouses' the following bullet point: <b>"To avoid increased flood risk by reducing the capacity of the floodplain or impacting upon existing flood defences."</b> Also amend last paragraph to include flood risk as follows: "Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, <b>flood risk</b> , biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access."

OA10.3	Environment Agency	7		7.A.2	Glasshouses	for Area 7 .."The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within and adjacent to the Park within Area 7.A.2 will be considered in relation to how the development impacts upon the openness of the Regional Park, ....."The following issues will need to be addressed: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located and designed so as - to protect the openness of the Park and views into & across the Nazeing Meads and Carthagenia area, particularly those views out across the Park from Dobbs Weir Road and into the Park from the valley sides. - Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park. - Enhance landscape character & preserve existing positive features such as wildlife areas, trees and woodland belts, attractive water edges. - Maintain the existing level and quality of pedestrian and cycle access within the Nazeing Meads and Carthagenia area. - Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution. - Protect & maintain water quantity & quality. - <b>To avoid increased flood risk by reducing the capacity of the floodplain or impacting upon existing flood defences.</b>	Comments noted and agreed. Text will be added to cover flood risk as recommended.	Amend text under 6.A.4 7.A.2 and 7.A.3 Environment by adding under the section titled 'Glasshouses' the following bullet point: <b>"To avoid increased flood risk by reducing the capacity of the floodplain or impacting upon existing flood defences."</b> Also amend last paragraph to include flood risk as follows: "Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, <b>flood risk</b> , biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access."
OA10.4	Environment Agency	7		7.A.2	Glasshouses	Continued from above... Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, <b>flood risk</b> , biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access."	Comments noted and agreed. Text will be added to cover flood risk as recommended.	Please refer to the amendments above.
OA9.5	Environment Agency	6, 7 & 8			Flood Defence Consent	Where Flood Defence Consent (FDC) has been mentioned change to: A Flood Risk <b>Activity Permit</b> is required for any proposed works or structures in, over or under any watercourse designated a main river, or within 8 metres of the top of bank. This is so we can ensure the works will not cause an increase in flood risk or a negative impact on the natural environment. Areas 6, 7 and 8 are situated in Flood Zones 2 and 3 (medium/high probability of flooding) and Flood Risk Assessments would need to be submitted with any development proposals.	Comments noted, this will be relevant when permission is sought for proposals..	No change
OA11.0	Historic England	6	Baseline Landscape & Heritage			Please amend change reference from AMIE to Scheduled Monument (the current NPPF terminology). Please amend other maps and references accordingly.	Change noted this will be amended	Amend reference from AMIE to Scheduled Monument throughout including maps.
OA11.1	Historic England	6	Thematic Proposals Landscape & Heritage			We welcome the broad heritage proposals for the area	Comments noted and welcomed	No change

OA11.2	Historic England	6		Context		Paragraph 1 Reference should be made to the historic environment in this paragraph. Paragraph 2 typo Stanstead should read Stansted	Comments noted and agreed - additional text will be added and the spelling corrected.	Amend second sentence in the Context section as follows: "It composes a mosaic of landscapes <b>and heritage assets</b> , extensive paths and culce routes and places of informal recreation...." Correct the typo in the second paragraph to read <b>Stansted</b> instead of Stanstead.
OA11.3	Historic England	6		Key Resources & Special features		Paragraph 5 we welcome reference to the historic environment. Reference should also be made to Conservation Areas and listings designations as well as Heritage at Risk status. Please amend reference from Scheduled Ancient Monument to Scheduled Monument, and historic assets to heritage assets, the current preferred terminology.	Comments noted and agreed, text will be corrected and amended.	Amend 2nd paragraph under Key Resources & Special Features - "Parts of the area have a significant sense of time depth, with <b>historic heritage</b> assets forming landmark features...For example...the Royal Gunpowder Mills, a Scheduled <b>Ancient Monument (SAM) and Conservation Area</b> ,.....and the Waltham Abbey complex to the south (also designated a <b>Scheduled Monument-SAM and Conservation Area</b> ) reflect this interest."
OA11.4	Historic England	6		Opportunities for visitors		Paragraph 10 we welcome the reference to heritage in this paragraph	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
OA11.5	Historic England	6		6.A.1		Town Mead and Waterways - This site is located adjacent to the Waltham Abbey Conservation Area. Reference to the need to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation area and its setting is needed in the heritage section.	Comments noted, additional text to be added under 6.A.1 Heritage	Amend text under 6.A.1 Landscape and Heritage as follows: "Waterway heritage features and buildings to be conserved and enhanced as an integral part of continuing environmental and access improvement, <b>taking account of the adjoining Waltham Abbey Conservation Area, its setting and character.</b> "
OA11.6	Historic England	6		6.A.2		Reference should be made to the fact that the Royal Gunpowder Mills site is a Conservation Area and on the Heritage at Risk Register. The final paragraph relating to heritage should be deleted. By definition within the NPPF, enabling development is development that is not otherwise in accordance with adopted policy. We are therefore of the view that a policy on enabling development is not a necessary component of a local plan document. A local plan should adequately set out a positive strategy for the historic environment without the need to include such a policy.	Amendments will be made to add Conservation Area to the Heritage Proposal and referencethe Heritage at risk Register The text covering enabling development is considered relevant in terms of the proposals - this document is not a local plan and the Authority is seeking to support appropriate development on site where this will enable the further restoration of heritage assets and increase access for visitors.	The following amendments will be made under 6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills -Landscape and Heritage: "Protect, conserve, and enhance the monuments, buildings, waterways and natural history of the Royal Gunpowder Mills ( <b>currently on the Heritage at Risk Register</b> ) and its associated landscape in accordance with its <b>SAM Scheduled Monument and Conservation Area</b> designations and the listed status of many of the buildings on site"
OA11.7	Historic England	6		6.A.4		River Lee Country Park - We welcome the landscape and heritage proposals and policies for this area. Reference should also be made to the Conservation Areas and the need to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation area and its setting.	Reference to Conservation Area has now been added to the relevant proposals under 6.A.2. Reference will also be added to 6.A.4 Landscape & Heritage 'Waltham Abbey Gardens'	Amend Proposal 6.A.4 Landscape & Heritage 'Waltham Abbey Gardens' as follows: Work with stakeholders to protect, <b>preserve</b> , restore and interpret the many elements of heritage interest at Waltham Abbey Gardens to establish the site as a major heritage attraction <b>taking account of its Conservation Area designation and setting.</b>
OA11.8	Historic England	7		Baseline Landscape & Heritage		Broxbourne Station is also listed. This should be shown on the map.	Comment noted. Notation will be added for Broxbourne Station.	Add a notation for Broxbourne Station on the Baseline Area 7 Landscape & Heritage Map to show it is listed
OA11.9	Historic England	7		Thematic Proposals Landscape & Heritage		We suggest that it may be appropriate for the Heritage symbol should read conserve and enhance heritage assets (in line with the NPPF)	Agreed, notation will be amended	All maps - change notation to heritage <b>asset</b> instead of Heritage feature.

OA11.11	Historic England	7		7.A.3		Wetland Park Central and North: Glen Faba and Roydon Reference should be made to the scheduling and listed designations at Netherhall.	Comments noted but not considered necessary to add further to proposal. Scheduling and listed designations shown on baseline mapping and protected status included in proposal where relevant	No change
OA11.12	Historic England	8		Key Resources & Special features		Paragraph 6 should add reference to the listed buildings, and the Conservation Areas. Please also amend the reference from SAM to Scheduled Monument.	Comment snoted, changes agreed	Add the following sentence at the end of paragraph 6 Key Resources and Special Features- " <b>as well as Conservation Areas at Stanstead Abbots and Great Amwell.</b> Amend reference to SAM to read Schedule Monument.
OA11.13	Historic England	8		8.A.1		Rye Meads and Stanstead Abbots - Amend reference from English Heritage to Historic England, our new name since 2015.	Comments noted, text will be updated.	Amend text under 8.A.1 Heritage to substitute <b>Historic England</b> for English Heritage
OA13.0	Natural England	6				ID Ref: OA9.1 - Natural England supports this change requested by the Environment Agency, recognising the integrated ecosystem services the Lee Valley Park can provide, for the benefit of flood risk management and nature conservation.	Check change	No change
OA13.1	Natural England	6		6.A.2 Biodiversity	Gunpowder Mills	ID Ref: OA9.4 – Consistent with our advice for - ID Ref: OA10.14 below and our letter of 19 February 2015, we specifically advise an additional word is inserted as indicated below in bold and square brackets:"Amend text under 6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills Biodiversity as follows: " Work with the Environment Agency and Royal Gunpowder Mills to improve the habitats and ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals[, <b>invertebrates</b> ] and fish, of the Waltham Abbey SSSI, with Cornmill Meadows and Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSIs, through complementary habitat management e.g. rewetting of ditches within Gunpowder Mills."	Amendment noted and will be added as suggested	Amend text under 6.A.2 Biodiversity as follows: "Work with the Environment Agency and Royal Gunpowder Mills to improve the habitats and ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals, <b>invertebrates</b> and fish, of the Waltham Abbey SSSI, with Cornmill Meadows and Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSIs, through complementary habitat management e.g. rewetting of ditches within Gunpowder Mills."
OA13.2	Natural England	6		6.A.4 Access to Nature	Biodiversity	ID Ref: OA9.6 – Natural England supports this change.	Support for the new text previously added to ensure sensitive sites e.g. SSSIs are managed to minimise damage and disturbance is welcomed.	No change
OA13.3	Natural England	6		6.A.3 Environment		ID Ref: OA9.8 – Natural England supports this change.	Support for amended text relating to the Water Framework Directive noted	No change

OA13.4	Natural England	6		6.A.4 Sport & recreation	Holyfield Lake	ID Ref: OA 10.2 – With reference to the advice provided about '6.A.2: Sailing, Boating and Rowing' in our consultation letter dated 19 February 2015, Natural England can advise that the proposed amended text accurately identifies that a Habitats Regulations Assessment is likely to be required for the proposed relocation of sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake. We also support the need for an ecological assessment of the likely impact on SSSI features. It should be noted at this strategic level, Natural England can only support this proposal if the project can clearly demonstrate it can avoid an adverse effect on integrity either alone and/or in combination with other plans/projects. Furthermore, the project will need to clearly demonstrate how it can avoid a significant impact on the nearby Turnford and Cheshunt Marshes SSSI.	The Authority is fully aware of the sensitive nature of this area of the Park and all required assessment processes would need to be undertaken in consultation with statutory bodies such as Natural England. Proposal text has been amended under 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation to provide clarity on timescales and process. Please see amendments here and under SR24.4.	Please refer to amended text below: 6.A.4 Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities will be supported. The existing refuge area to be protected and maintained.  <b>The Authority's long term aim is to develop this lake as a Centre for Sailing Excellence with sufficient infrastructure including, secure parking and a replacement lakeside building. In advance of the delivery of the long term aim studies should consider the impacts of this proposal on:</b> - green belt designation - ecological interests, including the adjacent SSSI/SPA and whether an EIA is needed; - the range and type of sailing and water activities which can be accommodated, and - flood risk. <b>This proposal should be read in conjunction with Proposal 7.A.2</b> Remaining text to be deleted from "Undertake feasibility work..." to "... clubs and groups".
OA13.5	Natural England	6		6.A.2 Biodiversity	Royal Gunpowder Mills	ID Ref: OA10.6 – Natural England supports this change.	Support for minor change to the species list under 6.A.2 noted	No change
OA13.6	Natural England	6		6.A>4 Biodiversity	River Lee Country Park	ID Ref: OA10.7– Natural England supports this change.	Support for minor change to the species list under 6.A.4 noted	No change
OA13.7	Natural England	6				ID Ref: OA10.11 – Natural England supports this change.	Support for the added reference to the Lee Valley SPA Site Improvement Plan noted	No change
OA13.8	Natural England	6				ID Ref: OA10.13 – Natural England supports this change.	Support for the revised text about managing access to sensitive nature areas is welcome	No change
OA13.9	Natural England	6		6.A.2 Biodiversity	Gunpowder Mills	ID Ref: OA10.14 – Consistent with our advice in our letter of 19 February 2015, we specifically advise an additional word is inserted as indicated below in bold and in square brackets: "Amend text under 6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills Biodiversity as follows: " Work with the Environment Agency and Royal Gunpowder Mills to improve the habitats and ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals, <b>invertebrates</b> and fish, of the Waltham Abbey SSSI, with Cornmill Meadows and Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSIs, through complementary habitat management e.g. rewetting of <b>ditches within Gunpowder Mills.</b> "	As above text will be amended as suggested	Amend text under 6.A.2 Biodiversity as follows: "Work with the Environment Agency and Royal Gunpowder Mills to improve the habitats and ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals, <b>invertebrates</b> and fish, of the Waltham Abbey SSSI, with Cornmill Meadows and Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSIs, through complementary habitat management e.g. rewetting of ditches within Gunpowder Mills."
OA13.10	Natural England	6			Biodiversity	ID Ref: OA13.1 - Natural England supports this change requested by RSPB	Support for the text added about the role of non-designated waterbodies and their role in supporting the SPA is welcome	No change
OA13.11	Natural England	6				ID Ref: OA13.3 - Natural England supports this change requested by RSPB	Support welcomed for the amended text about maintaining areas of shallow flood	No change

Responses to Draft Area Proposals and Final Proposed Amendments Authority April 2019

OA13.12	Natural England	7		Environment		ID Ref: OA9.1 - Natural England supports this change requested by the Environment Agency, recognising the integrated ecosystem services the Lee Valley Park can provide, for the benefit of flood risk management and <u>nature conservation</u> .	Support for additional text referencing flood risk management noted	No change
OA13.13	Natural England	7		Environment		ID Ref: OA9.8 - Natural England supports this change	Support for the amendments that make fuller reference to the Water Framework Directive noted.	No change
OA13.14	Natural England	7		7.A.1 Biodiversity		ID Ref: OA13.1 - Natural England supports this change requested by RSPB	Support for the amendments that protect <u>non designated water bodies</u> noted	No change
OA13.15	Natural England	7		7.A.1, 7.A.2 and 7.A.3 Biodiversity		ID Ref: OA13.3 - Natural England supports this change requested by RSPB	Support for new text added to protect areas of shallow flood is noted	No change
OA13.16	Natural England	8		8.A.1 Biodiversity Flora and Fauna	Rye Meads SSSI possible extensions	ID Ref: OA10.10 – Natural England supports this change	Support for change to text which now includes reference to the Rye Meads SSSI is noted	No change
OA13.17	Natural England	6 to 8			Lee Valley SPA area	ID Ref: OA10.11 – Natural England supports this change.	Support for additional text referencing the Lee Valley SPA Site Improvement Plan <u>noted and welcomed</u> .	No change
OA13.18	Natural England	6 to 8			Environment	ID Ref: OA9.1 - Natural England supports this change requested by the Environment Agency, recognising the integrated ecosystem services the Lee Valley Park can provide, for the benefit of flood risk management and <u>nature conservation</u> .	Support for amended text noted	No change
OA13.19	Natural England	6 to 8			Biodiversity	ID Ref: OA9.5 - Natural England supports this change.	Support for amended text referencing <u>non native species</u> noted	No change
OA13.20	Natural England	6 to 8			Environment	ID Ref: OA9.8 - Natural England supports this change	Support for amended text referencing Thames River Basin Management Plan <u>noted</u>	No change
OA13.21	Natural England	6 to 8		8.A.1 Biodiversity Flora and Fauna		ID Ref: OA13.3 – Natural England supports this change.	Support for the additional text added about managing areas of shallow flood water	No change
OA13.22	Natural England	8		8.A.1 Environment	Rye Meads	ID Ref: OA14.2 – For transparency and completeness, Natural England advises the addition of the words indicated below in bold and in square brackets: "Ensure future upgrades at Rye Meads Waste Water Treatment Works to increase the existing treatment capacity and to meet the required chemical and biological standards for discharged effluent do not have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Rye Meads <b>[SSSI, Rye Meads]</b> nature reserve and the Lee Valley Special Protection Area."	Comments noted additional text will be included as suggested.	Amend proposal text under 8.A.1 Environment as follows: "Ensure future upgrades at Rye Meads Waste Water Treatment Works to increase the existing treatment capacity and to meet the required chemical and biological standards for discharged effluent do not have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Rye Meads <b>SSSI, Rye Meads</b> nature reserve and the Lee Valley Special Protection Area."
OA14.0	Lea Valley Heritage Alliance.	6, 7 & 8			heritage	I was interested to see the plans for the park's future. The Alliance sees the park as an important stakeholder in moving its plans forward to enhance its current concept right up the valley to Luton. We are currently working on this and would like to see an officer of the Park attend our next meeting which we hope will be in June. Please consider this in your <u>consultation</u> .	Comments noted	No change

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Buisnesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals



Responses to Draft Area Proposals and Final Proposed Amendments Authority April 2019

OA16.0	Transport for London Spatial Planning & Crossrail 2	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Waltham Cross to Broxbourne Station	P14 - We support the need to work with LVRPA on developing a strategic access and wayfinding strategy to improve visitor access into the Regional Park. The change to reflect working with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 on a strategic approach to visitor access to the park rather than opposing level crossing closures is <b>strongly welcomed</b> .	Comments noted and support for joint working to improve visitor access welcomed.	No change
OA16.1	Transport for London Spatial Planning & Crossrail 2	6		6.A.4 Visitors	2. Cheshunt Station to Pindar Visitor Gateway	P15 - LVRPA should aim to work with Broxbourne Borough Council and the developers at Cheshunt Lakeside to create a suitable gateway into the park.	Comments noted - the Authority is currently engaged discussions on this matter	No change
OA16.2	Transport for London Spatial Planning & Crossrail 2	6		6.A.4 Visitors	5. Broxbourne gateway and Visitor Hub	P17 - Development potential at Broxbourne Gateway (Leisure Pool) should also refer to the need to maximise any development opportunity associated with Crossrail 2 in the longer term. Note, Crossrail is one word rather than "Cross Rail"	Comments noted. Proposals are framed around the opportunities which may emerge from work to update the Leisure Pool brief for this site. The spelling of Crossrail will be checked throughout.	Check and if necessary amend the spelling of <b>Crossrail</b> .
OA16.3	Transport for London Spatial Planning & Crossrail 2	6		6.A.4 Environment	Four Tracking and Crossrail 2	Support wording around Crossrail 2 and working with NR/CR2 team. However it should be noted that where Crossrail 2 provides a significant increase in service provision and four tracking to support this Network Rail cannot support the retention of level crossings as a solution to retaining crossing points. Network Rail/Crossrail 2 will continue to work with the LVRPA, and others, to investigate suitable alternatives.	Comments noted	No change
OA16.4	Transport for London Spatial Planning & Crossrail 2	6		6.A.4 Environment	Four Tracking and Crossrail 2	We suggest the wording on Area 6, page 30 be changed to read: "The Authority will work closely with Crossrail 2 including environmental specialists to mitigate any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2 proposals." We also suggest the text at the end of the above sentence that currently reads, "for example improved rail access at Cheshunt station and supporting infrastructure" be dropped, for no other reason than Crossrail 2 will provide this as a matter of course given the proposals for Cheshunt station.	This proposal is about integrating infrastructure into the wider Park. The first part of the sentence will be amended as suggested.	Amend text under 6.A.4 Environment - Four Tracking and Crossrail 2 second paragraph "The Authority will work closely with <b>Crossrail 2 including environmental specialists to mitigate</b> seek- <del>mitigation</del> for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2 proposals; for example improved rail access at Cheshunt station and supporting infrastructure....."
OA16.5	Transport for London Spatial Planning & Crossrail 2	6		6.A.4.1	Wharf Road	We recognise the need for improved wayfinding and better understanding of existing access points into the Park. However any increase in traffic movements over level crossings increases risk therefore we welcome recognition for the need to provide safe crossing of the railway. Further consideration for how this can be achieved will be needed and could include use of existing alternatives like Slipe Lane for cyclists/ pedestrians.	Comments noted.	No change
OA16.6	Transport for London Spatial Planning & Crossrail 2	7		7.A.1 Visitors	Mansers Footbridge	P4 Mansers Footbridge LVRPA's aspiration for improvement to Mansers Footbridge should also consider access to the footbridge, particularly to the west as part of any promotor's aspirations for this bridge. We would question the aim of providing cyclist access given that the footpath on the northwest side of the railway is currently little more than a dirt track that becomes a virtually impassable swamp after rain.	Comments noted, an amendment to proposal text will be made regarding access for cyclists to the bridge.	Amend 7.A.1 Visitors (3rd paragraph) as follows: Work with <b>Network Rail stakeholders to enable better incorporate</b> access for cyclists <b>to as part of</b> <del>the</del> the new bridge at Masers Railway Crossing at the northern end of Spitalbrook.....

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Buisnesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals

OA17.0	Thames Water	8			As you will be aware, Thames Water is the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for the majority of the Lee Valley Regional Park (LVRP) and are hence a "specific consultation body" in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. As a statutory undertaker in London and the Lee Valley, Thames Water operate, manage and invest in significant water and wastewater infrastructure in the LVRP. This includes Rye Meads Sewage Treatment Works located in area 8 [Note – the main part of the sewage works is not located in the LVRP]. We have the following comments on the consultation document:	Comments noted	No change
OA17.1	Thames Water	6, 7 and 8			Water and Wastewater Infrastructure A key sustainability objective for the preparation of Local Plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states: "Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:.....the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater...."Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: "Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment.....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas."	Comments noted. The Area proposals are not proposing large scale developments as is the case with a Local Plan.	No change
OA17.2	Thames Water	6, 7 and 8			The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) first published in March 2014 includes a section on 'water supply, wastewater and water quality' and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that "Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development" (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306). Policy 5.14 of The London Plan, March 2015 is directly relevant as it relates to Water Quality and Wastewater Infrastructure and Policy 5.15 relates to Water Use and Supplies. Policy S15 of the new London Plan draft for Public Consultation, December 2017, relates to water infrastructure.	Comments noted	No change

OA17.3	Thames Water	6, 7 and 8				It is important to consider the net increase in water and wastewater demand to serve development and also any impact that developments may have off site, further down the network. The Local Plan should therefore seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Thames Water will work with developers and local authorities to ensure that any necessary infrastructure reinforcement is delivered ahead of the occupation of development. Where there are infrastructure constraints, it is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades take around 18 months and Sewage Treatment & Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 3-5 years.	Comments noted	No change
OA17.4	Thames Water	6, 7 and 8				Thames Water seek assurance through the Plan that operational development, which will continue to be necessary on operational sites within the Park, will be considered favourably. Policies that seek to protect the openness of the Park should not unduly restrict essential water/wastewater infrastructure provision. Thames Water has a statutory obligation imposed through the Water Industry Act 1991 to treat and supply water. Text should be included in the Local Plan which states that providing need can be demonstrated then operational development will be considered favourably on operational land.	Comments noted, ultimately water/waste water infrastructure is a matter for the local and county authorities. The Area 8 proposals recognise that future upgrades may be necessary at Rye Meads but that these should not have a detrimental impact on adjoining nature reserve and SPA	No change
OA17.5	Thames Water	6, 7 and 8				In light of the above comments and Government guidance we recommend the Local Plan include the following policy/supporting text: PROPOSED NEW WATER/WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE TEXT "The development or expansion of water supply or waste water treatment facilities, will normally be supported, either where needed to serve existing or proposed new development, or in the interests of long term water supply and waste water management, provided that the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact that any such adverse impact is minimised."	Comments noted however the proposed wording would fetter the Authority in responding objectively to significant proposals.	No change
OA17.6	Thames Water	8			Access	Area proposals 8 include land that lies within Thames Water's ownership. The majority of Thames Water's landholdings are in operational use or are retained for future operational use. By their nature, this means that it is not normally possible for Thames Water to provide public access to these operational areas and their operational and security requirements must take precedence. Thames Water supports the aim of improving access, recreational and leisure opportunities in the Lee Valley, but this must not conflict with their health and safety and operational requirements.	Thames Water's position regarding its operational land is noted.	No change

OA17.7	Thames Water	8		8.A.1		Site No 8.A.1. Thames Water support in principle the section on the environment which relates to Rye Meads Sewage (Waste Water) Treatment Works, subject to the new text suggested above also being incorporated into the Plan.	Comments noted, however no changes are proposed. The Park Authority has an important role in helping to protect and improve the condition of the Lee Valley SPA especially given its statutory responsibilities around nature conservation.	No change
OA17.8	Thames Water	6, 7 and 8				Other Development Proposals There are 4 significant sites proposed, part or all of which, fall within the LVRP. However, sufficient detail on number of units and programme of development etc is not yet available for us to make an assessment. We therefore recommends that developers engage with us at the earliest opportunity to establish the following: - The developments demand for water supply and network infrastructure both on and off site; - The developments demand for Sewage/ Wastewater Treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; and - The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met.	These comments are noted but they are best responded to by the riparian authorities through their Local Plans.	No change
OA17.9	Thames Water	6, 7 and 8				We recommend the Local Plan include the following policy/supporting text: PROPOSED NEW WATER/WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE TEXT "Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades."The LVRPA will work with the Local Planning Authority to seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development. <i>continued below</i>	The recommended text is appropriate within a local plan but not as part of the Authority's plan of proposals. None of the proposals within Areas 6, 7 or 8 are likely to make major demands on the water or waste water infrastructure. The local planning authority will advise on this matter in any event as part of the planning application process.	No change
OA17.10	Thames Water	6, 7 and 8				The development or expansion of water supply or waste water treatment facilities, will normally be supported, either where needed to serve existing or proposed new development, or in the interests of long term water supply and waste water management, provided that the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact that any such adverse impact is minimised.	Please see comments above	No change

LB18.0	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm	7		7.A.3	Temple Farm	These representations are submitted by Dandara Ltd who are promoting for development, through the emerging Epping Forest DLP, land at Temple Farm, Roydon for new housing & a 'country park'. [Plan provided showing land interest]. Temple Farm falls within 'PDF Area 7 - Broxbourne to Rye House'. Roydon plays an important role within the PDF, being identified as an 'important entrance into park/possible gateway' focused upon the village's mainline station. The PDF identifies various objectives for Roydon (taken from Area 7 draft amended proposals): - Improving links from LVRP through to Roydon St; - Promoting Roydon St as a 'secondary gateway' into the Park; Ensure links to the Park both south of the station and to the north are maintained & clearly signed; - Maintain & promote the Roydon Loop section of the Lee Valley Pathway from Dobbs Weir Rd to Roydon station for pedestrians & cyclists including the provision of clear signage from the station into the Park; - Examine the feasibility of cycle hire provision at Roydon St to complement facilities at Broxbourne Meadows & potential facilities at Ware/St Margarets Sts; - Create & promote circular walking routes using Lee Valley Pathway & existing public footpaths with connections into Dobbs Weir, Roydon village & Station.	Comments noted	No change
LB18.1	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm	7	Area 7 Thematic Landscape & Heritage	7.A.3	Temple Farm	The PDF focuses on the promotion of Roydon as a 'secondary gateway' into the Park, building upon the accessibility of the village and particularly its position on the strategic London-Stanstead-Cambridge corridor. The vision is to deliver an attractive entranceway into the Park which provides legible, high quality routes which meaningfully link into the wider LVRP network, focusing upon the promotion and facilitation of sustainable transport modes including walking and cycling. The PDF accompanying Area 7 'landscape and heritage' thematic proposals map, identifies the western edge of Roydon as 'harsh visually detracting edge / investment area'. This acknowledges that there is poor integration between the LVRP and Roydon where the urban fringe character abruptly changes into rolling countryside with significant topographic and vegetation changes beyond the initial urban fringe. This urban edge environment detracts from the role of Roydon as a 'secondary gateway' into the park and acts as a physical and visual barrier which discourages access into the Park for both visitors and residents of Roydon.	Comments noted	No change

LB18.2	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm	7		7.A.3	Key Resources and Special Features section	Whilst we support the recognition within the PDF that the existing western edge of Roydon comprises a 'harsh visually detracting edge / investment area', we object to the deletion of the wording struck out in the extract below taken from the 'key resources and special features' section of the supporting text for Area 7 of the PDF which previously identified land abutting the western edge of Roydon as a 'landscape enhancement area' requiring significant investment for its improvement.	The objection is noted but this terminology 'landscape enhancement and investment area' is no longer relevant as the Landscape Assessment and draft Strategy produced in March 2018 now replaces the previous landscape assessment work completed in the late 1990s. The draft landscape assessment and strategy were part of the consultation alongside the Area Proposals.	No change
LB18.3	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm	7	Landscape & Heritage	7.A.3		Whilst the draft 'Landscape Assessment and Strategy' (March 2018) recognises at para. 4.35 that the principal value of 'Roydon Park' comprises "... a distinctive rounded hill above the 30m AOD contour to the east of the flat Lea floodplain and contained by the Stort Navigation to the north", it fails to explicitly recognise that this character does not comprise the entirety of land leading to the settlement edge. The part of Temple Farm located in closest proximity to the settlement edge has consistently been identified in landscape terms as distinct from the wider 'Roydon Park', including within the Park Plan 2000 where this edge is shaded darker purple as a 'landscape enhancement area' and distinct from the light blue 'landscape conservation area' of the wider 'Roydon Park'. [Figure 1 provided showing extract from Jan 2011 Thematic Proposals doc]. It is only at this stage of consultation for the PDF, as shown by the struck out text above, that land adjacent to the settlement edge has not been proposed for identification as a 'landscape enhancement area'.	The Landscape Strategy represents a fresh approach by the Authority in line with current ILA guidelines	No change
LB18.4	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm			7.A.3	Temple Farm	To accompany our representations to the emerging EFDC Local Plan, Dandara Ltd commissioned Define, a specialist landscape consultancy practice, to produce an independent Green Belt & landscape assessment technical note which has informed Masterplanning options drawn-up for land at Temple Farm (attached at Appx 2). Consistent with the Park Plan 2000 and earlier iterations of the Area 7 proposals for the PDF, the technical note recognises the distinct difference in landscape character between those field parcels which sit in closest proximity to the settlement edge & accommodate the majority of the existing agricultural outbuildings, & the more open landscape beyond which forms the eastern slope of the River Stort localised valley.	Comments noted	No change

LB18.5	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm	7		7.A.3	Temple Farm	The Define technical note concurs with the draft PDF that those field parcels immediately adjacent to the western edge of Roydon present a harsh, visually detracting edge to the Park which are physically & visually separated from the wider 'Roydon Park' landscape to the west due to mature vegetative boundaries & significant topographical changes. This independent Green Belt & landscape assessment work informed Masterplanning for the Temple Farm site for a development of between 200-250 new homes on those field parcels closest to the settlement edge alongside the delivery of a significant new 'Country Park' of circa 22 ha to the west. This Masterplan is reproduced in Figure 2 below and in full at Appendix 3.	Comments noted, the draft PDF Area proposal have been changed to refer back to the Landscape Guidelines. See above	No change
LB18.6	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm	7		7.A.3		This illustrative Masterplan, in addition to being informed by the Green Belt purpose and landscape context of the wider Temple Farm site, focuses development only within those field parcels which are physically and visually isolated from the wider Park landscape and setting, as well as positively addressing many of the Area 7 proposals contained within the PDF: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It delivers a significant new 'country park' within the LVRP which includes a range of pedestrian &amp; cycle routes connecting Roydon with the wider Park landscape;</li> <li>- It replaces largely inaccessible land, the easternmost part of which presents a harsh, visually detracting edge, with a comprehensive Masterplan which recognises the role that much needed new housing can play in facilitating major improvements to the accessibility, attractiveness, usability and recreational value of this part of the Park;...continued below</li> </ul>	There is no proposal in the PDF for housing. Details of the masterplan and residential development within the Park are noted. This is not a proposal that can be endorsed/included in the Area Proposals. The Authority has a suite of Proposals that relate to this area under 7.A.3 and these will be referred to when the Authority responds to the development proposals as part of the planning process.	No change
LB18.7	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm	7		7.A.3		Roydon no longer presents a harsh, unwelcoming edge to the LVRP but instead becomes a settlement which meaningfully integrates with the Park, facilitating a range of pedestrian and cycle routes that legibly connect with the existing village encouraging accessibility both for visitors, utilising the station, and existing residents; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Masterplan allows for the land to be managed for a range of purposes, with maintenance and management cross-subsidised by the associated new housing, including for recreation, leisure, ecological or community purposes;</li> <li>- Options are included for a formal visitor centre or Park linked community building (e.g. scouts) alongside a potential car park which could serve visitors to the Park or provide additional provision for the station;</li> <li>- There are opportunities to incorporate Park-wide infrastructure in recognition of the location of the land close to Roydon station such as cycle hire schemes; visitor information boards or circular walking routes.</li> </ul>	See above	No change

LB18.8	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm			7.A.3		<p>A meeting was held with the LVRPA on 18th April 2018 to discuss how the objectives set out for Area 7 and Roydon more specifically within the emerging PDF could be positively and proactively delivered having regard to emerging development proposals for Temple Farm shown in the Figure 2 Masterplan above.</p> <p>LVRPA stated that whilst Section 12 of the Lee Valley Regional Park Act 1966 continued to define the statutory purposes of the Park, the LVRPA Corporate Land and Property Strategy 2017 recognised that there were parts of the Park that did not meet the statutory purpose and in some cases, the disposal of land for non-park related purposes could assist in facilitating overall improvements to the statutory function of the Park. This approach accords with the thrust of the PDF in respect of guiding and proactively delivering positive change within the Park, especially associated with 'gateways', and is included in full at Appendix 4 with an extract in Figure 3 below.</p>	Comments noted	No change
LB18.9	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm					<p>Dandara Ltd's proposals for land at Temple Farm shown illustratively in Figure 2 above directly align with the LVRPA's Section 12 corporate land and property objectives by securing funding from the development of land located in parts of the Park which do not currently positively contribute and using those monies generated to deliver a significant Section 12 betterment to the Park as a whole. This accords with Dandara Ltd's approach to developing land identified as a 'harsh / visually detracting edge' and 'landscape enhancement area' for much needed new housing and using the monies obtained to deliver a new 22 ha 'country park' which significantly enhances the accessibility, legibility, usability and recreational value of this important gateway to the Park.</p>	Comments noted	No change



LB18.10	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm					<p>Despite the positive framework provided by the LVRPA's own 2017 Corporate Land and Property Strategy to meeting the objectives of the PDF, there was little consideration of the proposals put forward for land at Temple Farm during the 18th April 2018 meeting with numerous reasons for disengagement being put forward including Roydon being divorced from the principal parts of the Park where the LVRPA Estate functions; concerns regarding future funding of a new 'country park'; and the north-east corner of Area 7 not being seen as a current priority for the LVRPA. Whilst we therefore support the direction of travel set out within the PDF regarding the promotion of Roydon as a 'secondary gateway'; improving legibility; encouraging sustainable transport links including to Roydon station; and recognising that the edge of Roydon currently detracts from the setting of the LVRP; unless the LVRPA is prepared to actively engage with proactive landowners and their partners following the parameters set out in their own 2017 Corporate Land and Property Strategy, many of the core objectives of the PDF will not be achieved.</p>	Comments noted	No change
LB18.11	Dandara Ltd for Temple Farm	7			Temple Farm	<p>Land at Temple Farm provides an opportunity to work alongside a proactive landowner to deliver a significant improvement to this part of LVRP, focused on a new 22 ha 'country park' which significantly improves the legibility, usability &amp; leisure/recreational value of this part of the Park, linking to Roydon village as a 'secondary gateway' &amp; its railway station. Without such engagement, the western edge of Roydon will continue to present a harsh, detracting edge to the Park, connecting to land which would remain largely inaccessible &amp; accommodating a land use which does not contribute to the S12 stat.objectives. Whilst we acknowledge that the PDF is not examined as would a Local Plan, if it were, there would be fundamental concerns that it would fail the 'effective' test of soundness by not being deliverable. Whilst many of the objectives within the PDF are laudable, for them to be realised &amp; delivered, the LVRPA should commit to engaging proactively with landowners &amp; their development partners to consider how development on parts of the Park that currently detract from the S12 stat. purpose could be used to fund meaningful improvements, especially where these link to underused land resources adjacent to important gateways. If not, the PDF will be ineffective in guiding true beneficial/deliverable change in the Park.</p>	Comments noted	No change

Responses to Draft Area Proposals and Final Proposed Amendments Authority April 2019

LB19.0	Lea Valley Growers Association	6, 7 & 8			Glasshouses	The Lea Valley Growers Association repeat the concerns raised within their previous response of February 2015. The Association question whether the annual sum of £11m given by the Taxpayer to the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority represents value for money. A large sum of which is paid to a Trust. The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority's previous draft proposals were withdrawn in 2015 following complaints & pressure from the Lea Valley Growers Association and others as the Park Authority had not consulted and they contained proposals for the use of their compulsory purchase powers to destroy thriving Lea Valley Food Growing Businesses.	Officers from the Authority met with representatives from the Lea Valley Growers Association on 19 July 2017 to discuss amended Area proposals relating to existing and future Glasshouse sites in the Park. A draft set of revised proposals was presented and discussed at this meeting. These took into account the outcome of the judgement from the Court of Appeal and sought to address other concerns such as the naming of sites.	No change but note additional wording added as a result of EA comments about flood risk and storage see OA10.2
LB19.1	Lea Valley Growers Association	6, 7 & 8				Further concerns were discovered during the complaints process when it emerged that the Park Authority were unaccountable to Government for their conduct other than for financial purposes, and did not have external oversight of their non-financial actions. This behavioural culture and unaccountability demonstrated by the Park Authority may indicate why the taxpayer funded Authority chose to pursue a Judicial Review against another taxpayer funded Local Authority resulting in a six figure Taxpayer bill.	Comments noted	No change
LB19.2	Lea Valley Growers Association	6, 7 & 8				The Park Authority refused to publish the responses to the previous draft proposals following a Freedom of Information request from the Association citing Local Authority rules that they could publish at a later date. The authority have only published a summary of responses to date.	The Authority published in full the comments received from all parties on the draft proposals (2015), together with the Authority's response. These were all published on the Authority's website as part of the current consultation.	No change
LB19.3	Lea Valley Growers Association	6, 7, & 8				The Authority has refused to accept recommended scrutiny from the Local Government Ombudsman and instead decided to handle all final decisions regarding complaints against them themselves	The Authority is not required by legislation to adhere to the Local Government Ombudsman process. However it follows the LGO approach in full.	No change
LB19.4	Lea Valley Growers Association	6, 7 & 8				Therefore the Association consider a formal detailed response to the Park Authority futile until such time as the Government install external oversight of the Authority and hold them to account for their actions in order to avoid a repeat of such irresponsible behaviour that has caused severe distress to Lea Valley Businesses	Comments noted	No change

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Businesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals

LB20.0	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7				<p><b>"In the spirit of compromise"</b>. As a company based in the Lee Valley since 1928, and before that in Vauxhall at Falcon Stairs where it was started in 1612, by Sir Edward Zouche, (<a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vauxhall_glassworks">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vauxhall_glassworks</a>), an Elizabethan courtier, long before the Park (LVRPA), was established in 1967 by Act of Parliament as a National Park, we wish to comment on the Consultation.</p> <p>Our comments refer principally to Areas 6 &amp; 7 in the Park. We own 7 acres in Area 7, and abut Area 6 directly. To simplify our comments in the Consultation we shall present our views in numbered paragraphs in the accepted way used by the Civil Service, in the following 11 pages.</p>	Comments noted	No change
LB20.1	Nazeing Glass Works	6,7				<p>Section A- About Us. 1.Our site is categorised as PDL- Previously Developed Land, not Green Belt, although we are surrounded on all four sides by LVRPA owned land. 2. We have always had friendly relationships with our neighbour on two sides, LVRPA as we are a very "green company" having won several awards for our sustainability:- a) We were one of the first European Crystal glass companies to ban the use of lead in our glass in April 2003, &amp; remove all lead oxide &amp; all uranium oxide stored on the premises, at our own behest. b) We won the Award "Green Business of The Year 1998" run by EFDC, for our work in removing a bonfire tip on our field and installing an enclosed incinerator in our batch room, that also provided some internal heating. c) We developed, (with a 40% Government Eastern Regional Business Link grant), &amp; patented the world's First Non-Toxic crystal glass -no antimony or arsenic used- Patent No WO20 12156707A1 - Improvements in crystal glass –Google Patents.</p>	Details about Nazeing Glass Works noted	No change
LB20.2	Nazeing Glass Works	6 7				<p>So threatened were our main competitors in Europe, (Swarovski, Calp &amp; Riedel) that they threatened us with legal action, if we launched it as "Non Toxic Crystal". In a spirit of compromise, we now on legal advice, use the name "World First Crystal" (WFC) instead, and leave "Non Toxic" out of the main title, which is "The World's First non-toxic Crystal Glass"! d) We were awarded Commended in the "Best SME" National Award Category 2008 by The Manufacturer Magazine, Manufacturer of the Year Awards, and Shortlisted for "Design and Innovation", in their 2009 Awards (Manufacturer of the Year).</p>	Details about Nazeing Glass Works noted	No change

LB20.3	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7				So we are not a dirty smelly glass factory, but value highly our good housekeeping and cleanliness, reputation, which are essential to making high quality glass. We provide an essential role for British and EU customers to obtain British made fine glass, of up to seventy different original formulae, by a company with a heritage of over 400 years, celebrating 90 years on this same site,	Details about Nazeing Glass Works noted	No change
LB20.4	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7				3. Q. So what does Nazeing Glass Works make and how come most people have never heard of us? A. Simple. We make glass to order. In other words, we make what customers want to buy, which is why we have survived so long compared to our competitors. Q. Meaning? A. Street light fittings and lamp covers for transport, e.g. on the London Underground in the tunnels every seven seconds there is a light, for which we have made the covers, all 402 kilometres, 252 miles, over 400,000 light fitting covers, all made by Nazeing Glass Works, as they cannot use plastic covers underground. We made 1,100 special magnifying high intensity lights for the 2008 Beijing Olympics, to light up the magnificent birds nest stadium. Without us and our Danish lighting manufacturer, 30,000 dancers, athletes and performers would not have been seen.	Details about Nazeing Glass Works and its products are noted	No change
LB20.5	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7				Q. And more recently? A. We have just finished a contract worth almost £100k, part of a £55m make-over to manufacture special mouldings for the new Annabel's nightclub in Barclay Square, London, where one of Europe's most famous designers, based in London, Martin Brudnizki designed a "Room of Mirrors". We made all the mouldings, almost 1,200 pieces of glass, architraves, skirting boards, fireplace surrounds & dado rails in clear glass, which were then mirrored. Link <a href="https://www.telegraph.co.uk/luxury/drinking-and-dining/first-look-inside-legendary-london-club-annabels-unveils-55m/">https://www.telegraph.co.uk/luxury/drinking-and-dining/first-look-inside-legendary-london-club-annabels-unveils-55m/</a>	Details about Nazeing Glass Works and its products are noted	No change

LB20.6	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7			<p>Although we have a good ' neighbours 'relationship' with the LVRPA, it has had one or two shaky moments. In fact we found a comment in the late 1980's in EFDC Committee notes, referring to our site saying because there were car repairers and paint sprayers as tenants, the LVRPA would rather we closed down and sold the industrial site to them so they could demolish everything and replant grass and willow bushes. However they realised this was unrealistic and they could never justify the expense of paying the market price! I rang the information office, and spoke to a Senior Planner who said that recently they had been informed of the craftsmanship of our glass makers, and, that they were coming round to the idea, that having one of the last handmade glass makers in the country, in the Park might be an asset, especially if we opened to the Public. I replied that our factory shop was growing in leaps and bounds and that we did hold open days to the public about five times a year and these were free, for visits on Saturdays, and advertised locally and on a special Saturday morning opening we had had, nearly 500 visitors!</p>	<p>Details about the Nazeing Glas Works, its products and visitor open days noted</p>	No change
LB20.7	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7			<p>Section B- Our comments and reactions to the proposed changes to the Framework in this Consultation.</p> <p>1. As very large rate payers, (about £500k a year from our estate's 40 plus tenants), that feeds into the LVRPA income, we are concerned to see some diametrically opposed statements in Policy between Broxbourne Borough Council and Lee Valley Park Authority, and respectfully suggest some compromise should be agreed to allow the Plan for our area to proceed successfully.</p> <p>a) LVRPA proposes deleting the precious plan for a major "tourist/ visitor Centre" to be developed on the foundations of the Old Leisure Pool/Lido site in consultation with development partners. They said they would issue a tender document in early Autumn 2017 but have changed their mind/renege on this announcement.</p>	<p>Comments noted, although the Regional Park is not funded by business rates.</p>	No change

LB20.8	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7		6.A.4	5. Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North	b) Broxbourne Borough Council categorically states Framework Consultation Document LA 1.5 6.A.4 supported in their 2008 document "short term accommodation, office uses, (potentially), <u>an enhancement of leisure facilities e.g. boat moorings /cycle hire/marina. The creation of additional leisure facilities such as a climbing walls, adventure playgrounds cricket/tennis facilities.</u> " and goes on to suggest <u>"the implementation of 'pod' style accommodation...etc."</u> and supports the Framework's proposals for establishing this area as a major visitor hub". It goes on to add this telling recommendation for the area. "Any future small scale glass house development and settlement extensions should respect and respond to the existing small scale, contained pattern and well defined settlement edges at Cheshunt and Broxbourne, making use of the existing landscape framework ." Source LUC Draft Consultation by Land Use Consultants document, ( LCA 4A- Page 63/258). <b>THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE CAREFULLY READ, IN CONJUNCTION WITH OUR PROPOSALS BELOW</b>	Comments noted. Relevant documents in terms of any future development proposals for the old Leisure Pool site will be the Broxbourne Borough Council's Local Plan, currently submitted for examination. The Local Plan Submission Version includes the following policy: "Policy LV3: Broxbourne Leisure Pool Site. The Council and the Park Authority will up-date the Broxbourne Leisure Pool Development Brief to include the potential for residential development to the western end of the site to enable the wider development and improvement of the site and preservation of the existing parkland and natural areas".	No change
LB20.9	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7		6.A.4	5. Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park	c) It is our contention that LVRPA is in error in suggesting deleting "Development of the former Leisure Pool site for a leisure use appropriate to the Regional Park, options to be explored with potential development partners". We have found a reference somewhere that the reason this has changed is that there were no, or virtually no, potential proposals put forward. d) We wish to contest this statement as we have had three physical meeting with senior officers of LVRPA about use of the site by Nazeing Glass Works. We have taken on board the response that LVRPA does not want a manufacturing company on that site in the Park. Our application now concerns a national Training Academy for glass makers, on a much smaller, (under half the size 20,000sq ft compared to 45,00 0sq ft), studio scale inc offices, lecture & changing rooms showers, & 2 Museums etc. <i>Continued below</i>	The Authority's redrafted proposal seeks to ensure the revised development brief considers potential for residential alongside other uses. This proposal is included in the Borough Council's draft Local Plan and will be determined through the Local Plan process. There are however no proposals in the PDF for the ex Leisure Pool site that include industrial Glassworks, a Glassworks Museum and Visitor Centre and Real Tennis.	No change
LB20.10	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7		6.A.4	5 Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North	e) However it is now our intention to change the nature of Nazeing Glass Works into a major tourist & visitor destination, called "Broxbourne Glass Studio Project" open from 9.am to 3.30pm at least 5 days a week (& possibly special openings on Bank holiday week-ends, in agreement with our work force). f) Nazeing Glass Works has scaled down its operations considerably since the mid 1980's (employed 180 staff) to its now slimmer, studio type size of 25 people including 6 in admin.	As above	No change

LB20.11	Nazeing Glass Works	6		6.A.4	5. Broxbourne Gateway and Vistor Hub - River Lee Country Park North	Section C The previous occupier of the site the broxbourne Leisure Pool nicked "The Lido". A hard careful study has been made of the former Broxbourne Leisure Pool, built 1978 - demolished 2011, Cost approximately £12m in capital costs over this period. Running costs and income are known only to LVRPA.	Comments noted	No change
LB20.12	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7		6.A.4	5. Broxbourne Gateway and Vistor Hub - River Lee Country Park North	These are our conclusions:- 1. The project was very ambitions, the first leisure Pool in the UK with a 4 foot wave machine (used in the USA) .It attracted 100,000 visitors in the first three months ! 2. The site is in the Green Belt, but granted planning as it was meant to be an open air pool so qualified as an open air sports facility. However Broxbourne Swimming Pool objected it was too close, so the brief was changed to be an enclosed leisure pool. 3. It is on the edge of a 1 in 100 Flood Plain, with a high water table, so a vast 5 ft high mound measuring approx 32,000 sq ft. was built, and the pool was set 11.25 foot deep. 4. It was an Olympic-sized pool, meant as a sea training pool, (no diving) so only 4 foot Deep, but with a strong wave machine. 5. There were constant problems from breaking up of the mosaic tiles that lined the base of the pool. To what standard and hardness were these made? 6. The constant action of the wave machine, together with the massive water weight caused the fatal problems on this high water table site.	Comments noted	No change
LB20.13	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7				Working with the new potential owners of our site Nazeing Marina Village, led by local businessman Kevin Ellerbeck, we are looking for a new site nearby, and to refocus our business more on training. Our workforce is ageing and six of us have worked for over 40 years. The industry, if it is to survive, needs more and better trainees and trainers. Our federation, British Glass, of Sheffield, is bidding for a £20m "Glass Futures" contract from the Government, for training in the glass industry, and as a founder member, we hope to bid to be a leading training provider on our site, on a small scale , studio type production, highly skilled and very watchable.	Comments noted	No change

LB20.14	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7		6.A.4	5. Broxbourne Gateway & Visitors Hub - River Lee Country Park	object to the proposal in this consultation to the suggestion that instead of agreeing to what the Planning Authority Broxbourne Borough Council wants for the old Lido/Leisure Pool site, "the creation of additional leisure facilities such as a climbing walls ",adventure playground" cricket tennis facilities, The LVRPA states , " <u>Joint working with Broxbourne Council to update the Leisure Pool Development Brief to include the potential for residential development to enable the wider development and improvement of the site.</u> " Yet LVRA argues the opposite of what Broxbourne Borough Council want which is, " <u>the site is not suitable for residential development</u> " ( <u>Green Belt , inside the 1 in 100 year Flood plain</u> ). So LVRPA is diametrically opposing Brox.B.C.s requirements, so how is this " <u>Joint working</u> " together?	Comments noted. It is unclear the source of all the information referred to in this comment. Please refer to the above comments relating to joint working on a development brief.	No change
LB20.15	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7				Not only that but LVRPA say in their documents that "No,-or hardly any proposals were made by potential partners" This is just not true! My company, Nazeing Glass Works, tried to put forward a proposal, but were told "Wait until September 2017 , when we shall issue papers for a tender process". When asked in November when these were being issued, to be told , "We've changed our mind and want to build residential housing on that site" was a uncalled for blow!!! LVRPA Then crossed out the following " development of the former Leisure Pool site for a leisure use appropriate to The Regional Park ,options to be explored with potential partners".	Please refer to the response above	No change
LB20.16	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7				Yet there are more common policies than disagreements. COMPROMISE ! Sport,- Sport for all, all ages- LVRPA & Brox BC and British Waterways all agree that Sport, exercise, and healthy living are essential prerequisites in the Lee Valley Park Message. "Sport in Lee Valley is all about inclusion. The idea of involving the greatest number of people in sport in our region is what drives the Regional Park Authority's Sports Development team. So whether it's supporting excellence at the highest Olympic level or simply encouraging fun sport for families, Lee Valley is 100% dedicated to making it happen.	Comments noted	No change



LB20.17	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7			<p>As Lee Valley is home to several world-class sports venues, sports linked to these centres of excellence have been given particular priority. Several outreach projects and London 2012 legacy programmes are in place, to both support high achievement and encourage increased physical activity for all. These priority sports include Tennis is one of the sports mentioned, and while there is provision in the South, of 6 outdoor and two indoor courts, there is none here. The reason may be that lawn tennis is well catered for is the success of Broxbourne Tennis Club, one of the best in the County with 300+ members, and has permission by the LTA to grow to 600, and is only 400 yards away, just outside the Park.</p> <p>The ambition to promote opportunities for people to get active also extends to Lee Valley Regional Park's countryside and open spaces. In every corner of the park's 10,000 acres, there's a sustained effort to maximize sports options to the widest possible audience". Our Real Tennis Training Academy and Court will comply with all these aims and objectives.</p>	Comments noted	No change
LB20.18	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7			<p>Other features of the Park:- Sustainability, - Low Carbon- low energy Retaining the open and country feel of the Park Protecting the wildlife, species, and historic environment, especially around Broxbourne Station ( Broxbourne Mill and listed buildings near there , and the Norman Broxbourne church) all must be cherished and valued, and we might be able to promote interest in this nearby.</p> <p>These are all values that will be respected and endorsed by both NGW and NMV. The "green setting" is a key to the site, and must be preserved. Brox B.C. wants a major attraction on the Lido site and no permanent or long term housing. LVRPA is wanting to delete any visitor/tourist centre and wants housing, but the area is green belt and much of it inside the 1 in100 Flood Plain WHY? Brox B. C. have said that rented/ tourist accommodation might be possible on some of the area, low cost or temporally</p>	See comments above relating to Broxbourne's position and joint working	No change

LB20.19	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7			<p><u>An Original Solution " In The Interest Of Compromise" To Satisfy All Three Partners</u> Brox,B.C, LVRPA, and British Waterways</p> <p>: Nazeing Glass Works Ltd, (NGW), whose planned "The Broxbourne Glass Studio Project" (BGSP), and Nazeing Marina Village have come up with a solution. NGW are looking for a new site close by, within the next two years, to move to, in order to refocus their production to be more glass training orientated, and at the same time to downscale from a large factory of 45,000 sq ft, at present to around 20-25,000 sq ft. The whole Lido site measures 0.81 of a hectare which is 87,188 sq ft. But the actual foundations of the pool measure 54 x 52.4 sq m, so, 2,830 sq m or 30,458 sq ft.</p>	<p>Comments noted, there have been initial discussions with the officers of the Authority and the local planning authority about these proposals which are ongoing as part of the pre-application process.</p>	No change
LB20.20	Nazeing Glass Works	6, 7			<p>Nazeing Glass Works would like to purchase the freehold of this area, for a negotiated commercial sum, bearing in mind it is a permitted sporting venue within the Green Belt, and not a major housing development, perhaps stretching the final area to 32,500 sq ft to include the balustrade and surrounding path, but leave the mound as a public area for picnics n summer recreation area for sunbathing by visitors, and play area for small children in teh ownership and maintenance of the LVRPA.</p> <p>(The purchaser would be obliged, if the scheme was not successful to sell back the site, to its previous owner LVRPA, for not more , nor less than 80% of the sum paid).</p> <p>If successful in its negotiations with the site owner LVRPA, and in obtaining the Planning consent it needs, then we would build a state of the art medium size glass studio works for the training and small scale production of glassware, much of it to be sold to visitors. It will add a museum, a cafe, a lecture room for up to 75 people, (which can be hired out), changing room and showers shared with the Real Tennis Court, but each would have its private locker rooms with electronic access by members or employees.</p>	<p>Comments noted, there have been initial discussions with the officers of the Authority and the local planning authority about these proposals which are ongoing as part of the pre-application process. The Authority's current proposals for this site are in line with the policy in the Broxbourne Local Plan Submission version, subject to examination during Oct and Nov 2018.</p>	No change

LB20.21	Nazeing Glass Works	6			<p><u>The Design of the Studio will be exceptional! World Class! An Exemplar that will interest architects the world over. &amp; may win many awards. It is inspired by the David Mellor Cutlery "Roundhouse, built on the site of an old gasometer, by Sir Michael Hopkins practice in the 1990's, but update for the 21st century.</u></p> <p>At the top of a gentle 30 foot slope will appear a large dome, culminating in a discreet chimney opening, with monitored emission controls 24 hours a day. It will echo the soft contours of the mound and look like an organic shape of a silver restaurant dish cover in a without a handle, in dark gold colour or dark slate, soft, curved and rounded, unlike the sharp square shape of the box-like Lido that squatted there before. It will reflect the 250 year old tradition of a glass factory cone, but be softer, gentler, more welcoming profile to visitors, almost "Middle Earth-like ( JK Tolkien 's Hobbit village)</p>	Detail about the design of the proposed Glass Studio is noted - please see comments made above	No change
LB20.22	Nazeing Glass Works	6		6.A.4	<p>The construction of the glass studio would be revolutionary as it would ( subject to agreement), be one of the first buildings in the world to use the newly invented solar glass tiles, invented by Solar City, a subsidiary of Corning Glass, of New York, the largest glassmaker in the world. Nazeing Glass Works and Corning Glass have done some business together over the past five years and the electricity from these tiles would be used in the Glass Works, &amp; to provide up to 10 public charging points, using 100% solar energy for commuters owning electric cars using Broxbourne Station- chargeable but discounted below normal energy prices.</p>	Details of the Glass Studio are noted, please refer to comments made above	No change

LB20.23	Nazeing Glass Works I	6		6.A.4	<p>The studio would measure about 20,000 sq ft, &amp; in the remaining 5,000 sq ft (450 sq metres) it would build the World's First Public Real Tennis Court &amp; "BALL &amp; RACKET Museum, open 7 days a week to visitors. The Court would be open from 10am to 6pm to visitors 7 days a week, &amp; available 24Hrs a day to full members. There are 43 Real Tennis courts in the World; the nearest being Hatfield, Cambridge, Newmarket &amp; Lord's Cricket Ground, the MCC, &amp; at Chelmsford, Prestead Park, (which has built two). These very solid courts cost over £1m ea. to build. The whole unit would be called "The National Academy for Glass and Real Tennis Training", be supported by the Tennis &amp; Rackets Association, and the International Real Tennis Professionals Association, based in Richmond, Surrey &amp; be associated with all the other 27 Real Tennis Courts in the UK. There would be synergy of shared changing rooms and toilets as the Glass Studio will work from 8am to 4pm, and the tennis court will be used mainly in the evening and at weekends. These two units would cost between £2.m and £2.35m it is estimated, &amp; all would be paid for, by the owners of Nazeing Glass, from the sale of the land of their site opposite, as a philanthropic gesture, for the first five years, but with the aim of breaking even in 3 years.</p>	Details for the Real Tennis facility are noted.	No change
LB20.24	Nazeing Glass Works	6		6.A.4	<p>A large factory shop, (5,000 sq ft) would sell some of the products made on site, and the units would aim for 30,000 visitors a year spending around £12 each, and another 30,000 visitors visiting the glass works as spectators, and the Real Tennis Court paying £1.95 a head.</p> <p>The operators would want to aim for, and offer to youngsters aged between 15 to 17 ½ free visits with their teachers, as career guidance and to recruit new trainees, especially f Asian and Afro-Caribbean backgrounds from a 12 mile radius to include the East End and North London, possibly dyslexic, and low achieving disadvantaged schoolchildren, boys and girls.</p> <p>With this in mind a bid for funding will be made to the National Lottery Heritage Fund under the new 2018 programme of "Heritage, Communities and People" programme, as well as improving education of the young.</p> <p>The project will also be linked to the Eden project to share environmental economies, through a connection between the owner of Nazeing Glass Works, and Sir Tim Smit of the Eden project, who we believe will give the idea his blessing and want to link up, (To be confirmed)</p>	Details of the factory shop are noted, please refer to comments made above	No change

LB20.25	Nazeing Glass Works	6 & 7		6.A.4		In addition, Nazeing Village Marina, Will Build & Operate a 10 Areas Site, Formerly The Glass Works site &, in addition, would offer to build a small scale matching steel and glass "pod" above the 1 in 100 yr Flood Plain with about 30-40 low cost & rented apartments, & share the profits & income 50/50 with RPA. These could be hired by trainee glass makers doing six month training courses, for cheap local accom. There may be some S.106 financial advantages to improve the road network. And car parking to cope with the anticipated demand (remember the Lido had 100,000 visitors in the first 3 months!), that the two companies NGW and NMV may be able to make, & help network rail build a better road bridge.	Details noted see comments above	No change
LB20.26	Nazeing Glass Works	6		6.A.4		The glass studio/ training Academy, & Real Tennis Court will be highly environmentally friendly, recycling waste heat from the furnaces that usually go into the atmosphere at 100o C for hot water and showers in the shared changing rooms, male & female, & for museum room, lecture heating in the winter. As far as we know this has NEVER been done before & will be a world "Exemplar". Constant carbon usage will be monitored & as the glassmaking uses little water there will be no chemical run offs into the water course/ River Lee. The roof guttering will be designed to capture rain water & recycle it as a grey water scheme.	The proposed environmental credentials of the proposed development are noted. Please see comments above	No change
LB20.27	Nazeing Glass Works	6		6.A.4		We believe if approved, this building could become a major landmark in the northern section of the park, subtle, distinct and much loved by the locals. All Tennis and Glass works car parks, (but not the commuter ones) will be re surfaced to become self draining not as at present, and over 1,000 trees, most native to the area like Black willows, will be planted as landscaping. He chosen architects Stonewood Design, based in Wiltshire, won "Small Project Architect of the Year 2016", and RIBA National Award Winner 2015, and have been chosen for their high ethics and respect for the environment. Finally, it is hoped to interest Channel 4's "Grand Designs" in this innovative and ground breaking project.	Details noted see comments above	No change

LB21.0	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	7				Nazeing Marina Village Ltd (NMVL) have secured a controlling interest in the Nazeing Glassworks site located in Nazeing Road, Nazeing. It is intended to carry out a major redevelopment of this life-expired commercial site. Full details on the proposed development will be detailed in this Report. The Glassworks regeneration scheme has been worked up in conjunction with the principle site occupier (Nazeing Glassworks Ltd) and their owner Stephen Pollock-Hill and this submission to LVRPA has been jointly prepared with Stephen Pollock-Hill. With respect to the Glassworks regeneration, we hope to not only receive your support for our proposals, but we seek to provide facilities for the LVRPA on your adjoining land and the wider LVRPA area. These proposals will be expanded in greater detail later in this Report. This Report forms the basis of our consultation response.	Comments noted. Initial officer level discussions have taken place at this early stage in the scheme development.	No change
LB21.1	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				It is the stated intention of the LVRPA to provide a major hub development at the entrance to the park and for the provision of a major tourist attraction set around the former Lido site and Broxbourne Station and embrace the forthcoming enlargement for CrossRail 2 from 2030 onwards when it will become the Northern entrance hub to the new rail network. We believe that we can put forward a proposition to the LVRPA to carry out the regeneration of the former Lido site, the Nazeing Glassworks industrial area and the wider LVRPA hinterland area. All our proposals for the Glassworks regeneration and the associated works on LVRP land will be 100% funded by NMVL as part of the community gain that will be included within a s106 Legal Agreement running with any new planning consent issued by Epping Forest District Council.	Comments and proposals for the Nazeing Glass Works and former Leisure Pool site noted.	No change
LB21.2	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				In addition to the above, we would like to put forward a joint venture arrangement between LVRPA and NMVL for the redevelopment of the former Lido site together some major infrastructure proposals that will assist not only the LVRPA but the wider community as well. Nazeing Glass Works Ltd, who wish to move their factory, would like purchase outright the immediate Lido area of about 28,000 sq ft, for a modern interpretation of an historic glass factory (to retain the legacy of the glassworks site that has been in the area since 1928, and whose origins date back to 1612 in Vauxhall), and a glass training centre for youngsters and school leavers, using a government Glass Academy Grant for 5 years, and a Real Tennis Academy - more below see later	Comments and proposals for the Nazeing Glass Works and former Leisure Pool site noted.	No change

LB21.3	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd				<p>General Context - in the PDF Strategies Policies Report, [a summary of the LVRPA report is incl ] the Draft Strategic Policies set out a series of key challenges &amp; opportunities to be addressed &amp; a set of strategic aims to address these. The proposals being put forward in this Report will seek to achieve all or most of these objectives <u>Redevelopment and Regeneration of the Nazeing Glassworks Industrial Area</u>. The first point to remember here is that the proposals for this site must be looked at in the wider context of the PDF Strategies Report &amp; the other proposals being put forward in this Report for the former Lido site adjacent to Broxbourne Station. Nazeing Glassworks is an established commercial site, &amp; itself has a history dating back to 1928 here &amp; back to the first glass factory in Vauxhall, founded by Sir Edward Zouche in 1612. All the current buildings on the site are life-time expired and the site requires complete rebuilding and regeneration. The Glassworks site is not located in the Green Belt, and is located only 12 mins walking distance to Broxbourne Station. The "Vision Statement" for the regeneration proposals are included as Appx A to this Report.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There have been initial officer level discussions with Nazeing Marina Village concerning the draft proposals described. It is understood these proposals are under discussion with the local planning authorities concerned. It is agreed that the Nazeing Glassworks site is a previously developed site in the Regional Park.</p>	No change
LB21.4	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7			<p>However, this Vision Statement details only the works being carried out directly on the site, but this Report sets out what facilities we would like to provide on the adjacent LVRPA land that will not only compliment the Glassworks proposals but assist LVRPA with respect to the aims &amp; objectives set out in their PDF. It is hoped to be able to work very closely with the LVRPA to arrive at a comprehensive improvement /regeneration of the surrounding area to provide a "Destination Hub" for this part of the Park area. The enclosed Vision Statement will thus be expanded based upon the future discussions with the LVRPA. <u>All of the proposed works will be carried out by Nazeing Marina Village Ltd as an expense to the development and will be covered in a s106 Legal Agreement to accompany any planning consent issued by Epping Forest District Council for the Glassworks site.</u> We set out below in very general terms the type of facilities and/or improvement to the adjoining LVRPA area as detailed in Plan 1. In addition, it is intended to provide a new cycle/walkway as shown in yellow on Plan 1 (provided with these comments) to connect the existing cycle/walkway path from Broxbourne Station via the River Lea to Nursery Road and to the LVRPA land adjacent.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There have been initial officer level discussions with Nazeing Marina Village concerning the draft proposals described. It is understood these proposals are under discussion with the local planning authorities concerned.</p>	No change

LB21.5	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				Area 1 – Bridge over Nazeing Road - is proposed to improve this access point by the bridge by the provision of - a) A new cycle/walkway over the former Lido site, b) A ramped access alongside the existing step access to the South side of the bridge, c) A new access on the North side of the River to provide both step and ramped access, and d) A pedestrian safety barrier be erected on Nazeing Road to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists can cross the river at this vantage point in a safe manner.	Details of access improvements noted.	No change
LB21.6	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				Area 2 – Land immediately to the South of the Glassworks site. This is a triangular piece of land that is effectively "land-locked" by Nazeing Road, Nazeing Meads, River Lea and Nazeing Glassworks. This area is already served by an existing substantial access point via Nazeing Road. It is proposed to a) improve this access point by the provision of;-Improve the road access into this area, b) Provide a new cycle/ walkway shown on Plan 1 to connect the cycle/ walkway path from the River Lea to Nursery Road and the wider cycle/walkway network, c) provide a new and ample car parking area for visitors, d) Provide toilet facilities, e) Provide a Visitor Facility and Interpretation Area, f) Provide camping pods and possibly yurts, and ablution facilities (optional) g) Other facilities that LVRPA deem appropriate for this location. h) Provide Bus Shuttle Service from Broxbourne Station	Comments and details noted. There have been initial officer level discussions with Nazeing Marina Village concerning the draft proposals described. These are matters that are under discussion with the local planning authorities concerned.	No change
LB21.7	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				Area 3 – Land Adjoining Nazeing Mead. a) Provide a open timber decking area to Nazeing Mead, adjacent to the Glassworks site, to provide a lakeside walkway /picnic area, b) Provide Children's Play Area, and c) Provide a new cycle/walkway as shown on Plan 1 to connect the cycle/walkway path from the River Lea to Nursery Road, d) Any other facilities that LVRPA deem appropriate for this location. e) Provide Bus Shuttle Service from Broxbourne Station. Area 4 - Nazeing Mead Lake. a) Jointly discuss with LVRPA the opportunities available to increase the usage of the Nazeing Mead Lake area for water-based activities. b) Other facilities that LVRPA deem appropriate for this location. c) The provision of the facilities detailed in Areas 2 and 3 will help facilitate the above objectives. d) Provide Bus Shuttle Service from Broxbourne Station	Comments and details noted. There have been initial officer level discussions with Nazeing Marina Village concerning the draft proposals described. These are matters that are under discussion with the local planning authorities concerned.	No change

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Buisnesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals



LB21.8	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				<p><u>Accessibility Generally.</u> A limited Bus Service C392 is provided in Nazeing Road from Water Lane at Tylers Cross to Sainsbury's Superstore in Hoddesdon. The Bus stops at Broxbourne Station but only operates from Monday to Saturday between the hours of 10am and 1pm. It is intended to provide a concierge Bus Mini-Service to operate between Broxbourne Station and the new development at the Glassworks site. The hours of operation will be between 07.00 and 19.00 and will operate on a 30 minute shuttle timetable during these periods. This Bus Service will be available to the public at large to access the facilities on the adjoining LVRPA land as set out in Areas 2, 3 and 4</p>	<p>Comments and details noted. There have been initial officer level discussions with Nazeing Marina Village concerning the draft proposals described. These are matters that are under discussion with the local planning authorities concerned.</p>	No change
LB21.9	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				<p><u>Redevelopment and Regeneration of the former Broxbourne Lido Area</u> It is hoped that Nazeing Marina Village Ltd, in partnership with the LVRPA can carry out a Joint Venture on this site for it to be developed in conjunction with the Nazeing Glassworks site. The initial proposition being put forward by Nazeing Marina Village Ltd for further discussion is:-  a) LVRPA supply the site. b) Nazeing Marina Village Ltd and the LVRPA would jointly submit a planning application for the site. The proposals being put forward are detailed further below. c) The scheme to be developed would be comprehensive, not only for the site, but the immediate LVRPA area and to both EFDC, and Broxbourne Council, as it straddles the County borders. d) Nazeing Marina Village Ltd would build out the approved development in conjunction with its regeneration of the Glassworks site. e) After all costs and disbursements had been deducted, any residual profit would be split 50/50.</p>	<p>Comments and details noted. There have been initial officer level discussions with Nazeing Marina Village concerning the draft proposals described. These are matters that are under discussion with the local planning authorities concerned. There are however no proposals in the PDF for the ex Leisure Pool site that include industrial Glassworks, Glassworks Museum and Visitor Centre and Real Tennis.</p>	No change
LB21.10	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				<p>f) The Immediate pool site would be sold off to Nazeing Glassworks Ltd for a new state of the art, potentially prize winning designed glass factory, employing the latest solar heating, plus bio mass of waste willow grown in the Park, and using the waste chimney heat, available 24 hours a day to supply hot water to the Glass main building and sports complex, with any excess heat being made available to nearby houses. At present 3 chimneys exhaust 24 hrs a day heat at over 100° C into the atmosphere causing global warming and waste energy into the atmosphere. The new facility would address this current pollution problem. This facility would be open 7 days a week (April to end September) as a tourist attraction, with a minimal visitor fee, refundable against a purchase in the shop.</p>	<p>Comments and details noted. There have been initial officer level discussions with Nazeing Marina Village concerning the draft proposals described. These are matters that are under discussion with the local planning authorities concerned. There are however no proposals in the PDF for the ex Leisure Pool site that include industrial Glassworks, Glassworks Museum and Visitor Centre and Real Tennis</p>	No change

LB21.11	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				<p>The former Lido site is located immediately adjacent to Broxbourne Railway Station and is on the boundary of LVRP Areas 6 &amp; 7, (shown on Plan 1). It is the intention to provide this area as a major Destination Hub for this part of the LVRPA area. The key point here is the proposal for Crossrail II, with Broxbourne St being the main Northern Terminus. In their Framework Document, the LVRPA propose substantial landscape improvements at key entrances to the Park to maintain &amp; enhance access into the Park including Broxbourne Meadows, Broxbourne St &amp; the former Lido site. It is also intended to improve the quality of access routes into the Park from the north along Paynes Lane, Green Lane and Old Nazeing Road. It is also intended to enhance the existing area as a tranquil space for informal recreation, walking and cycling forming part of the wider River Lee Country Park Area. <i>continued below</i></p>	<p>Comments and details noted. There have been initial officer level discussions with Nazeing Marina Village concerning the draft proposals described. These are matters that are under discussion with the local planning authorities concerned.</p>	No change
LB21.12	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				<p>It is also intended to improve and extend the existing network of tracks and paths to create circular routes with links through to adjoining areas of the River Lee CP for walkers &amp; cyclists. In particular, Para "6.A.4 Visitors" in Area 6 covers most of the above &amp; has been adhered to fully as a point of reference. In addition, there is a Site-Specific Policy detailed under Para 5 in the Area 6 River Lee Country Park Draft Amended Proposals. [This section incl as part of comments]</p>	<p>Comments and details noted. There have been initial officer level discussions with Nazeing Marina Village concerning the draft proposals described. These are matters that are under discussion with the local planning authorities concerned.</p>	No change
LB21.13	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7				<p><u>Proposals</u> It is intended to provide and integrate all of the above aims and objectives into the development proposals for the Lido site. There is already a pedestrian link from Broxbourne Station into the Lido site adjacent to the River Lea, but it is not well sign-posted. Only local residents know of this access point so this needs to be addressed as part of these proposals. The bridge over the railway line needs to be "strengthened" to accommodate greater traffic loads, but the Eastern ramp needs to be re-aligned into a "straight" section of Nazeing Road. In addition, the single section road from the bridge down to the Lido site needs to be widened as it is too narrow. This road is the start of Old Nazeing Road. It is being put forward to the LVRPA in this Report that should a joint venture arrangement be entered into between the parties then we could jointly consider contributing to the Highways Authorities a substantial investment towards these road infrastructure improvements. This contribution will be generated from the development and regeneration of the Lido site.</p>	<p>Details of access proposals noted, these will need to be discussed with the relevant planning and highway authorities in relation to the proposed developments.</p>	No change

LB21.14	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7			As detailed earlier, Stephen Pollock-Hill has already had two preliminary discussions with the LVRPA about the provision of a Glassworks, Glassworks Museum and Visitors Centre on the Lido site. An architects brief has been drawn up showing an attractive cone shaped building, with the existing balustraded walkway as a viewing gallery into the production floor of the glass works with about 20 people making glass using the traditional age old methods, & blowing and manipulating the molten "living " glass into magical shapes and products, many of which can be bought on site. Blowing, pressing, casting, spinning, and hand crafted goblets will be on view, the only glass works left in the South East of England, outside the small glass studios. These proposals being put forward for this facility are enclosed in Appendix B. The provision of this facility will be a Landmark in the area and provide a focal point in its own ight.	Comments noted. There have been officer level discussion to discuss the initial outline proposals for the ex Leisure Pool site. This project is at a early stage. It is understood that discussions are taking place with the local planning authorities	No change
LB21.15	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7			There is already an ample car parking facility on the site, a remnant of its former Lido use. These car parking facilities can be refurbished as part of the overall scheme. It is also proposed to provide a new cycle/walkway [shown on Plan 1] to connect the cycle/walkway path from the existing path at Broxbourne Station to the River Lea & then to Nursery Road & the wider cycle/walkway route network. The Nazeing Bridge improvement works proposed will be carried out by Nazeing Marina Village as part of their development as detailed earlier in this Report. The income generation from the Lido site will be by the provision of a limited amount of residential development located on the River (perhaps on "stilts" with moorings underneath to take into account the potential flood risks. This an of course be the subject detailed discussion, but a number of riverside town houses would be appropriate with ground floor areas as covered moorings. Provide some affordable apartments (perhaps for LVRPA employees or Park Rangers?) can be provided together with some camping pods.	As stated above officers are aware of the initial details of the proposals for the ex Leisure Pool site. These will need to take account of Broxbourne Borough's draft Local Plan Submission Version which states - " <u>Policy LV3: Broxbourne Leisure Pool Site</u> <i>The Council and the Park Authority will update the Broxbourne Leisure Pool Development Brief to include the potential for residential development to the western end of the site to enable the wider development and improvement of the site and preservation of the existing parkland and natural areas</i> ". The Authority and the Council are seeking to ensure a joint approach to secure the future of this area through the Local Plan process	No change

LB21.16	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7			<p>All of the above can perhaps be summarised as follows:- 1. Provide the Visitors Centre, Glassworks &amp; Museum and Real Tennis Court &amp; Gallery. The small Museum will explain the 15th century origins of the game &amp; how every ball and racket game; squash, fives, lawn tennis, badminton, &amp; table tennis is descended from this sport of Kings &amp; Queens. Only 43 courts exist world wide and 27 in the UK, all private. This would be a Public court (with some private members linked to nearby Broxbourne Tennis Club), There may be room also for 1 indoor lawn tennis court in the construction. It would be linked to Hampton Court, Lords MCC, and Queens Club where the promoter has played on many occasions. Please refer to the web link <a href="http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-berkshire-36917316">http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-berkshire-36917316</a> 2. Improve the existing car parking areas to the site, 3. Provide a new cycle/walkway from Broxbourne St up to Nazeing ridge (and beyond). 4. Provide residential riverside development. 5. Provide affordable apartments for sale or rent. 6. Provide camping pods and associated facilities. 7. Prepare a scheme of Road Improvements works to the Bridge at Broxbourne Station and to re-align the Nazeing Road Eastern "ramp" from the bridge.</p>	Comments and summary of proposals noted	No change
LB21.17	Nazeing Marina Village Ltd	6 & 7			<p><u>Summary &amp; Conclusion</u>. The purpose of this Report is four-fold. Firstly, it is to detail &amp; explain to the LVRPA the development plans for the re-development of the Nazeing Glassworks site. Secondly, to outline to LVRPA the Nazeing Marina Village proposals to immediately invest in &amp; regenerate the LVRPA land immediately adjacent to the Nazeing Glassworks site. Thirdly, to put forward proposals for a joint-venture proposal of the former Lido site that will provide for a wider regeneration of the LVRPA area into a major Destination Hub for this part of the Park Area. Lastly to explore the creation (at no cost to LVPA or Broxbourne Council, British Waterways, a landmark building on the immediate old Lido site, that is designed to fit into the landscape (rather than be a "shed" ) - see David Mellor Cutlery Factory built on an old gasometer site in Hathersage, Peak District NP. See: <a href="https://www.davidmellordesign.com/visitor-centre">https://www.davidmellordesign.com/visitor-centre</a> The proposals being put forward represent the starting point of the consultation process to allow further discussions that could include the setting up of a "Steering Group". It is hoped to receive a positive response to the proposals in this Report &amp; to set up an early meeting between the parties to explore these fantastic opportunities further.</p>	Comments and summary of proposals noted	No change

Responses to Draft Area Proposals and Final Proposed Amendments Authority April 2019

SR22.0	Bristol Real Tennis Club	6			Real tennis	I write to vote Yes please to the proposed Real Tennis development, having been involved with the wonderful, historic game that is real tennis for some 40 years, I wholeheartedly support the provision of a new facility that will bring the game to a new audience ,a game that will appeal to everyone.	Comments noted but there is no proposal in the PDF Area proposals for Real Tennis.	No change
SR23.0	Broxbourne Rowing Club	6, 7	Sport & Recreation Baseline Maps		Broxbourne Rowing Club	Areas 6 and 7 Base Map Sports and Recreation We noticed that on the Area 6 and 7 Base Map Sports and Recreation shows our Rowing Club as canoeing facilities, could this please be updated to rowing facility. The Lee Valley Boat Centre is also shown as a canoeing facility. There are also several moorings though I think some of these are historic.	Agreed, Baseline maps will be updated to correctly notate Broxbourne Rowing Club and the Lee Valley Boat Centre. Mooring locations will be checked.	Amend Baseline Sport & Recreation maps. Remove reference to canoeing facilities, replace with Rowing Facility. Amend reference to Boat Centre to read boating activities
SR23.1	Broxbourne Rowing Club	6		6.A.4 Visitors	5. Broxbourne Gateway & Visitor Hub	Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub and river usage We are keen that any development of the Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub and use of the River between Carthage and Aqueduct Locks, does not have any negative impact on our ability to row and our rowing club. This is already a very busy part of the River Lea and we are already in discussion with LVRPA regarding the increased mooring in the area.	Comments noted. The Authority is aware of these issues and does not wish to see additional activities create 'congestion' on the waterway. Visitor Proposals seek to support and retain existing activity.	No change
SR23.2	Broxbourne Rowing Club	6		6.A.4 Visitors	1. South River Lee Country Park	We would like any development of the water taxi referenced in 6.A.4 1 or other increased usage of the river in this area to be discussed with Broxbourne Rowing Club so that it does not have a negative impact on our ability to row and our rowing club. We work well with the Lee Valley Boat Centre, recognising that they do have a big impact on our ability to row, the fact that they are only open in the summer and only rent out the smaller boats from 10am means we try to do most of our rowing before they open and after they have closed, any extension of these opening times or other similar usage would have a major impact on our ability to row. It would actually support us greatly if they were able to open in the morning slightly later at the weekend as this would give us more time to row before they are using the river.	Comments noted, proposals reference the need for a feasibility study to ascertain if a water taxi service would be viable. This work would need to consider the requirements of the Broxbourne Rowing Club.	No change
SR23.3	Broxbourne Rowing Club	6		6.A.4 Sport & Recreation	Herts Young Mariners Base	Flat water canoe trails The areas where flat water canoe routes are being considered, may affect rowing on the river. Broxbourne Rowing Club may be affected by (6.A.4) Explore options to extend Lee Valley Flat Water Canoe Trail north to Herts Young Mariners Base from Lee Valley White Water Centre and Lea Rowing Club may be affected by 6.A.1 flat water canoe trail, as part of the route linking through to Old Ford in Tower Hamlets. Can we please request that the relevant rowing club is involved in any development to eliminate or at least minimise any negative impact on rowing in these areas.	Comments noted and agreed. Proposals note the need to explore options in relation to extending the flat water canoe trail, key stakeholders such as the Rowing Club will be need to involved in this work.	No change

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Buisnesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals

SR23.4	Broxbourne Rowing Club	6		6.A.4 Sport & Recreation	We are please to see that in section 6.A.4 Sailing, Boating and Rowing you do reference rowing, 'Work with stakeholders and operators to support and maintain the waterways for rowing and recreational boating. Explore opportunities to improve facilities at the Lee Valley Boat Centre.' Now that Canal & Rivers Trust have recognised Water Sports Zones in their London Mooring Strategy document around both Broxbourne and the Lea Rowing Clubs could these be referenced in your documentation, to show the importance of maintaining the sport of rowing in these two areas.	Comments noted, the relevant maps will be altered to include the Water Sports Zone at Broxbourne.	Amend proposal Maps for Area 6 Sport & recreation to show the C&RT Water Sports Zone Other. Note that the Mooring Strategy states 8.28: Install 'water sport zone' signage between Lock 8 (Aqueduct Lock) and Lock 7 (Carthagena Lock)
SR24.0	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7			<u>Executive Summary.</u> ESSA Water Activities Centre is an 'open to the public' charity giving introduction sessions and courses on all forms of water activities for young persons from the age of 9 years through to adults, at an affordable cost providing all the boats, waterproof clothing, equipment, qualified personnel and safety cover. We have been based at Central Lagoon for 24 years within a secure gated area ensuring the safety of our users. In 2017: - We provided nearly 6000 sessions for over 4000 persons, 92% of whom were young people. - With 33 Youth and 62 adults volunteer crew providing a total of 8306 hours generating a social value of £58k	Comments and detail about ESSA noted	No change
SR24.1	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7		7.A.2 Sport & Recreation	<u>Recommendation.</u> LVRPA reconsider their proposal to relocate ESSA Water Activities Centre from Central Lagoon to Holyfield Lake as we believe the proposal is not realistic or cost justified. Allow ESSA to continue to operate at Central Lagoon as at present with a long lease that would enable ESSA to obtain grant funding to improve the land and buildings at no cost to the LVRPA.	Comments noted. Since the submission of these comments meetings have been held between ESSA and the Authority. It has been agreed that whilst the proposal will remain as a long term option, a longer lease will be granted to ESSA to assist with their plans to obtain grant funding and make further improvements to their site.	Please refer to amendments set out below

SR24.2	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7			<p>High level summary of reasons for our recommendation (all of these are covered in detail in the main section). 1. Cost • LVRPA would incur all costs of pre-assessments, surveys &amp; construction of a new purpose built centre &amp; relocation &amp; utilities upgrades • A 3 year planning &amp; implementation period would be required from time of decision. 2. Safeguarding and Health &amp; Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ESSA works with many young people who have to be secure under safeguarding regulations; shared use of Holyfield Lake makes this extremely difficult to manage.</li> </ul> <p>3. Infrastructure • The proposed site is further away from public transport links • Utilities e.g. electricity, mains water, sewage, communication facilities (telephone and broadband) would all need to be installed or upgraded. 4. Environment • Any major change of this nature will involve considerable environmental impact. E.g new buildings, vast numbers of vehicle movements to move ESSA; all of which would be built on a current 'green-site'. 5. Access and parking facilities • ESSA Water Activities Centre would require sufficient parking facilities to accommodate the needs of volunteer crew and user groups. • Access to the site would need upgrading for the volume of traffic.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is understood that feasibility work to explore the re-location option would require joint working with stakeholders to carry out a range of detailed surveys, viability testing and other assessments. This is a long term proposal and would require planning permission.</p>	<p>Please refer to amendments set out below</p>
SR24.3	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7		7.A.2 Sport & Recreation	<p><u>Conclusion.</u> We had hoped that we had done sufficient to demonstrate that the proposed relocation of ESSA Water Activities Centre would be costly and time consuming for both LVRPA and ESSA and would produce no discernable benefits, therefore not justified. On the contrary, the proposed relocation would be extremely damaging to the valuable work our charity does in introducing young people to an active lifestyle through engaging in water activities, which supports the LVRPA in delivering its strategic objectives. The LVRPA insistence on a full feasibility study/ business case for the proposal to relocate ESSA to Holyfield Lake, in itself, has cost, staff and time implications for LVRPA and consultees. This would also include considerable time and resource being spent by ESSA volunteers and trustees.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Since the submission of these comments meetings have been held between ESSA and the Authority. It has been agreed that whilst the proposal will remain as a long term option, a longer lease will be granted to ESSA to assist with their plans to obtain grant funding and make further improvements to their site.</p>	<p>No change- see amendments below</p>

SR24.4	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7		7.A.2 Sport & Recreation	<p>We believe that the proposal to relocate ESSA is flawed and based on a series of misconceptions about ESSA Water Activities Centre that could be resolved through consultation and discussion with us as stakeholders, which has been notably absent throughout the process of drawing up this framework and these proposals.</p> <p>There is a considerable risk to the Authority that, if ESSA Water Activities Centre is displaced to make way for a Centre for Angling, that the proposed centre would either not be built or, if built, it would quickly fall into disuse, in either case leaving this site vulnerable to unauthorised occupation. Finally, it is unclear what strategic land use objective would be achieved by relocating ESSA Water Activities Centre to Holyfield Lake. Any relocation plan for ESSA from Central Lagoon would need to be assessed against Epping Forest District Council (EFDC) soundness test for planning</p>	<p>Since 2015 when the first Area Proposals consultation took place there have been a number of meetings and correspondence between the Authority and ESSA to discuss the operations of the club and the value of its work as a charity with young people. It has subsequently been clarified that the relocation proposal is a long term option. In respect of this a longer lease is in the process of being agreed with ESSA. Please see revisions to proposal text under 7.A.2 - this new text will replace the current text and previous amendments.</p>	<p>Sport &amp; Recreation 7.A.2 delete text under Water Recreation and Sport from "Undertake feasibility work..." through to "... access issues" and replace with: <b>"The Authority is committed to working with ESSA and other stakeholders which currently have an interest in Nazeing Central lagoon. In the medium term the lake will remain as the base for the ESSA Water Activities Centre and the existing angling activity and use will continue. In the long term the Authority's aim is to develop this lake as a Centre for Angling with sufficient infrastructure including, secure parking, new swims and a replacement lakeside building serving both Anglers and visitors. In advance of the delivery of the long term aim studies should consider the impacts of this proposal on green belt designation, the range and type of angling which can be accommodated, flood risk management and other environmental and access issues. Studies will also need to consider the relocation of the Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6 and this Proposal should be read in conjunction with 6.A.4"</b></p>
SR24.5	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7		7.A.2 Visitors Carthageana and Sport and Recreation - Water Recreation and Sport	<p><u>Introduction.</u> The Charity Trustees of ESSA Water Activities Centre (ESSA) are pleased to note that, in relation to Central Lagoon itself, the previous suggestions of day hubs, school camping and public use of ESSA Water Activities Centre toilets have been deleted from the proposals. Whilst we are pleased to see that 'the findings of the ESSA Water Activities Centre initial feasibility study have been noted' we are extremely concerned that the LVRPA would still like to undertake a feasibility study to consider the 'business case and options' for relocating ESSA to Holyfield Lake.</p> <p>We consider that the following comments should be taken into consideration before seeking the approval of members for the final Park Development Framework for Areas 6 &amp; 7.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>Please refer to amendments above</p>



SR24.6	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7		7.A.2 Sport and Recreation - Water Recreation and Sport	<p><u>Water Activities at Central Lagoon.</u> ESSA Water Activities Centre have been operating from Central Lagoon for 24 years and it has proved to be the ideal location for young persons who have not experienced any form of water activities e.g. sailing, wind surfing, traditional rafting, wobble boarding, katakanuing, dragon boating, kayaking, paddling and canoeing. ESSA is recognised by the Royal Yachting Association (RYA) and the Adventure Activities Licensing Authority (AALA) as a young persons and adult training centre, providing introductory sessions and recognised courses.</p> <p>Unlike the other sailing facilities in the Lea Valley, ESSA is not a 'members only club'. It is a registered charity offering water activities to the public, and providing all the equipment, qualified personnel, craft and safety cover required at an affordable cost without any requirement to pay a membership fee.</p>	Comments and detail about ESSA's operations noted	No change
SR24.7	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7			<p>Central Lagoon is particularly suitable for beginners as at approximately 22 acres, with good unobstructed view points from on land and water, where novices can be easily supervised. It is small enough to give young people confidence yet big enough to provide more challenging conditions for those wishing to move on to more advanced skills. For example, we routinely support Hertfordshire Scouts in their training in preparation for their annual Mersea sailing week and for expeditions to Lochearnhead in Scotland. ESSA owns and maintains buildings and storage units, maintains the leased grounds and foreshore whilst operating at no cost to LVRPA. In fact we contribute to LVRPA income through our payment of a full commercial rent of £6335 per year index linked to RPI.</p>	Comments and detail about Central Lagoon noted	No change
SR24.8	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7			<p>In addition, ESSA contributes to the LVRPA by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introducing the Lea Valley to new users from a wider area than LVRPA 'Catchment area'4 e.g. Cambridgeshire</li> <li>- In 2017, we held nearly 6000 sessions for over 4000 persons, 92% of whom were young people. This is the group that is significantly under represented in the LVRPA user statistics</li> <li>- In 2017 we had a volunteer crew providing:  33 Youth making 285 visits giving 1934 hours  62 Adults making 1079 visits giving 6372 hours  <u>95 Total</u>            <u>1364 visits</u>            <u>8306 hours</u></li> </ul> <p>Using LVRPA Evidence Base5 at National Minimum wages this gives a social value of £11,411 for Youth and £47,025 Adult, a total of £58,436 in social value. This is in addition to the LVRPA's own volunteering hours, and provides extensive volunteering opportunities for young people and adults, making a significant contribution to the promotion of volunteering within the LVRPA area.</p>	Comments and detail of membership noted	No change

SR24.9	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7			<p>One of the objectives of the LVRPA is to improve users' wellbeing. There is now considerable evidence that physical activity is important for young persons under 18 and that all children and young people should minimise the amount of time spent being sedentary.<sup>8</sup> It is now well documented that sailing helps towards a positive attitude, and promotes good mental health<sup>9</sup> as well as giving physical exercise.</p> <p>Sport England's Land Use Policy Statement requires 'best use is made of existing facilities in order to maintain and provide greater opportunities for participation and to ensure facilities are sustainable'. ESSA remaining at Central Lagoon and with a long lease would allow us to improve our facilities through grant funding at no cost to the LVRPA.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Since the submission of these comments meetings have been held between ESSA and the Authority. It has been agreed that whilst the proposal will remain as a long term option, a longer lease will be granted to ESSA to assist with their plans to obtain grant funding and make further improvements to their site.</p>	<p>No change but see amendments made above and below</p>
SR24.10	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7			<p><u>Dual Use of Central Lagoon.</u> The Nazeing Meads fishing permits cover 125 acres of water, of which we only lease 22 acres or 17% of the total water available for fishing. The operating hours of ESSA Water Activities Centre are considerably less than those available to fishermen. Fishing permits at Nazeing Meads covers Brackens Pool, North, Central and South Lagoons with fishing allowed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks of the year. Whereas water activities on Central Lagoon mainly take place from Easter to September/ October on weekday evenings and daytime weekends, leaving the remaining time available for fishermen. We estimate that we are on the water less than 5% of the total hours available for fishing. Furthermore, many water activities, e.g Wobble boarding, rafting etc take place in the 'harbour' area outside our training room where there is little or no fishing.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
SR24.11	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			<p>Our typical session involves a maximum of two hours on the water and we only run two sessions a day leaving 20 hours when there is no activity on the water. It is a condition of the fishing permit that lines are back leaved and, provided that the fishermen observe this requirement, there is no reason for fishing not to take place whilst we are sailing. On those occasions when the lake is unusually busy with water activities, permit holders have the option of using Southern Lagoon or Brackens pool which have no sailing or North Lagoon, which is a bigger body of water and has a different pattern of use to Central Lagoon.</p> <p>During a recent meeting with ESSA Trustees in context of negotiating the new lease, LVRPA confirmed that there have been no complaints from fishermen over the last 3 years. Kings Arms &amp; Cheshunt Angling Society respond that it is possible for anglers and water activities to co-exist as at other Lea Valley lakes and other clubs such as Welwyn Garden City.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

SR24.12	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6				<p><u>Sailing at Holyfield Lake.</u> Fishers Green Sailing Club (FGSC) points out that they provide opportunities for competitive racing at inter-club, national and international levels. ESSA Water Activities Centre provide introductory sessions and Levels 1 &amp; 2 Youth &amp; Adult Sailing qualifications, and are always happy to refer any young person/adult with an interest in racing to FGSC or other local member only clubs.</p> <p>ESSA water activities include dragon boating, wind surfing, traditional rafting, wobble boarding, katanuung, kayaking, paddling and canoeing. We specialise in the provision of water activities for scout and guide groups as well as other youth groups, and these activities are not compatible with racing which is the mainstay of the FGSC programme. It would be dangerous to both parties to run these activities in the same area at the same time as the demand for use of the facilities would coincide, namely evenings and weekends.</p>	Comments and range of activity noted	No change
SR24.13	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6				<p>Holyfield Lake is suitable for FGSC as it is a larger area of water for competent /experienced sailors. However, for young persons who have never taken part in water activities before, the 180 acre<sup>13</sup> open water would be daunting and make safety cover more difficult to provide with potentially increased risk to the participants.</p> <p>FGSC have indicated<sup>14</sup> that their toilets and changing rooms require upgrading and the proposal to move ESSA to Holyfield Lake would put additional pressure on the shoreside facilities and these matters would have to be addressed. LVRPA have acknowledged that shared use of adult changing facilities by ESSA Water Activities Centre users would raise safeguarding issues, and require separate facilities on child protection grounds</p>	Comments noted. These matters would be considered as part of any future feasibility work	No change

SR24.14	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6			<p><u>Relocating ESSA Water Activities Centre to Holyfield Lake.</u> LVRPA comment 16 that options for new shared facilities would have to be addressed. For the avoidance of doubt, ESSA Charity Trustees would like to make it clear, there is no possibility of us 'sharing buildings/facilities' with an adult club due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ESSA has a no alcohol policy, whereas FGSC have a bar for social gatherings.</li> <li>- ESSA Water Activities Centre has a strict no smoking / drug taking policy. ESSA owns and maintains: 50 dinghies, 2 dragon boats, kayaks, equipment for rafting, 8 large storage containers, 1 gear store, Flam stores, ride on mowers, Numerous trailers for boats, 'Workshop' for maintenance and repairs, Several pontoons. These will require separate and secure storage area near to the shoreline. ESSA Water Activities Centre has a strictly enforced Child Protection Policy and procedures, with Enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checking. To maintain this at Holyfield Lake would require ESSA to be housed in a self-contained activity centre within a gated secure area.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted, these matters would be addressed through the detailed feasibility in accordance with the regulations on child safety. Amendments have been made to Proposal text under 6.A.4 Sailing, Boating, Rowing and also under 7.A.2 Water Recreation and Sport. All other text relating to feasibility work has been deleted.</p>	<p>6.A.4 Sailing, Boating and Rowing - add new text as follows: "Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake <del>as a centre of excellence</del> for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities will be supported. The existing refuge area to be protected and maintained. <b>The Authority's long term aim is to develop this lake as a Centre for Sailing Excellence with sufficient infrastructure including, secure parking and a replacement lakeside building. In advance of the delivery of the long term aim studies should consider the impacts of this proposal on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- green belt designation</li> <li>- ecological interests, including the adjacent SSSI/SPA and whether an EIA is needed;</li> <li>- the range and type of sailing and water activities which can be accommodated, and</li> <li>- flood risk.</li> </ul> <p><b>This proposal should be read in conjunction with Proposal 7.A.2"</b> Delete remainder of text from "Feasibility work.....clubs and groups."</p>
SR24.15	ESSA Water Activities Centre				<p>In 2017 ESSA had 4000 visitors and regularly has large groups attending, requiring car parking for up to 30 cars and several mini buses within a secure area to accommodate the needs of users and volunteer crew. 5.4 As part of our courses and work with scout/guide groups, we offer occasional overnight camping, and would require a safe and secure area for camping away from the water but near to our centre and facilities.</p>	<p>Comments noted, feasibility work would need to take account of these requirements.</p>	<p>See amendment above</p>
SR24.16	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6			<p>Holyfield lake is particularly poorly located for public transport, whereas at Central Lagoon we have volunteers and users arriving by public transport. Whilst the distance between Central Lagoon and Holyfield Lake is not great 'as the crow flies', it is a difficult journey of about 20 minutes by road along the Crooked Mile and involves an awkward turn into the FGSC access road that would be difficult for mini buses to navigate and would discourage many of our existing user groups from visiting us. We also have a considerable body of users in and around Bishops Stortford and it is unlikely that they would make the longer journey, particularly for an evening booking. The location of the lake leaves us further away from current public transport locations e.g. Broxbourne station. Many of our users employ public transport to attend sessions.</p>	<p>Comments on access noted. This is an important issue that feasibility work would need to consider.</p>	<p>No change</p>

SR24.17	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6				ESSA would need a designated area of the lake in which to operate to keep it separate from adult racing activities which is the mainstay of the FGSC programme. Sight lines at Holyfield Lake are obscured by islands which make the provision of effective safety cover more difficult and resource intensive to provide. The risk of novice sailors / canoeists getting lost from view behind the many islands would need to be addressed. Larger area of water could lead to extended recovery times for young persons (age 9+) following capsizes giving rise to increased risks to safety of young persons.	Comments and concerns noted	No change
SR24.18	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6				<p><u>Implications of relocating ESSA Water Activities Centre to Holyfield Lake.</u> To relocate ESSA Water Activities Centre to Holyfield Lake would require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitable foreshore with sufficient slipways (currently have 4) and pontoons facilities.</li> <li>• New multi-use Centre, meeting disabled access requirements, with classroom/training room, office, kitchen, rest area, male/female changing rooms, toilets and showers.</li> <li>• The changing areas, showers and toilets will need to be accessible from the outside.</li> <li>• New storage units as some existing storage units at Central Lagoon are unsuitable for transportation</li> <li>• A new purpose built building on 'green site' before ESSA Water Activities Centre relocates, with environmental and ecological issues to be taken into account.</li> </ul> <p>To enable smooth relocation, any new purpose built centre for ESSA at Holyfield Lake would have to be built prior to our relocation. Transporting all the containers and equipment mentioned above. On professional advice provided to ESSA, a timescale of 3 years to plan, relocate, and set up would be required. LVRPA would incur costs of pre-assessments, surveys &amp; construction</p>	Comments noted. These matters would be considered as part of any future feasibility work	No change

SR24.19	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7			<p><u>Other Considerations.</u> Location of the proposed Centre for Angling. Throughout Area 6 &amp; 7 Development Framework there are many mentions of improving and developing Broxbourne Gateway as a main visitor access point and hub. If there is a demand or need for such a centre, it would be better to have a Angling Information Centre based at the Broxbourne Gateway with good vehicle, pedestrian and public transport access, and the many families that visit this area could make use of its facilities. Central Lagoon is highly suitable for ESSA Water Activities Centre, but would be insufficiently accessible as a Centre for Angling as it is not a main access point, has minimal passing visitors and situated down a track only open to ESSA Water Activities Centre users and fishermen with no convenient public transport nearby. As LVRPA is open to the public, any building would now have to meet the current building requirements including disabled access; therefore a Centre for Angling would have to be built after ESSA Water Activities Centre had relocated.</p>	Comments noted. These matters would be considered as part of any future feasibility work	No change
SR24.20	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7			<p>Providing a new Centre for ESSA Water Activities Centre at Holyfield Lake, and a new Centre for Angling at Central Lagoon are expensive options for LVRPA. It is unclear where the funding would come from to meet the substantial capital costs required to construct the new facilities at Central Lagoon and Holyfield Lake, how the proposed Centre for Angling would generate enough income to be self sufficient and how the building would be maintained. LVRPA has produced no evidence of demand from the angling community for a Centre for Angling based at Central Lagoon and the consultation on the previous version of the draft framework drew a number of negative comments about Central Lagoon as a suitable location for such a centre if indeed there is a need for one.</p>	Comments noted. These are matters that would be considered as part of any future feasibility work	No change
SR24.21	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6, 7			<p>It has been noted by respondents that the presence of a large number of Cormorant, Geese and Signal Crayfish that has reduced the number of small fish in Central Lagoon. There is no evidence that sailing has any detrimental effect on fish stocks. LVRPA notes that Central Lagoon has 'very large specimen fish suitable for competent/advanced anglers' and respondents have said that, with the limited frontage devoid of fish that Central Lagoon is the wrong place to start a beginner or cultivate an interest in fishing.</p>	Comments noted	No change
SR26.0	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6			<p>We note that the Draft Landscape prepared by LUC March 2018 is the subject of a 2nd round of consultation. The Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Company is not aware of any submission by either the 'Foundation' or ourselves, the 'Company', to the 1st consultation of 2015.</p>	The Area Proposals are subject to this, second round of consultation, and volunteers involved with the WARGM did respond to the first consultation. The landscape strategy has only had one round of consultation, i.e. this one to which the WARGM has responded.	No change

SR26.1	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.2 Visitors		6.A.2 Visitors: We have separately asked for a wording amendment to recognise that the Royal Gunpowder Mills already has a café/restaurant.	Comment noted see response below under SR26.12	Remove reference to café/restaurant see below under SR26.12
SR26.2	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.2 Sport & Recreation		6.A.2 Sport and recreation: We welcome new opportunities for informal recreation and natural play, but the aim of opening up the site to the public for such purpose should not commandeer the relatively small area of decontaminated land as this 'free to roam' area is to be shared with members of the public and schools who are seeking history, education and other experiences of the Royal Gunpowder Mills. We believe that we strike a healthy balance between energetic and tranquil usage of the site by careful management. As new areas are made safe for the public new opportunities will be welcomed.	Comments noted, this issue is recognised. The draft Proposal states "create new opportunities for informal recreation and natural play opening up a <u>wider area within the site to the public</u> "	No change
SR26.3	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.2 Community		6.A.2 Community: We engage with the local community for education and volunteering. Volunteering for heritage conservation will become more important as heritage funding pots shrink. We welcome the aim of the LVRPA to support events and history-related activities on the site, which can be extended as noted above when more 'free-to-roam' areas are created.	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
SR26.4	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.2 Landscape & Heritage		6.A.2 Landscape and Heritage: The SSSI is valuable because, unlike the adjacent LVRPA land which is recent (1970s) gravel works, the landscape is very old and in many areas essentially untouched. We believe that that we are already working in harmony with your aims for landscape and heritage. Additionally, we are working closely with Historic England and Natural England towards achieving a Scheduled Monument Plan. This will identify conservation priorities and cost repairs enabling forward planning over the long term for built heritage conservation, integrated with management of the woodland. The draft of this plan will be submitted to you for consultation.	Comments noted and work on a Scheduled Monument Plan welcomed	No change
SR26.5	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.2 Environment		Environment: We believe covered by comments above	Comment noted	No change
SR26.6	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.3 Visitors		6.A.3 Visitors: We actively engage with local tourist cross-border initiatives and tourism strategy	Comments noted and supported	No change
SR26.7	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.3 Sport & Recreation		6.A.3 Sports and Recreation: As covered above.	Noted	No change
SR26.8	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.3 Biodiversity		6.A.4 Biodiversity: As covered above.	Noted	No change

SR26.9	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.4 Landscape & Heritage		6.A.4 Landscape and Heritage: We are aligned with this aim of celebrating and promoting heritage and explore opportunities as resources allow. We have piloted and are now establishing programmes of talks and tours. We invite other organisations to have their events hosted in our historic buildings. We work with the EFD Museum and partners. Our resources are few, and we would welcome working with your teams to achieve this LVRPA aim.	Comments noted and welcomed.	No change
SR26.10	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6			Context	Amendments as follows: The Abbey Gardens and Cornmill Meadows/ Tree Park are also a key hub for education activities. The heritage theme continues at the nearby Royal Gunpowder Mills <del>Secret Island</del> which includes an exhibition about the history of explosives manufacture and a range of themed attractions and seasonal events to celebrate the unique history of the site and its growing wildlife value	Amendment noted, this will be actioned	Amend Context section - remove the term <b>Secret Island</b> from the 4th paragraph under 'Opportunities for Visitors'.
SR26.11	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.2 Visitors		Amendments as follows: "The preferred option is for a new pedestrian/cycle bridge over the Horsemill Stream from the west, towards the southern end of the site so that visitors crossing into Royal Gunpowder Mills will arrive close to the entrance of the <del>'Secret Island'</del> visitor attraction and disturbance of the Waltham Abbey SSSI is minimised."	Amendment noted, this will be actioned	Amend second paragraph under 6.A.2 Visitors to remove reference to Secret Island as follows: ".....so that visitors crossing into Royal Gunpowder Mills will arrive close to the entrance of the <del>'Secret Island'</del> visitor attraction and disturbance of the Waltham Abbey SSSI is minimised." Check accompanying proposal maps to ensure correct wording is used.
SR26.12	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.2 Visitors		Amendments - suggest removal of the example as there is already a cafe/restaurant on site. There is wide scope for further visitor facilities. "Support the provision of new visitor facilities on site <del>such as a cafe/restaurant</del> and work with the Royal Gunpowder Mills <del>Trust</del> and other stakeholders to establish the best location and type of facility given the important heritage and ecological value of the site..."	Amendment noted, this will be actioned	Amend last paragraph under 6.A.2 Visitors as follows: "Support the provision of new visitor facilities on site <del>such as a cafe/restaurant</del> and work with the Royal Gunpowder Mills <del>Trust</del> and other stakeholders to establish the best location and type of facility given the important heritage and ecological value of the site..."
SR26.13	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.2 Biodiversity		Amendments as follows: ".....through complementary habitat management e.g. re-wetting of ditches within <del>the Royal</del> Gunpowder Mills and re-wetting of land at the northern end of Cornmill Meadows."	Amendment noted, this will be actioned	Amend proposal text under 6.A.2 Biodiversity as follows: "Work with Environment Agency and <del>the</del> Royal Gunpowder Mills to improve the habitats and ecological connectivity ..... through complementary habitat management e.g. re-wetting of ditches within <del>the Royal</del> Gunpowder Mills and re-wetting of land at the northern end of Cornmill Meadows."
SR26.14	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.2 Community		Amendments as follows "Work with Royal Gunpowder Mills to promote and support events <del>such as</del> re-enactments, <del>science demonstrations</del> and historical activities on site as part of the visitor attraction and heritage interest of the site..."	Amendments noted, these will be actioned	Amend proposal text in second paragraph under 6.A.2 Community as follows: "Work with Royal Gunpowder Mills to promote and support events, re-enactments, <del>science demonstrations</del> and historical activities on site as part of the visitor attraction and <del>heritage interest of the site."</del>
SR26.15	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.4 Biodiversity		Amendments as follows: "....through complementary habitat management e.g. re-wetting of ditches within <del>Royal</del> Gunpowder Mills and re-wetting of land at the northern end of Cornmill Meadows."	Amendment noted, this will be actioned	Amend proposal text under 6.A.4 Biodiversity - Waltham Abbey SSSI as follows: "....through complementary habitat management e.g. re-wetting of ditches within <del>Royal</del> Gunpowder Mills and re-wetting of land at the northern end of Cornmill Meadows."

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Buisnesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals



Responses to Draft Area Proposals and Final Proposed Amendments Authority April 2019

SR26.16	Royal Gunpowder Mills Waltham Abbey Ltd	6		6.A.4 Landscape & heritage		Amendments as follows: "Work with stakeholders to conserve, promote and celebrate heritage features, artefacts and buildings within the River Lee Country Park"	Minor edit noted, this will be amended	Amend spelling under 6.A.4 Landscape & Heritage as follows: "Work with stakeholders to conserve, promote and celebrate heritage features, artefacts and buildings within the River Lee Country Park"
SR27.0	Hertford County Yacht Club	8				I am writing to comment on the consultation proposals on behalf of Hertford County Yacht Club, based on Abbots Lake, Stanstead Abbots. In summary, HCYC has no specific concerns with the proposed strategic plan and welcomes the fact that LVRP continues to support our activities.	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
SR27.1	Hertford County Yacht Club	8				We do have a concern regarding the level of tree cover around Abbots Lake which obviously increases year on year and is making the lake a difficult venue for sailing and in particular training of new members. We would welcome any proposal that introduced clearings or reduced the height of foliage around the lake and prevented or managed future tree growth. I will write to our LVRP contacts with more detailed comments on tree cover.	Comments noted - this is a management issue which will be passed on to appropriate colleagues.	No change
SR27.2	Hertford County Yacht Club	8				Our other concerns at present are security and the condition of the access track, neither of which are affected by the proposals included in the draft plan.	Comments noted. This is also a management issue which will be passed on to appropriate colleagues	No change
SR29.0	Royal Yachting Association	6, 7	Sport & Recreation	7.A.2	ESSA	As you will no doubt be aware ESSA Water Activity Centre is a tenant of LVRPA and has been for some 24 years at the Central Lagoon Nazeing site. As ESSA is a RYA Training Centre it has contacted The Royal Yachting Association (RYA1) for assistance in connection with its Lease renewal negotiations with the LVRPA, particularly in relation to the proposed length of the Lease, the rent and termination clauses. More recently ESSA has contacted the RYA again in connection with your proposal contained within the LVRPA Park Development Framework to relocate it to the Holyfield Lake site.	Comments noted. Following a recent meeting between representatives from ESSA and the Authority matters are in hand to agree a longer term lease for ESSA to enable them to obtain funding and carry out further improvements on site.	No change
SR29.1	Royal Yachting Association	6, 7	Sport & Recreation	7.A.2	ESSA	As well as a RYA Training Centre, ESSA is also a registered charity and AALA registered. It has been based at the Central Lagoon site for the last 24 years providing boats, equipment and instructors for 'grassroots' sailing instruction and water activities for young people aged from age 9 to 18, families and adults on an affordable 'pay and play' basis.	Comments and detail regarding ESSA's status as a RYA Training Centre noted	No change

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Buisnesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals

SR29.2	Royal Yatching Association	6, 7	Sport & Recreation	7.A.2	ESSA	ESSA deliver a variety of water based activities including sailing for a wide range of participants, their programme provides the opportunity for youngsters to try sailing for the first time, many of whom have the opportunity to develop their skills with progression being encouraged. This all takes place in a friendly and supportive environment that positively encourages the participants to challenge themselves in an unfamiliar yet safe setting. The skills learned don't only impact their technical knowledge, most of the activities are group focussed enabling the development of social interaction and team work which in turn has a positive impact on the youngsters personal life skills. Most of the participants will gain RYA qualifications often leading to regular sailing participation, those that continue through the awards enabling those individuals to take leadership roles resulting in a sustainable model for future provision.'	Comments and detail regarding ESSA's status as a RYA Training Centre noted	No change
SR29.3	Royal Yatching Association	6, 7	Sport & Recreation	7.A.2	ESSA	ESSA Water Activities Centre is not a private members club and is managed and run by Charity Trustees who are all volunteers. It is therefore consistent with LVRPA strategic aims to encourage visitors into the park and offer facilities on a 'pay and play' basis. ESSA is currently under a 3 year Lease with a mutual 6 month termination clause and no security of tenure. LVRPA have published proposals showing that it intends to relocate ESSA to Holyfield Lake at Fishers Green, subject to the outcome of a feasibility study by LVRPA.	Further discussions have been held between representatives of the Authority and ESSA and a longer lease is to be agreed which will enable ESSA to obtain funding and carry out further improvements on site. Further amendments to the proposal text will be made to clarify that the proposal is long term. Please refer to the amendment under 7.A.2 here and the changes proposed for 6.A.4 under SR24.14 above.	Sport & Recreation 7.A.2 delete text under Water Recreation and Sport from "Undertake feasibility work..." through to "... access issues" and replace with: <b>"The Authority is committed to working with ESSA and other stakeholders which currently have an interest in Nazeing Central lagoon. In the medium term the lake will remain as the base for the ESSA Water Activities Centre and the existing angling activity and use will continue. In the long term the Authority's aim is to develop this lake as a Centre for Angling with sufficient infrastructure including, secure parking, new swims and a replacement lakeside building serving both Anglers and visitors. In advance of the delivery of the long term aim studies should consider the impacts of this proposal on green belt designation, the range and type of angling which can be accommodated, flood risk management and other environmental and access issues. Studies will also need to consider the relocation of the Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6 and this Proposal should be read in conjunction with 6.A.4"</b>

SR29.4	Royal Yatching Association	6, 7	Sport & Recreation	7.A.2	ESSA	Access to funding is so often vital in ensuring such organisations can develop and grow. The Centre is in need of substantial funding to repair foreshore, such repair will no doubt benefit the LVRPA as Landlord of the site. However, grant makers, understandably, need to ensure their investment is secure and, in order to achieve this, there needs to be a relatively long lease without a break clause. We would therefore support ESSA's wish to be allowed to remain at Central Lagoon, Nazeing with a longer term lease (i.e. at least 15 years) without a mutual break clause thereby enabling ESSA to access funding in order to improve its facilities and benefit the local community. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions. I would be happy to meet with you to brief you in more detail if that would be of assistance	Further discussions have been held between representatives of the Authority and ESSA and a longer lease is to be agreed which will enable ESSA to obtain funding and carry out further improvements on site. Further amendments to the proposal text will be made to clarify that the proposal is long term.	Please refer to amendments above under SR29.3
SR30.0	Sport England	6, 7 & 8				Sport England support the additional wording and amendments to the Area 6, 7 & 8 Draft Amended Proposals as we feel that the addition of wording in each of the initial sections is positive and in line with our strategy as they help to in force the variety of facilities within the park and the wider benefits they provide.	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
SR30.1	Sport England					It is important that these strategies make use of the evidence base compiled by the surrounding Local Authorities in terms of their PPS and BFS work, supported by the evidence compiled for the Lee Valley Park Strategic Policies to inform the facilities these areas are planning to protect, enhance, provide or dispose of.	Comments noted	No change
SR30.2	Sport England					The wording removed from some of the policies removes the emphasis of providing specific facilities and provides a more adaptable and flexible approach to providing facilities and developing the park. We support this approach as it allows the plan to adapt to the changes in need of the park users and relevant stakeholders. The policy appears to have moved emphasis from providing facilities to exploring the feasibility of new facilities, this is a positive change and is supported by Sport England as it will ensure that new facilities to be provided and suitable in terms of viability and fit for purpose	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
SR30.3	Sport England	6		6.A.4 Sport and Recreation		Policy 6.A.4 Sport & Recreation - Sport England are supportive of the additional wording which has been added to this policy. It is important to take into account the needs of the various stake holders on the site and the additional wording prevents the needs of one stake holder being given more weight than the other. It is our opinion that this is a positive change which will seek to protect both sports taking place on this area.	Comments noted and welcomed	No change

Responses to Draft Area Proposals and Final Proposed Amendments Authority April 2019

SR30.4	Sport England	6		6.A.4 Sport and Recreation	Sailing, Boating and Rowing	Sailing, Boating and Rowing - Sport England are supportive of the changes to this policy. It is seen that the revised wording is positive to improving the centre. The change to a feasibility focus will help to ensure the relocations would be viable, and the new wording adds focus to the outcome of stakeholder engagement. This will ensure the facility users are happy with the proposals and prevents the loss of a needed facility.	Comments noted and welcomed. Further minor amendments are proposed to make clear this is a long term proposal requiring detailed feasibility and options work.	Please refer to amendments under SR24.14 above
SR30.5	Sport England	7		7.A.1 Sport and Recreation		Policy 7.A.1 Sport and Recreation - The wording removed from this policy removes the obligation to protect and enhance facilities on the lakes in the south east of Spitalbrook. The policy changes document notes that these amendments have been made following submitted by SR32 Sec. Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society. Sport England accept these changes if the comments received on the original consultation confirmed that the facilities are surplus to the requirements of the relevant stakeholders. However, if these facilities are currently in use and closing them will displace users. It is our view that they should also be protected by the policy.	Comments noted	No change
SR32.0	Tennis and Rackets Association					I have read Stephen Pollock-Hill's proposal with much interest. The Tennis & Rackets Association supports projects which would have the potential to broaden the appeal of this unique sport and SPH is seeking to do so much more by creating an open club system. This is doubly exciting as current players tend to be part of the existing club structure, which makes it more difficult to break through. Demographically and geographically, Lee Valley makes sense. The nearest club would be Hatfield and I would see that as a mutually beneficial to both the existing and potential club. The Association has also been looking at alternative construction techniques which would have the benefit of reducing capital costs. This is all available from the T&RA. Finally, the concept of a national training centre is a long term aspiration. We trialed an apprentice scheme this year but lack the venues to make this a long term viable option. However, a centre changes everything. It also increase the need for Professionals and coaches, so self-fulfilling the requirement. I am happy to talk further but wanted to register the support of the T&RA.	Comments and detail provided noted. There is however no proposal for Real Tennis in the PDF Area proposals.	No change
GI33.0	Individual	8				1) The footpath at the East Ware Weir needs work. It's used a lot but becomes a boggy quagmire in wet weather.	Comments noted, this is a management issue.	No change

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Buisnesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals

GI33.1	Individual	8				2) There was a requirement in the planning permission for the Plaxton Way, Ware development that a foot bridge be provided between Plaxton Way and the Tumbling Bay area. This would have crossed the old River Lea and provided access to the NE shore of the reservoirs. This has never been provided. It would be appreciated.	Comment noted. This is a matter for the local planning authority	No change
GI33.2	Individual	8				3) There's a long standing request to improve the footbridge from Crane Mead, Ware to Tumbling Bay. One request was that it should provide vehicle access. I think that would be too much. But it would greatly improve access if it included ramps suitable for bicycles and disabled persons in the same style as the bridge to the GSK Car park at the western edge of Ware. This improvement appears in various EHDC District Plans but has never been implemented.	Comments noted, although not a site under Authority ownership this is a matter that could be pursued under the Sport & Recreation proposals 8.A.2 "maintain and improve pedestrian and cycle routes for informal recreation..." although it would need to be led by C&RT/EHDC	No change
GI33.3	Individual	8				4) Hardmead Lock should never have closed off the ability of the public to cross the river when the lock keeper's cottage was sold off. There ought to be a way of providing a public path and bridges while still giving the residents of the cottage security and privacy.	It is understood this was a C&RT decision made for operational reasons	No change
GI33.4	Individual	8				5)The National Cycle Path along the banks of the Lea, Lea Navigation and Stort might best be described as "good in parts". Sadly there are way too many places where the path is narrow, over grown, potholed, muddy.	Comments noted. The route along the Stort is in good condition, recently upgraded as part of the Roydon Loop project. In respect of the Lea Navigation representations have been made to the C&RT in the past on this matter.	No change
GI33.5	Individual	8				6) There are too many places where barriers have been put in place to slow cyclists that are really too aggressive. They've not only made it very difficult for cycles to negotiate but also difficult for wheelchairs and such like. And pretty much impossible for devices like tricycles. A typical example of this is Stanstead Lock. I understand the need to slow cyclists in places but not at the expense of making the path impassable for some users.	Comments noted. A balance is needed that enables a single access route for pedestrians alongside use by cyclists, barriers enable this to happen	No change
GI34.0	Brox-Lea Residents Group		Area 6 Thematic Sports & Recreation			Can you please accept this letter as our consultation response with respect to the above. We object in the strongest terms to the proposals as written in the Draft Document and we will set out below why we have this objection. We will then set out how these deficiencies can be addressed with a series of recommendations to be included in the final document. In particular, we refer to the Canal Towpath on the River Lea from the White Bridge to the Wharf Road in Broxbourne, this being the towpath that is owned wholly by the LVRPA. In particular, I enclose a copy of the plan from your consultation for Area 6 that illustrates the Sport & Recreation proposals. [Plan shows towpath adjoining Broxbourne Meadows & Silvermeade].	Objection noted. A new scheme is under consideration to address these concerns. Officers have put forward a proposal to the C&RT for long term moorings which would stretch for 400metres along the west side of the Navigation at Broxbourne. This is designed to regulate the problems the Brox-Lea Residents Group have raised but will require further internal discussion and then consultation with Brox-Lea Residents Group and the Broxbourne Rowing Club.	No change

GI34.1	Brox-Lea Residents Group	6, 7			<p>But while the nature of our submission relates to this specific area, it also relates to the wider LVRPA area with respect to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The River Lee generally,</li> <li>- LVRPA Policy with respect to canal towpaths in their ownership</li> <li>- Policing of narrowboats licenced by the Canal &amp; River Trust on LVRPA owned towpaths</li> <li>- LVRPA Policy with respect to temporary moorings on LVRPA owned towpaths</li> <li>- LVRPA Policy with respect to permanent moorings on LVRPA owned towpaths</li> <li>- Broxbourne Council's Planning Policy on Residential Moorings.</li> </ul> <p>I would like to set out our position as follows, but rather than repeat matters I think it would be helpful if you referred to a recent letter that I sent to LVRAP dated 18th May. A copy of this letter is enclosed.</p>	Comments noted please refer to the response above	No change
GI34.2	Brox-Lea Residents Group	6			<p>When you read the attached letter of 18th May, it sets out that there is clearly a "policy vacuum" with the Park Development Framework, and these matters should be addressed. In particular, the area located immediately next to Broxbourne Station is perhaps one of the most widely used park area of the River Lea due to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Its proximity to Broxbourne Station and this access gateway point into the Park</li> <li>o Broxbourne Rowing Club</li> <li>o The Lee Valley Pleasure Boat Centre</li> <li>o Lee Valley Cycle Hire</li> <li>o Model Railway Centre</li> <li>o Cafeteria</li> </ul> <p>In addition to all the above, and of most concern to the people I represent, this is perhaps one of the only sections of the River Lea that passes through a major residential area. Bearing in mind the very congested nature in this specific location, we are asking that the LVRP restrict the mooring of Narrowboats along this section of the river. This makes perfect sense. Let me explain.</p>	Please see above	No Change

GI34.3	Brox-Lea Residents Group	6				<p>Firstly, as the LVRPA own the towpath (not the Canal &amp; River Trust) you are in the unique position to be in control of the leisure and visitor facilities in this very congested area. The mooring of narrowboats (in this location) is not compatible with the other leisure uses for this short section of the river. Secondly, The owners of the houses that back on to the River Lea have mooring rights for boats. If narrowboats are moored up opposite, then the Rowing Club find it almost impossible to use this part of the river at the weekends in the summer due to the Pleasure Boats on hire from the adjoining shop. Thirdly, there is the issue of nuisance that (some) narrowboat owners inflict upon the residential properties here and the visitors to the area that use the towpath. These matters are more fully explained in the enclosed letter 18th May. Lastly, there is the Health &amp; Safety aspect that it would appear that the LPRPA seem to wish to ignore. Again, these matters are more fully explained in the enclosed letter. I am sure that the Broxbourne Rowing Club and the Leisure Craft Hire Shop have made their own representation to you in this respect with respect to the above.</p>	<p>Detail about the towpath and moorings noted. The Authority's Ranger service is now checking the area regularly to prevent use of the adjoining towpath for repair and maintenance works. Please also see comments above</p>	No change
GI34.4	Brox-Lea Residents Group	6				<p>Lastly, but most disturbingly, one of your senior officer's has suggested to colleagues of mine that the LVRP are considering permanent residential moorings along this part of the River Lea. Should this be the case you can be reassured that this residents group will do all within its power to prevent this. My understanding is that it is LVRPA standing policy to object to any new residential development in the Park area. I find it difficult to understand how the LVRPA could support residential moorings when this is clearly against their own standing advice. In addition, Broxbourne Council (from whom planning consent must be sought to have residential moorings allowed) have their own Local Plan Policy that is actively against residential moorings on the River Lea.</p>	<p>Detail about the towpath and moorings noted. The Authority's Ranger service is now checking the area regularly to prevent use of the adjoining towpath for repair and maintenance works. Please also see comments above</p>	No change
GI34.5	Brox-Lea Residents Group	6				<p>The cynic might suggest that this would merely be a revenue generating exercise by the LPRPA, but if this went forward it would clearly be against the aims and objectives of the LVRPA for visitor activity and enjoyment in the area generally by visitors, sports activists and residents. Whilst revenue generation from permanent moorings might accrue to the LVRPA, this would be to the detriment of the existing permanent residents in this small enclave located by Broxbourne Station centred around the Broxbourne Rowing Club.</p>	<p>Please refer to the above comments</p>	No change

GI34.6	Brox-Lea Residents Group	6		6.A.4 Visitors.	5. Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North	<p><u>Conclusion and Recommendations</u></p> <p>The existing Draft of the Park Framework is deficient in that it does not detail any policies with respect to:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LVRPA Policy with respect to canal towpaths in their ownership,</li> <li>2. Policing of narrowboats licenced by the Canal &amp; River Trust on LVRPA owned towpaths,</li> <li>3. LVRPA Policy with respect to temporary moorings on LVRPA owned towpaths,</li> <li>4. LVRPA Policy with respect to permanent moorings on LVRPA owned towpaths.</li> </ol> <p>So there must be a general policy with respect to item 1 - 4 above that can set out in full how the LVRPA will deal with these very live issues that need to be addressed both now and in the future.</p>	Please refer to the comments above	No change
GI34.7	Brox-Lea Residents Group	6		6.A.4 Visitors.	5. Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North	<p>In addition, Policy 5 with respect to the "Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North" (page 17) should reflect the policies above, and this organisation would suggest that the following clauses be inserted into the updated Framework document shown in red. Sections to be deleted shown in blue.</p>	Comment noted	No change
GI34.8	Brox-Lea Residents Group	6		6.A.4 Visitors.	5. Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North	<p><u>5. Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North</u></p> <p>Establish a major visitor hub at Broxbourne as a primary gateway into the River Lee Country Park ..... This will be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Supporting and retaining the existing provision for cycle hire, boat hire, river cruising, <b>rowing training (from Broxbourne Rowing Club)</b> and catering (<del>and recreational moorings</del>) as a core element of the Broxbourne Gateway;</li> <li>o <b>To facilitate the above to provide restricted mooring to the short section of the River Lee from the bridge by the Pleasure Cruising Hire shop for 500m to the edge of the Keyzers Estate Residential Area (as indicated in Fig1).</b></li> <li>o developing synergies with similar facilities elsewhere within the River Lee Country Park and wider Park, e.g. drop off points at the Lee Valley Park Farms and Lee Valley White Water Centre for cycle hire;</li> <li>o Exploring options with stakeholders and existing operators to reposition, enhance and enlarge these visitor facilities, to create a more extensive visitor offer potentially in one key waterside location;</li> <li>o Exploring options for replacing existing holiday chalets at Broxbourne Meadows with new 'pod' style visitor accommodation; <i>Continued below</i></li> </ul>	Please refer to the comments made above	No change



GI34.9	Brox-Lea Residents Group	6		6.A.4 Visitors.	5. Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North	o joint working with Broxbourne Council to update the Leisure Pool Development Brief to include the potential for residential development to enable the wider development and improvement of the site. o There will be no provision of permanent Residential Moorings on the River Lea on land in the ownership of the LVRPA. Any planning application on any land in the ownership of any third party submitted to either Broxbourne Council or Epping Forest District Council will be resisted. o Any unlawful mooring of narrowboats on the towpath in the ownership of the LVRPA will be the responsibility of the narrowboat licensor (The Canal & River Trust) to enforce. Suitable steel signs will be erected in these locations with the contact number of the C & R T Enforcement Team clearly shown. Local Residents Groups and other stakeholders will be invited to monitor compliance with the no mooring regulations.	Please refer to the comments made above	No change
GI35.0	Individual	6				I would only say in relation to Area 6, my comments on Waltham Abbey Gardens are merely "noted" by the Authority. I find it mystifying that the Park Authority apparently has no ambitions to improve the landscape and interpretation of the Abbey Gardens (a project which would surely attract sympathetic interest from the Heritage Lottery Fund).	Note main comments relate to Landscape	No change
GI38.0	Ware Town Council	8	Visitors Thematic	8.A.2	Access	The footpath at the East Ware Weir needs work. It is used a lot but becomes a muddy bottle neck around the back of the old keeper's cottage.	Comments noted, this is a management issue	no change
GI38.1	Ware Town Council	8		8.A.2	Access	There was a requirement in the planning permission for the Plaxton Way, Ware development that a foot bridge be provided between Plaxton Way and the Tumbling Bay area. This would have crossed the old River Lea and provided access to the North East shore of the reservoirs. This has never been provided. It would be much appreciated as it would open up the North side of the Ware quarry pits.	Comments noted. This is a matter for the planning authority to follow up.	
GI38.2	Ware Town Council	8		8.A.2	Access	There's a long standing request to improve the footbridge from Crane Mead, Ware to Tumbling Bay. It would greatly improve access if it included ramps suitable for bicycles and disabled persons in the same style as the bridge to the GSK Car park at the western edge of Ware. This improvement appears in various EHDC District Plans and HCC transport plans but has never been implemented.	Comments noted, although not a site under Authority ownership this is a matter that could be pursued under the Sport & Recreation proposals 8.A.2 "maintain and improve pedestrian and cycle routes for informal recreation..." although it would need to be led by C&RT/EHDC	No change
GI38.3	Ware Town Council	8		8.A.2	Access	Hardmead Lock should never have been closed off to the public completely when the lock keeper's cottage was sold off. It prevents the ability to cross the river there. There ought to be a way of providing a public path and bridges while still giving the residents of the cottage security and privacy.	It is understood this was a C&RT decision made for operational reasons	No change

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Buisnesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals

GI38.4	Ware Town Council	8, 7			National Cycle Path	The National Cycle Path along the banks of the Lea, Lee Navigation and Stort might best be described as "good in parts". Sadly there are way too many places where the path is narrow, over grown, potholed and muddy. The area around Meadgate Road, Nazeing is particularly bad.	Comments noted. The route along the Stort is in good condition, recently upgraded as part of the Roydon Loop project. In respect of the Lee Navigation representations have ben made to the C&RT in the past on this matter.	No change
GI38.5	Ware Town Council	8			Cyclists	There are too many places where barriers have been put in place to slow cyclists that are really too aggressive. They have not only made it very difficult for cycles to negotiate but also difficult for wheelchairs and mobility scooters and almost impossible for devices like tricycles. A typical example of this is Stanstead Lock. The need to slow cyclists in places should not be at the expense of making the path impassable for other users.	Comments noted. A balance is needed that enables a single access route for pedestrians alongside use by cyclists, barriers enable this to happen	No change

Key  
 LA - Local Authority  
 OA - Organisations and agencies  
 LB - Landowners Buisnesses  
 SR - Sport recreation Interests  
 GI - Groups Individuals