

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

ID. No.	Organisation name or individual	Area 6, 7, 8.	Map Ref	Schedule ref	Site name or issue	Consultee Comments	LVRPA Response	Proposed Amendment
LA1.6	Broxbourne Borough Council	7		7.A.1	Admirals Walk Lake	The Park's proposals for this area include the improvement of links to the LVRP and New River, the provision of recreational and fishing facilities and, as currently shown on one of your thematic maps, the provision of a car park. The Council supports the overall improvement of this area and enhanced access for the public and would like to work with the Park to develop projects to secure improvements for pedestrians and cyclists. However, given the difficulties of access, to and across the New River, and the fact that this field is in private ownership, we are doubtful that this is the best site for visitor parking. Please can we liaise further to ensure appropriate wording for this locale.	Support for proposals welcomed. The 'potential' car park notation shown on north western side of Admiral's Walk Lake will be removed as it is unlikely this can be accommodated within the Park.	Amend Area Thematic Proposal Map for Visitors - remove Potential Car Park notation from western boundary
LA1.7	Broxbourne Borough Council	7		7.A.1	Dobbs Weir Caravan Park	The Framework proposes further expansion of the Dobb's Weir Caravan Park at Essex Road in Hoddesdon. However, the Council considers that the Caravan Park is already developed to its natural boundaries and is unsure that sufficient space exists within the current boundary to significantly increase plot numbers. If this proposal is to be retained, please could you provide a plan that shows how an expansion could be accommodated.	Comments noted. Dobbs Weir caravan park is currently being enhanced to improve the visitor accommodation offer.	No change
LA1.8	Broxbourne Borough Council	7		7.A.1	Land- scape & Heritage	Maintaining and Strengthening Buffers at Hoddesdon Business Park - The Council's Hoddesdon Business Park Strategy sets out a number of proposals and projects for the employment area, which seek to maintain its existing provision and attract new businesses. As well as improving its employment offer, the Strategy also highlights a number of transport and environmental schemes including the landscaping of boundaries with the Lee Valley Regional Park i.e. land at the northern end of Ratty's Lane where improvements are proposed to the ad hoc car parking area that serves the Lee Valley Park, land east of Ratty's Lane where work has begun on the provision of a sustainable energy facility, the boundary of the transport depot at Charlton Mead Lane and the Dobbs Weir boundary to the south of the Business Park. The Council therefore supports your proposals to improve these boundaries but considers that these could be strengthened to create a small visitor car park at Ratty's Lane which is already a popular point for people to access the Park. We would like to bring to your attention the Council's intention to amend the boundary of Hoddesdon Business Park through the Local Plan to include, among other amendments, the Sustainable Energy Facility site at Ratty's Lane. The site is not within the LVRP but does adjoin it.	Comments noted including notification of boundary amendments to the Hoddesdon Business Park. The Authority has commented on the draft Local Plan. There are no proposals to establish a car park at the end of Ratty's Lane. This land is not in the Authority's ownership or control. It is understood that there are a number of issues relating to illegal parking, camping and anti-social behaviour in this location, which would need to be resolved before public entry to the Park is encouraged or promoted.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA1.9	Broxbourne Borough Council	7		7.A.1 also 7.A.2 check	Spitalbrook Carth- agena Lock	Spitalbrook and Carthagena Lock, north of Nazeing New Road - The Council fully supports the Framework's proposals for making improvements to habitats close to the lakes, improving visitor access and providing educational facilities in the Spitalbrook/Carthagena Lock area north of Nazeing New Road. Whilst the Council recognises the significant contamination issues which currently restrict the options for opening up this area for recreational use it is an area with significant potential. The Council would therefore recommend that the Framework advocates more detailed proposals being drawn up for this area, a project on which we would like to work jointly with you	Comments welcomed. The Proposals for Spitalbrook are based on the conclusions of the Spitalbrook Environmental Strategy and masterplan, Nov 2012. More recently the Authority has commented on Broxbourne's draft Local Plan and suggested the following rewording of Policy LV4 Spitalbrook - "The Council will work with the Authority and other stakeholders to restore, manage and protect habitats at Spitalbrook as a site of special biodiversity interest with visitor access. This could be delivered through enabling development on the site linked with the opportunities which Cross Rail 2 could realise". The Authority will engage with the Council and other stakeholders as it brings forward more detailed plans for the site.	Add the following text under 7.A.1 Biodiversity Access to Nature as follows: Work with Broxbourne Council and other stakeholders to restore, manage and protect habitats at Spitalbrook as a site of special biodiversity interest with visitor access. This could be delivered through enabling development on the site linked with the opportunities which Cross Rail 2 could realise. Any enabling development to integrate with and secure investment in the parklands and respect the sites unique biodiversity.
LA1.11	Broxbourne Borough Council	6 to 8			Visitors	The Council is supportive of a number of other projects and schemes outlined within the thematic proposals; - Improving signage to the Park from existing train stations; - Improving connections between the Park's leisure facilities and the borough's residential areas.	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
LA1.14	Broxbourne Borough Council				Cycling	Cycling - The improvement of cycling opportunities within the Park is mentioned several times in your plans. The Council welcomes this and is keen to work with you to link our ambitions with yours.	Support noted and welcomed.	No change
LA1.15	Broxbourne Borough Council				Local Plan	The Council will be publishing the Local Plan within the next few months. In accordance with statute, it will include the Lee Valley Park Plan within its overall provisions through an appropriate policy. For the most part, the Local Plan will also directly reflect the proposals of the Park Framework within its allocations. There are, however, two exceptions where we have not secured common ground – Britannia Nurseries and Turnford Surfacing. It may be possible to reach a common position on the latter but as things stand, there is likely to be an allocation for Britannia Nurseries that sits directly counter to the Park's own proposals for the site	The position on Britannia Nurseries has been concluded; the site has permission for housing with a play area and visitor parking. Proposals for Britannia Nurseries will be amended, please refer to comments under Area 6, LA1.2. Comment regarding Turnford Surfacing site are made under Area 8.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA1.16	Broxbourne Borough Council				Four Tracking	The other point of potential difficulty is the four tracking of the West Anglia main line along which a safeguarding direction may be issued within the course of both plans. We will both have to address and respond to the implications of such a direction in due course. However, as things stand, the Broxbourne Local Plan is likely to support the extension of Crossrail to Broxbourne with direct implications for the level crossings along the route.	Comments noted: The Authority recognises the importance of maintaining a network of crossings which can satisfy its operational requirements and the need to ensure safe and convenient access for visitors. As stated above since these proposals were issued Network Rail has continued to reduce surface level crossings on an incremental basis without responding to officers' concerns for the need for an access strategy designed to address operational and visitor needs. The Authority's existing draft proposals state that mitigation will be sought for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2	Amend proposal 7.A.1 Environment as follows: Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 Support ongoing investment in the Abellio Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and work with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 team, the local and county authorities to develop a strategy for retaining crossing points and access into the Park for all visitors and to enable operational management, without large areas of parkland being lost to new bridge landings, new roads or related infrastructure. and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park. Retaining and enhancing these access points into the Park forms part of the Green Arc Strategic Green Infrastructure project 'Lateral Links' to improve connectivity linking the Park with the wider landscape and adjoining urban areas.
LA1.17	Broxbourne Borough Council				Joint working	The Council welcomes the publication of the Park Authority's proposals for the Park area within the Borough and looks forward to working with the Authority to bring forward many of the proposals and schemes set out in the thematic proposals for areas 6, 7 and 8. I would welcome further meetings to secure pragmatic and deliverable solutions and to align our respective plans.	Comments noted - it is intended to continue with regular meetings (Duty to Co-operate) between officers from both authorities.	No change
LA3.0	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7			Planning process	The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at its meeting on 10th February 2015, considered a report on the Lee Valley Regional park Authority's Park Development Framework consultation. Members discussed the statutory duties and role of the Park Authority, the potential impact of some of the proposals on the Green Belt, particularly in Area 6, and the possible implications for some glasshouse businesses and other long-standing commercial uses. The chairman of the Lea Valley Food Task Force described the on-going work of the group which included involvement by the Regional Park Authority officers. Members were also made aware that the Park Authority intended to run a second round of consultation in summer this year.	Comments noted	No change
LA3.1	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7			General support	The Committee agreed the following as the formal response of the Council to the consultation: That the Council supports the overall approach of the proposals in the context of the statutory functions of the Park Authority, ie in relation to (i) sport and recreation, (ii) leisure, (iii) education and (iv) landscape, heritage and nature conservation;	Support noted and welcomed	No change
LA3.3	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7		Environment	CPO powers	That the Council objects to proposals, as currently worded, concerning the use of compulsory purchase powers in relation to a number of glasshouse sites and other long-standing commercial uses within the Park;	Objection noted.	Please refer to amendment below
LA3.4	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7			Glass-houses	That the Council encourages the Park Authority to work more closely with the Lea Valley Growers Association and individual growers to advance schemes for land swaps to benefit both the Park and the glasshouse industry;	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly.	Please refer to amendments below

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA3.5	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7		Glass-houses	That the Council encourages the Park Authority to reconsider its attitude towards the glasshouse industry in the light of the National Planning Policy Framework, the on-going 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.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly. Under Environment 7.A.2 and 7.A.3 existing references to any named areas or sites have been deleted. Amended proposal is shown opposite, minor changes are made regarding views to ensure it fits the relevant section of the Park..	<u>Glasshouses</u> . The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the Park within 7.A.2 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: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the Naxeing Mead & Carthagea areas; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and 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 & Carthagea area; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. 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, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. 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.
LA4.0	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Funding	<u>ECC Interest in the Lee Valley Park Authority - Park Framework.</u> ECC has an interest in shaping future growth and development throughout Essex, and this includes spatial development proposals at the county border and those outside that may impact our community. The County Council responds to and shapes future spatial policy for the Lee Valley and commenting on this Consultation. ECC offers substantial annual funding to the Lee Valley Park Authority, and therefore aims to ensure that the spatial, environmental, social and economic priorities are consistent.	Comments noted.	No change
LA4.1	Essex County Council	6 & 7		General	<u>Strategic Context</u> A range of strategies produced solely or in collaboration with the Essex borough, city and district councils as well as the Greater Essex unitary authorities of Thurrock and Southend-on-Sea provide the strategic context for the response to this Consultation. The relevant strategies are set out below	Comments noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA4.2	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Vision for Essex	<p><u>Vision for Essex 2013-2017</u> The Vision for Essex sets out the principles that will support the community of Essex. A key principle is to 'work in partnership' to deliver the best outcomes for service users. We assist in developing emerging spatial and planning policies to ensure that positive impacts for Essex are delivered and mitigation measures minimise potential negative impacts. The Vision for Essex sets out the core purpose and key challenges for Essex. The key challenges from the vision that are relevant to ECC's response to the Lee Valley Park Authority – Park Framework consultation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase educational achievement and enhance skills - develop and maintain the infrastructure that enables our residents to travel and our businesses to grow; - support employment and entrepreneurship across our economy; - improve public health and wellbeing across Essex; - safeguard vulnerable people of all ages; and - Respect Essex's environment. 	Comments noted. Many of these matters are addressed under specific proposals for Community. The Authority would welcome involvement in any updates to the current Vision as we have now reached 2017.	No change
LA4.3	Essex County Council	6 & 7		General	<p><u>Council's Outcomes Framework</u> In February 2014 the Council adopted the Outcomes Framework for Essex - a statement of seven outcomes that set out ECC's ambition based on its Vision for Essex 2013-17. The Outcomes that are specifically relevant to this consultation include –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Children in Essex get the best start in life; - People in Essex enjoy good health and wellbeing; - People have aspirations and achieve their ambitions through education, training and lifelong-learning; - Sustainable economic growth for Essex communities and businesses; and - People in Essex experience a high quality and sustainable environment. <p>The outcomes reflect ECC aspirations for Essex residents and communities, guiding action in the short, medium and long term hence the importance of ensuring the outcomes inform emerging <u>spatial policy</u>.</p>	Comments noted. Many of these matters are addressed under specific proposals for Community.	No change
LA4.4	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Essex Economic plan	<p><u>Essex Economic Strategy</u> The Economic Growth Strategy (EGS) for Essex sets out EEC's economic vision and how this may be delivered. All of the proposals in the EGS are designed to achieve five objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Essex businesses are enabled and supported to be more productive, innovate and grow, creating jobs for the local economy; - Essex businesses are enabled to compete and trade internationally; - Individuals are equipped and able to access better paid jobs through an education and skills offer that meets the needs of businesses; - The life chances of people in our most deprived areas are improved be ensuring that residents are able to access jobs and public services; and - Securing the highways, infrastructure and environment to enable businesses to grow. 	Comments noted. Many of these matters are addressed under specific proposals for Community.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA4.5	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Essex Economic plan	<u>Essex Economic Plan</u> The Economic Plan for Essex is based on the collective ambitions of all local authorities in Essex. It identifies the steps that local partners will take together, alongside the private sector and HM Government to accelerate local growth over the next seven years (2014-2021). Furthermore it lays the foundation for long-term sustainable growth in the years to follow. Following analysis of the challenges and opportunities facing the Essex economy, and discussions with partners and local businesses, key issues that need to be addressed to facilitate sustainable economic growth were agreed and identified. The key issues that have some relevance to this consultation include - - Issue 1: Enhancing the Essex workforce – To ensure Essex can compete, the workforce should be developed to ensure there are the right skills to support existing and future employers as well as the needs of businesses in Essex's key growth sectors. - Issue 2: unlocking growth in Essex's strategic growth corridors - Investment to enable growth and development in established corridors offers a greater return on investment. - Issue 3: Enhancing the productivity within the Essex economy - Essex has the assets to exploit a competitive advantage in key sectors and to bring about a step change in local innovation and Research and Development investment. - Issue 4: The reputation of Essex - If Essex is to attract businesses into the county, and attract investment from the UK and overseas, it needs to develop and maintain the right reputation.	Comments Noted	No change
LA4.6	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Essex Transport Strategy	<u>Essex Transport Strategy – the Local Transport Plan for Essex, June 2011</u> ECC produces a Transport Strategy for the County. The strategy highlights the role high quality transportation plays in delivering strong and sustainable communities coupled with providing a prosperous economy. The Strategy sets out the transport vision for Essex, the transport outcomes to achieve over a 15 year period, policies and implementation. The Strategy includes specific priorities for West Essex.	Comments noted. Integration of the County Councils proposals for cycling are addressed in the Authority's adopted Cycling Strategy.	No change
LA4.7	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Joint Working	<u>ECC's Detailed Response</u> ECC's response sets out issues and questions that ECC has with the Park Framework from a thematic basis. Further joint working is welcomed to ensure consistency with local and national planning and spatial policy.	Comments noted and further joint working supported	No change
LA4.8	Essex County Council	6 & 7		General support	<u>Overarching Principles and Objectives for the Lee Valley Park Authority.</u> ECC acknowledges and supports the broad and dynamic remit of the Park Authority to develop and preserve leisure, recreation, sport and nature throughout the Regional Park. ECC welcomes working in partnership with the Park Authority in seeking to deliver its broad remit, and ensure that the Park Authority delivers a sustainable legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. ECC supports the Park Authority in seeking to deliver proposals that deliver Park's ambitions through maintaining and delivering - sport and recreation, leisure, education and valuing existing and future landscape, heritage and nature conservation. ECC is therefore supportive of the strategic approach that the Park Authority is seeking to deliver. Comments from ECC also highlight where it is important that the ambitions of the Park Authority are consistent with the strategic objectives of the wider locality.	?Support noted and future partnership welcomed. The Park has an important 'offer' in terms of preventative health and mental health and fostering general well-being.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA4.9	Essex County Council	6 & 7			CPO powers	<p><u>Compliance with Local & national Policy & Guidance</u> ECC's Economic Plan for Essex highlights the importance of west Essex, and recognises the role performed by the Lee Valley and in particular its contribution to supporting innovation in food production and technology. It is considered important that emerging policy secures the future for the food industry increasing the market share of specialist food supply to the capital. ECC considers it is essential that emerging spatial policy and development proposals within west Essex and adjoining authorities are consistent. The Park Authority consultation refers to a long term strategy of removing non-conforming and non-park compatible uses. It highlights that the Park Authority will use Compulsory Land Purchase Powers to support this aim. ECC is particularly concerned about the following proposals, where the Park Authority may use Compulsory Purchase Powers on land currently used for food production. ECC regards this approach as inconsistent with the broader strategic spatial and economic objectives within west Essex. The specific proposals that ECC are particularly concerned about within the Park Framework's consultation for Areas 6 - 8 include –</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan</p>	<p>Please see amendments below.</p>
LA4.10	Essex County Council	6 & 7	6.A.4 Environment & 7.A.2 Landscape & Heritage	Glass-houses	<p>Area 6 – River Lee Country Park - The Park Development Proposals refers to "Langley and Mile Nurseries stating that in the "short to medium term until the land can be brought into recreational and leisure use, through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary. It is likely that major redevelopment or expansion for new large scale glasshouse use will be resisted" (Area 6 Park Development Framework Proposals, 2014, page 26). Area 7 – Nazeing Meads and Carthagea – The Park Development Proposals states that "the open character of the valley floor to be protected from development ... at Sedge Green Nurseries. Over the long term, non-park compatible intrusive uses to be removed or their adverse impact mitigated including through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary" (Area 7 Park Development Framework Proposals, 2014, page 14). ECC considers that the proposals set out within the consultation document have undermined consumer confidence, highlighted by customers contacting local businesses to question whether the nurseries will be operational in the medium to longer term. ECC accepts that businesses are concerned about the impact the consultation document may have upon their future growth potential, especially given the concerns that customers have raised with the growers.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out opposite for 7.A.2 and 4 Environment, including minor changes to ensure it relates to the sub section. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.</p>	<p><u>Glasshouses</u>. The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the Park within 7.A.2 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: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the Nazeing Mead & Carthagea areas; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and 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 & Carthagea area; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. 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, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. 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.</p>	

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA4.11	Essex County Council	6 & 7			CPO powers	ECC questions the use of compulsory purchase powers on these sites, and considers that the park proposals should ensure they are consistent with wider strategic economic and spatial aims and objectives. Furthermore it is important that the Park Authority proposals are viable. ECC questions whether the Park Authority has fully understood the financial implications involved in the acquisition of the glasshouses, and therefore queries the viability of the Park Framework. It is acknowledged that the Park Framework is non statutory and therefore requires adoption by individual Local Planning Authorities. Proposals set out by the Lee Valley Park Authority should therefore be consistent with national and local planning policy and guidance. ECC welcomes greater joint working to ensure that the Lee Valley Park Authority produces a plan that is consistent with the local, County and national planning policy and guidance.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. References to CPO powers have been deleted and a new proposal added for glasshouse areas within 7.A.2 and 7.A.3.	Please see amendments proposed above
LA4.12	Essex County Council	6 & 7			Access	<u>Surface Access</u> ECC as highway authority welcomes discussions with the Lee Valley Park Authority to discuss any potential impacts that changes or alteration to land use may have on the highway network. ECC aims to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place, and future spatial plans contain policies to ensure any issues impacting on the highway network are minimised.	Comments Noted	No change
LA4.13	Essex County Council	6 & 7			Heritage	ECC welcomes that Landscape and Heritage have been identified as being of significance within the Lee Valley Regional Park. It is noted that reference to landscape and heritage has largely concentrated on the designated assets, primarily the Scheduled Areas of the Waltham Abbey Gunpower Factory and Waltham Abbey itself. The consultation documentation does not identify the extensive undesignated assets relating to below-ground archaeology, unlisted structures or the Paleolithic and paleo-environmental deposits known to exist within the Lee Valley.	Comments noted. The Authority has little information or expertise regarding undesignated heritage assets but would welcome guidance from Essex County Council on this matter as proposals are delivered.	No change
LA4.14	Essex County Council	6 & 7			Heritage	Considering the wide range of assets spread over a large area it would be worth considering the development of a historic environment conservation management plan for the Lee Valley Regional Park. This would identify all of the heritage assets; both designated and undesignated, and would provide recommendations for both their management and promotion. Once completed there would be a strong understanding of the heritage within the Park and how it can be used and managed for the benefit of the local population and visitors to the area.	Comments noted. Agreed that the development of a historic environmental conservation management plan would be beneficial to the understanding of the Park's heritage and how best to interpret and manage it for visitors. However this would need to be a project that is supported by a range of stakeholders	No change.
LA4.15	Essex County Council	6 & 7			Heritage	It should be noted that groundworks relating to habitat management (such as scrapes or regarding of water features) or other activities such as the improvement of visitor facilities may have an impact on the historic environment. As part of any development proposal discussion will be required with appropriate historic environment specialists to establish whether mitigation measures are required.	Comments noted. Areas with statutory designations will have a consent mechanism that will be adhered to. Larger scale works on areas with no known historic designations may require planning permission and there would be scope for comment and mitigation as required.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA4.16	Essex County Council	6 & 7			SUDs	Flood Water Management ECC recommends that consideration be given to ensuring delivery of sustainable drainage systems as part of any new development. It is recommended that the Park Authority ensures that development integrates water management, biodiversity and amenity.	Agreed. The open spaces and green infrastructure of the Regional Park has an important role in flood management. The Authority does seek to ensure new development incorporates sustainable drainage systems and that water management benefits biodiversity and amenity.	Amend Proposals under 7.A.1, 7.A.2 and 7.A.3 Environment as follows: Ensure proposals support the implementation of the Thames River Basin Management Plan. Work with the Environment Agency to ensure any new development incorporates measures such as sustainable drainage systems that mitigate and reduce flood risk whilst also delivering wider sustainability benefits to biodiversity, water quality and recreational amenity.
LA5.0	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			General Support	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above. This letter relates to the services of the Environment Department only and you may receive separate correspondence relating to other of the County Council's services. The County Council is supportive of the proposals and has the following comments to help strengthen the baseline evidence, and the character and quality of proposals in relation to 'landscape' and the 'historic environment'.	Noted and support welcomed	No change
LA5.1	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Landscape	The County Council will refer to the 'Landscape Character Assessment, Evaluation and Guidelines for Southern Hertfordshire October 2001' when advising on landscape planning, management and conservation matters within the area. The following comments are given with reference to this document. The draft 'proposal schedules' for landscape are generally consistent with the strategies for managing change and guidelines identified in the Southern Hertfordshire Landscape Character Assessment. The proposals can vary in the level of detail, with some quite broad brush, and others referring to specific materials and plant species. The Landscape Objective (5.1) states that comprehensive design guidelines will be produced to ensure new elements create a unified Park character. This approach is supported. The guidelines should address elements promoted through the proposals, such as signs and interpretation, acoustic fencing, access tracks and cycle paths, plant species and building materials, and serve to ensure a high level of craftsmanship and quality.	Comments relating to Landscape Guidelines noted. Landscape Proposals have been informed by the draft Landscape Sensitivity Study.	No change
LA5.2	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Landscape Baseline documents	The Park Development Framework acknowledges the 'Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) and Landscape Strategy Vision for the Regional Park,' produced in 1996, and states that it remains the basis for landscape conservation and enhancement within the Park - however it is not listed in the baseline documents. The Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 (LUC) was based on, and should be used alongside, the 1996 LCA. However there is concern that the 1996 document significantly pre-dates the best practice guidance for landscape character assessment published in 2002 (The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage), plus a high level of landscape change has occurred over the past 20 years. The Landscape Objective (5.1) published July 2010, refers to undertaking a Landscape Assessment. It is recommended that the local level landscape character assessments for Southern Hertfordshire and Broxbourne, that were produced in 2001 and 2008 respectively and are based on current best practice, could help inform the baseline of any new landscape strategies and design guidelines.	The Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 augments and adds value to the 1996 Landscape Assessment. In drawing together the Sensitivity Study the three landscape character areas - conservation, enhancement and investment were considered to still have currency and they are notated on the baseline Thematic Landscape and Heritage maps. The Authority is not in a position to review the Landscape Assessment in the near future but local landscape character assessments relating to the riparian boroughs/districts and counties would inform this process.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA5.3	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Baseline documents	The integration of the Hertfordshire and Green Arc Infrastructure Strategic Highlights Plan is fully supported.	Support noted and welcomed	No change
LA5.4	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Land-scape & Heritage	Historic Environment - The County Council supports the guiding principles for the future development and management of the Regional Park, in particular, the principle of sustainability. It also supports the inclusion of Landscape and Heritage as one of six themes examined in relation to each site examined within the proposals. The County Council provides the following comments with the intention of strengthening the draft proposals with regard to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.	Comments noted	No change
LA5.5	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Heritage	The draft proposals include 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. The intention to conserve and enhance these assets, and to highlight the industrial heritage of the Navigation (including waterway heritage features) and the wider Lea Valley, is to be commended.	Support noted and welcomed	No change
LA5.6	Hertfordshire County Council	7		Heritage	Conversely, however, no awareness is shown of the number and range of undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are present within the Regional Park and already recorded on the Hertfordshire Historic Environment Record [HER]. Dobbs Weir and Rikof's Pit in particular are the sites of some of the most important early Mesolithic archaeological remains in Southern England and the surviving prehistoric alluvial deposits within the Park generally have a high potential for archaeological and palaeo-environmental remains.	Comments noted. The Authority has little information or expertise regarding undesignated heritage assets but would welcome guidance from Hertfordshire County Council on this matter in terms of developing proposals for the future.	No change
LA5.7	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Heritage	In addition to these known heritage assets, new sites are identified on a regular basis throughout the county, and the HER is constantly updated to reflect this. 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., and 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.	Comments noted	No change
LA5.8	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		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.	Thematic Proposals for Heritage state that the Authority will "Protect and celebrate the heritage of the Park" (Objective 5.2 Heritage) and they provide the strategic overview for the whole Park. The area based proposals seek to identify and provide more detail on those heritage based proposals of most relevance at this point in time, within a 5 to 10 year timeframe. Any development within the Park will need to meet policy requirements as set out in the NPPF and as interpreted by the riparian planning authorities in their Local Plans.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA5.9	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Heritage	It is clear from previous, supportive, comments made several years ago by the County Council's Historic Environment Unit on the Lee Valley Regional Park Development Framework Consultation (Objective 5.2 Heritage) that it was intended to produce an Historic Environment Characterisation Study for the whole Park area, but this does not appear among the baseline documents accompanying this consultation. The County Council would still support the production of such a study and would be happy to provide advice and relevant information from the Hertfordshire HER, on request.	Support noted	No change
LA5.10	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Transport	The County Council is supportive of the proposals within the consultation to improve links from public transport nodes into the Park via walking and cycling. The promotion of sustainable modes of transport should be considered and enhanced in preference to increasing car parking at gateway and access points to the Park.	Agreed and support welcomed. Area 7 proposals seek to encourage access to the Park by public transport, cycle and by foot, but recognise that some facilities and attractions are poorly served by public transport and safe cycle routes.	No change
LA5.11	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Visitor Hubs & Transport	The proposals seek to establish a number of visitor hubs which will provide gateways into key areas of interest within the Park, as follows: • Cheshunt Station and Pindar Visitor Gateway • Fishers Green Visitor Hub • Lee Valley Park Farms Visitor Hub • Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North • Ware Station • Rye House Station • St Margaret's Station • Broxbourne Station • Roydon Station • Lee Valley White Water Centre. The focus of the document on promoting sustainable transport by designating stations throughout the Lee Valley Park hinterland as key access points into the Park is welcomed. In certain locations such as Broxbourne and at the Lee Valley White Water Centre (WWC) more significant improvements and new facilities are planned in order to act as key gateways into the Park.	Comments noted	No change
LA5.12	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Visitor Hubs & Transport	As noted within the document, the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority should seek to work with relevant stakeholders, including the County Council as highway authority and the district and borough councils, in order to develop gateways and visitor hubs. In particular, further technical work to seek to establish routes for pedestrians and cyclists from public transport nodes into the Park is welcomed. This may include enhanced signage, new crossing points and dedicated pedestrian and cyclist routes. Once the proposals become more detailed, reference should usefully be made to Urban Transport Plans (UTPs) that have been prepared by the County Council with partners, which in many instances set out proposals and aspirations to enhance such provision. The relevant documents are: • Cheshunt and Waltham Cross UTP • Hoddesdon and Broxbourne UTP • Hertford and Ware UTP	Noted, partnership working with all stakeholders will be essential in respect of improving sustainable transport/access opportunities. Issues relating to cycle routes are addressed in the Authority's adopted Cycling Strategy.	No change
LA5.13	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Visitor Hubs & Transport	In some cases, such as to establish visitor hubs or increase parking provision at selected locations, further technical work may be necessary, including the production of Transport Assessments or Design and Access Statements. In these cases, the Park should engage with the County Council in order to determine the scope of any necessary technical work.	Noted and agreed	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA5.14	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Rights of Way	The proposals may affect the public Rights of Way Network (ROWN). At this point in time, it is difficult to comment accurately on how the proposals may affect and connect with the Network, though initial analysis suggests further investigation is required. It is proposed that the LVRPA establishes a working group with the County Council's ROW team in order to examine these issues and connectivity within and outside the Park's network, with discussion to include: • some of the footpaths indicated on the maps do not match with definitive routes and it is not clear whether the intention is to dedicate those non-definitive routes to the public.	Comments noted. The Authority liaises with the County on issues relating to ROWN and would welcome support for improving access into the Park. Routes provided by the Authority are designated as permissive routes.	No change
LA5.15	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Cycling	• there are a lot of cycle tracks shown over definitive public footpaths - it would be beneficial to the public to have them upgraded legally to cater for the cycling formally.	The Authority will obtain all necessary permissions for any new cycle routes and ensure they meet required standards.	Amend Visitor Proposals Map to show proposed routes and routes as they relate to written text.
LA5.16	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Bridleways	• there are no bridleways shown in the Plan, which is a significant omission. Suitable routes should be identified as a means of encouraging this healthy recreation in the countryside, and contribution to the local economy. Strategic north-south and east-west connecting bridleway routes would be a start, from which a more integrated network could then be developed (NB bridleways cater for multi-user, i.e. pedestrian, cycle & equestrian).	Sport & Recreation Proposal 7.A.3 includes a proposal to explore options for bridleways within the Glen Faba and Roydon area (Essex CC), linked to bridleways beyond the Park boundary. There are no proposals for bridleways in Area 6. The Area 8 Visitor proposals map includes Bridleway H25 and seeks to develop a network of routes linking together existing bridle paths. The Authority would welcome further information from the Council on this matter.	No change
LA5.18	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Rights of Way	Reference should also be made to the County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) which is subject to ongoing updates.	Comments noted.	No change
LA5.19	Hertfordshire County Council	7	Visitor Proposal Map	7.A.1	Minerals & Waste	The County Council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has observations regarding Area 7 Proposals – Broxbourne to Rye House. In particular these relate to Sub-Area 7.A.1 – Spitalbrook, Admiral Walk Lake, Dobbs Weir. The draft proposals for Area 7 clearly set the context of the area, stating that there are 'large areas of reclaimed former gravel pits' where large sites 'are being brought into leisure use now that gravel operations have ceased'. The County Council acknowledges that new recreational routes are being sought to improve opportunities for informal recreation and access to nature in areas previously out of bounds to the public. It is noted that there is the intention to establish a visitor access link for pedestrians and cyclists through Spitalbrook between Nazeing New Road and Dobbs Weir via the Old Haul Road in Spitalbrook as shown on the Area 7 Thematic Proposals map.	Comments noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA5.20	Hertfordshire County Council	7		7.A.1	Minerals & Waste	Sand and gravel has been extracted from within the sub-area over an extended period of time. The first planning permission for which the County Council has records is dated 1950, though records also point to extraction taking place prior to comprehensive town and country planning being introduced to this country in 1948. The site has limited sand and gravel reserves remaining which are unlikely to be worked as machinery has now been cleared from the site. Whilst it is accepted that the future use of this area is being considered to create improvements for public access, the Lee Valley Regional Park should be aware that the site is recorded as a 'Dormant site' as part of the Review of Mineral Planning Permissions (RoMPP) carried out by the County Council. This means that if any works were to take place using the existing planning permissions registered as part of the RoMPP then full modern conditions may be imposed by the County Council. The RoMPP process only refers to mineral planning permissions, though these often can include waste infill as part of restoration works. There are other planning permissions at the site which did not form part of this process. Correspondence has taken place with the County Council in recent years regarding this site, in particular with matters relating to the Olympics within the Lee Valley. If any proposed works were to take place under cover of the RoMPP to improve the site for recreation and access purposes then advice should be sought from the County Council	Comments noted. The necessary advice will be sought from the County Council as part of the planning process.	No change
LA6.0	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8			General	Public Health responsibilities transferred from the NHS to HCC in April 2013. Our ambition for Hertfordshire is to see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizens who enjoy life and are healthy • Safe and active communities that get on well • A strong economy where businesses thrive • A high quality environment • People who are able to achieve their potential. Hertfordshire's Public Health priorities are documented in the county Public Health Strategy which can be accessed here: http://www.hertsdirect.org/docs/pdf/p/phstrat.pdf . Achieving this strategy will bring significant benefits to our population in terms of increased quality of life and better health. The Strategy fully supports and endorses the widely recognised need for a place-based, whole-system approach to improving health and reducing health inequalities – approaches which align well with spatial planning and the principles of sustainable development.	Comments noted. Proposals designed to address these issues are included under Community.	No change
LA6.1	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8			Community Health	The following response sets out the general public health criteria recommended for consideration as part of the Park Development Proposals. Health and wellbeing criteria will more often than not reinforce many of the principles of sustainability, healthy communities, open space and green infrastructure that are already outlined in the proposals being consulted upon. Specific commentary in relation to the themes and proposals is made at the end of this response.	Comments noted. Agreed, proposals supporting active use of open spaces whether through sport, learning, enjoyment of nature or general use is known to benefit health and well being, alleviate stress and psychological disorders and improve the daily quality of life. Proposals designed to address these issues are included under Community.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA6.2	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Community Health	Spatial planning has a clear and strong influence on healthy choices made by individuals, and evidence suggests that there are a number of issues that impact on physical and mental health. Building health into our urban and our rural environments is a vital step towards delivering longer term improvements in health across the whole of society. This can be as important as investment in medical interventions. Healthcare is a vital service but it often treats the symptoms rather than the causes of health inequalities and poor health. By building health into planning we seek to address some of the causes of poor health. The Public Health Service supports the guiding principles for the future development and management of the Regional Park, in particular, the principles of Regional Value and Sustainability. However, we would point out that there is no explicit reference to health in the guiding principles, nor within the six themes examined in relation to each site within the proposals.	The Thematic Proposals 2011 covered health and well being under the Community Theme with a section set out under "Objective 4.1 Health - Facilitate people pursuing healthy lifestyles". However the role of the Authority's Youth and Schools team covers Sport and Orienteering, outdoor learning and programmes which instill a sense of ownership amongst young people for the outdoors - important for the future of open spaces, the countryside and wildlife etc. Again this is about the role of the Park in social and mental health and general well-being, the therapeutic benefits it can achieve. Proposals designed to address these issues are included under Community..	No change
LA6.3	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Community Health	The Lee Valley Park is a significant part of the green infrastructure in the southeast part of Hertfordshire. Its 'offer' is predicated – in part - by outdoor recreation and sport. It is therefore a notable omission that there is no explicit reference to the benefits and opportunities of the park for both physical and mental health. The Public Health Service is keen to engage with the Park Authority (and make connections with relevant District/Borough public health representatives if required) in particular to ensure links into Public Health sponsored initiatives and campaigns around healthy lifestyles e.g. the Hertfordshire Year of Cycling and Hertfordshire Year of Walking.	The Authority would welcome future partnership working with the Public Health Service. Explicit reference to the benefits and opportunities to health and well being is made under the Thematic Proposals Community Theme. Further references will be added to the introductory sections of Areas 6 and 7 where the Park is able to cater for a combination of outdoor activities and for example large scale orienteering competitions. Profound Special Needs can also be catered for - e.g. sensory safari. The Authority was engaged with the Year of Cycling and has a Cycling Development Officer in post.	Amend introductory text to Area 7 and add the following sentence at the end of the 3rd paragraph under Opportunities for Visitors: Opening up these new areas to the public will further enhance the role of the Park in meeting public health needs both physical and mental health.
LA6.4	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Community Health	There are some fundamental key messages to support this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactivity in Hertfordshire costs the health economy £16m+/year (Sport England, 2014) • One in four adults do less than 30 minutes physical activity in a week (DPH Annual Report, 2014) • The minimum recommendation for adults to keep healthy and prevent illness such as heart disease, cancer and diabetes is 150 minutes of activity a week (see Physical Activity Guidelines https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-physical-activity-guidelines). <p>The Lee Valley Park includes within its geographical coverage parts of Hertfordshire where health inequalities are recognised as an issue; where obesity and inactivity are well noted challenges. The park offers a fantastic natural resource at the doorstep of these communities and we'd want to ensure that this potential is utilised and linked in with local work on further health promotion.</p>	Agreed re the Park and its offer - many opportunities exist to get fit, relax, enjoy nature and join in activities in parklands and Proposals seek to enhance these opportunities and access to them	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA6.5	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Community Health	Health Improvement should be one of the key objectives in these proposals, with explicit reference to tackling health inequalities in the local community, whilst promoting active travel, increasing physical activity and encouraging healthier lifestyles. Further detail around these issues can be found in the county's Public Health Strategy as referenced above	Area Proposals are underpinned by the Park wide Thematic Proposals 2011. These include proposals aimed at improving the health and well being of people visiting and using the Park. Objective 4.1 "Heath - Facilitate people pursuing healthy lifestyles" provides specific reference to this but all proposals will assist in delivering this objective.	No change
LA6.6	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Visitors	Specific comments in relation to the key themes in the proposals: - Fully support the proposals around cycle hire. - Within the development of new catering facilities, we would encourage further investigation of the opportunities for local food procurement / production. Furthermore, as part of this new provision, can the Park Authority ensure – through the tendering process and subsequent contract management – that healthy food options are available as standard across the park.	Comments noted.	No change
LA6.7	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Visitors	Will the proposals for new visitor provision offer opportunities in relation to employment, skills and training (including those for vulnerable groups)? One of the wider determinants of health is access and opportunities around education, skills and employment.	Comments noted. Through our Youth and Schools programme Teacher Training is offered. Vulnerable Groups are also taught life skills and learning relating to the outdoors - for example how to navigate. Other operators within the Park will offer employment and learning opportunities. The Lee Valley Leisure Trust Vibrant Partnerships operates a system of casuals and apprenticeship positions which offer training and skills opportunities	No change
LA6.8	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Visitors	Note there is a stated need for improved car parking and accessibility and recognise the park will attract visitors from further afield. However, priority should be placed on accessibility by pedestrians, bikes or sustainable modes of transport wherever possible. This should be supported by ensure appropriate facilities are available within the park for visitors such as free water top up points, secure bike racks around visitor centres etc.	Agreed - support facilities and infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists at existing and new centres or hubs (railway stations for example) is important. Feasibility studies for new provision will cover these points and it is the Authority's intention to ensure all visitor facilities include cycle parking and water points. These issues are covered in the Authority's adopted Cycling Strategy	No change
LA6.9	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Visitors	To ensure accessibility for all users, will visitor hubs and key park attractions be accessible for wheelchairs and pushchairs?	Yes this is the case for Authority operated facilities and sites which are DDA/Equality act compliant where reasonable and practicable	No change
LA6.10	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Sport & Rec	Fully support establishment of recreational routes for pedestrians and cyclists. Would encourage that wherever possible these are linked to wider networks outside of the park to enable active travel i.e. park users accessing the park by foot or bike as a first choice, rather than car	Agreed. It is very important that the Regional Park is connected to the network of paths and cycle routes beyond its boundaries and that these routes are well promoted and signed. This requires joint working amongst a number of stakeholders. This challenge is addressed in the adopted Cycling Strategy. Area 7 Proposals identify the points at which these network connections require enhancement or creation.	No change
LA6.11	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Sport & Rec	In all proposals, we would encourage the prioritisation of pedestrians and other sustainable modes of travel in accessing the park.	Comments noted and supported	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LA6.13	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Sport & Rec	Will the proposals for development of the Lee Valley White Water centre and other recreational facilities within the Park offer opportunities in relation to employment, skills and training (including those for vulnerable groups)? One of the wider determinants of health is access and opportunities around education, skills and employment.	Opportunities for employment and training will arise as a result of new leisure and recreational provision within the Park.	No change
LA6.14	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Sport & Rec Community	Encourage and support community events that promote and utilise active travel, recreation and utilise the parks potential for healthy lifestyles. Fully support the further development of outdoor play facilities, and would encourage that these are made accessible wherever possible by sustainable modes of transport to address inequalities within local communities and encourage active travel.	Comments noted and supported - outdoor play facilities informal and formal are located in the River Lee Country Park within Area 6. There may be opportunities for outdoor events and guided activities within Area 7 for example at the Spitalbrook site.	No change
LA6.16	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Community	We are encouraged to see some proposals refer to volunteer opportunities and would support the further promotion of this. Evidence demonstrates a strong link between volunteering, wellbeing and links to local communities. This could be enhanced further through conservation and health pilot projects.	Agreed. There is a full programme of volunteer activity throughout the Park.	No change
LA6.17	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Environment	Fully support the proposals for improving water quality and ecological conditions, recognising the benefits for wider outdoor activity.	Comments and support welcomed	No comment
OA9.0	Environment Agency	6 to 8		General	We welcome the inclusion of 'sustainability' in each of the above 'Draft Area Proposals for Consultation, December 2014' documents. Our following comments are applicable to all the proposal schedules for Areas 6, 7 and 8 on the matters of flood risk management, and on biodiversity. Additionally, please note our comments on the Environment theme in regard to the Water Framework Directive.	Comments noted	No change
OA9.1	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Environment	<u>Flood Risk Management</u> In general, there is a high level of flood risk throughout the area which needs consideration as proposals develop. Additionally, the Park fulfils a significant role in flood storage and conveyance to the surrounding area. Opportunities to enhance the flood risk management benefit provided by the Park should be championed in the area proposals. Recommendation: Add wording added to the 'Environment' sections along the following lines: "Work with the Environment Agency, and other stakeholders to support development projects which integrate measures to mitigate and reduce flood risk within and outside the Park, at the same time as delivering wider sustainability benefits to biodiversity, water qualityetc."	Agreed	Amend Proposals under 7.A.1, 7.A.2 and 7.A.3 Environment as follows: Ensure proposals support the implementation of the Thames River Basin Management Plan. Work with the Environment Agency to ensure any new development incorporates measures such as sustainable drainage systems that mitigate and reduce flood risk whilst also delivering wider sustainability benefits to biodiversity, water quality and recreational amenity.
OA9.2	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Environment	<u>Flood Defence Consent</u> Our consent is required for any proposed works or structures within 8 metres of the top of bank of any watercourse designated a main river. 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. We are happy to assist the Park Authority with early advice regarding the development of projects scheduled within the Park area.	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
OA9.3	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Bio-diversity	We welcome the text, and the biodiversity elements of the proposals appear to be relatively comprehensive. That said, the Lee Valley Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) is not cross-referenced.	The current BAP dates from 2000 and it is now under review. It does however form part of the baseline.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA9.4	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Bio-diversity & Angling	We also recommend referencing the Lea Fisheries Action Plan in the Biodiversity sections, e.g: 6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills Rewetting the dry watercourses on the site- designs should also benefit fish. 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park; Angling. 'Renovate swims for disabled anglers'. Ensure that disabled access is strategically assessed to ensure facilities are used as designed. 8.A.2 Biodiversity; the opening up of the Tumbling Bay area. 'Work in partnership...' include Ware Angling Club and Amwell Magna as partners.	Comments noted and changes made under Area 6 and 8.	No change
OA9.5	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Bio-diversity	We welcome references to managing non-native invasive species (NNIS) in the Area 6 and 7 consultations, i.e. Area 6 - to Himalyan Balsam in the corner of Wharf Road. However, there are no references to NNIS in the Area 8 consultation. Recommendation: Review the documents for consistency in terms of managing non-native species. We also recommend the creation of a NNIS strategy for the Park, which would support the Park Authority's biodiversity and environment proposals. Our comments on the Water Framework Directive below are also applicable here.	Comments noted. NNIS are an issue across the whole Park and need to be tackled on a landscape scale to see benefits. References to managing NNIS have been added to Area 8 Biodiversity Proposals.	No change to Area 7
OA9.6	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Access to Nature	Balancing access and recreation with wildlife requirements needs careful consideration. Access to nature areas that are more sensitive, for example Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's), needs to be managed to minimise damage and disturbance and to improve the status of these areas. This may mean restricting access to particular areas, and / or to particular times of year (e.g. not during nesting season or near the constructed otter holts or kingfisher banks). For example, the proposed new canoe route needs to balance the needs of river users against protection of fish habitats. Consideration needs to be given along the old river Lea particularly the Fisher's Green section, of potential damage to fish spawning habitat. This could be managed by closing the route during more sensitive times of the year i.e. the closed season for angling/ spawning season for fish. Recommendation: Insert text in all proposals schedules 'Biodiversity' sections text similar to the following: 'Work with stakeholders including Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Wildlife Trusts to ensure that access to nature areas that are more sensitive, for example Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's), are managed to minimise damage and disturbance, and to improve the status of these areas.'	Comments noted. All routes and access to nature areas would need to be carefully considered before they are opened up. There is always the potential to build-in seasonality into the terms of use and restrict access during certain times of year. The proposed new canoe route is incorrectly shown on the Proposals Map and will be amended - see comments under Area 6.	No change to Area 7 but amendments in Area 6. Similar response under OA10.13
OA9.7	Environment Agency	6 to 8		SSSIs	Whilst we defer to Natural England's comments in regard to designated sites and protected species, in our view, the references to SSSI's within the Park seem well covered. We welcome the references to the need for ecological reconnection of habitats.	Support noted and welcome	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA9.8	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Environment	<p><u>Water Framework Directive (WFD)</u>. There are three waterbodies that fall into the Park boundary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GB106038033200. Small River Lea (and tributaries) 2. GB106038077851. Lee (Woollens Brook down to Tottenham lock) 3. GB106038033240. Lea Navigation (Hertford & Ware). <p>There is no reference to the WFD within the Area 6 documents 'Environment' sections, one reference in Area 7, and two references in Area 8. Whilst acknowledging the attention given to the WFD, we strongly advise that the London Plan (LP Policy 5.14 and text refers) approach should be used for the Area proposals. Specifically, we recommend that the proposals refer to the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) as the relevant expression of the planning and delivery of WFD objectives. The Thames RBMP has a list of actions for waterbodies within the Park to be progressed through physical works to watercourses and their corridors. Local Plans are required to be in general conformity with LP policy.</p>	Comments noted. Amendments will be made to Area 7 to make fuller reference to the Water Framework Directive.	Amend Environment Proposal text under 7.A.1 as follows: Work with the Environment Agency to improve, maintain and monitor water quality to meet Water Framework Directive objectives to enhance ecological conditions and recreational amenity. Ensure proposals support the implementation of the Thames River Basin Management Plan . Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Work with the Environment Agency and other stakeholders to improve, maintain and monitor water quality to meet Water Framework Directive objectives to enhance ecological conditions, angling and sailing activity. Ensure proposals support the implementation of the Thames River Basin Management Plan.
OA9.9	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Environment	<p>To assist, appended to this response are extracts from the two main Thames RBMP action plans (the Lee [Fieldes Weir to Tottenham Locks], and the Small River Lee), that cover Areas 6 to 8 of the Park. There are a number of detailed actions to be delivered on the River Lee from Fieldes Weir downstream. There is much less for the Small River Lee, where I have simply appended the relevant Action Map. Please contact us for further information about these actions as needed. The main actions relate to: removing hard banking and creating marginal / reed bed habitat along the Lea Navigation; introducing riffle/pool/glide sequences and improving the marginal fringing habitats along the Lea; and improving fish passage on the Flood Relief Channel.</p>	Comments Noted, reference to the Thames River Basin Management Plan has been added to Area 7 proposals as suggested.	See above amendments
OA9.10	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Environment	<p>For information, please note that proposals may require a WFD compliance assessment to secure RBMP goals and the physical works to achieve them. Any development within the Park affecting the waterbodies noted will need to assess and confirm:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The nature of local individual and cumulative effects upon WFD quality elements and subsequent impact (if any) on the relevant waterbodies 2) For each waterbody affected: the agreement of adequate (if any) mitigation(s) required to ensure 'no deterioration' or prevention of progress towards good ecological status or potential. 	Comments and requirements for development within the Regional Park noted.	No change
OA9.12	Environment Agency	7		Environment	<p>The more significant proposals listed within the Areas 6-8 documents that require careful consideration in terms of water management with the RBMP action plans in mind, include: Area 7 7.A.1 Wetland Park Visitor Hub expansion, 7.A.2 Development of Centre for Angling at Nazeing Central Lagoon</p>	Comments noted and agreed.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA9.14	Environment Agency	6 to 8			Environment Thames River Basin Management Plan	Opportunities should be taken when considering proposals to implement actions in the RBMP's Action Plans. Recommendation: Review proposals schedules 'Environment' sections to ensure consistency. The WFD (and specifically the Thames River Basin Management Plan) is relevant to all Areas. Insert policy 'hook' at the relevant 'Environment' sections along the following lines: 'Work with Thames Water, the Environment Agency and other stakeholders to ensure proposals support the implementation of the Thames River Basin Management Plan and its identified actions to secure improved water and ecological quality'.	Comments noted Environment Proposal text for Area 7 will be amended.	See amendments made under OA9.8 above
OA10.0	Natural England	6 to 8			General	Having taken a look at the documentation provided with this consultation and having liaised with colleagues who are responsible for a number of the designated sites involved in these areas Natural England has the following comments to make. Overall Natural England is broadly supportive of the development framework and welcomes the proposals set out within the document. Our intention is to provide input in order to assist in continuing the excellent work that is currently being done across the Lee Valley Regional Park. A number of the comments made, relating to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in particular, ensure that the document would be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 118 in particular.	Comments noted	No change
OA10.4	Natural England	6 to 8			Joint working	Natural England acknowledges the need to engage stakeholders to explore options and advise that we are keen to be kept informed of any proposals and suggest that additional consultees should include Graham White (RSPB), accounting for his long association in birdwatching/surveying these areas and role as author of the LVRPA report 1993.	Comments noted and joint working supported. Graham White is listed as a consultee and was consulted on the proposals.	No change
OA10.8	Natural England	7		7.A.2 to 7.A.3	Nazeing to Rye House	Having checked the proposals for Nazeing to Rye House Natural England is broadly supportive of what has been put forward and wouldn't have any comments to make in relation to this area.	Comments noted and support welcomed	No change
OA10.11	Natural England	6 to 8			Lee Valley SPA area (including Walthamstow Reservoirs)	<u>General overall comments covering the Lee Valley SPA area</u> The Plan provides reference to key areas where there is proposed to be targeted action in the specific areas of the Lee Valley Park and in general the aspirations and actions are welcome. In seeking to assist partnership delivery of achieving and maintaining favourable conservation status for the Lee Valley SPA, Natural England has produced a Site Improvement Plan (attached to response email) in consultation with key stakeholders and attaches it for your Authorities reference. Please note there may be helpful park-wide initiatives that assist this process, such as dealing with invasive species and/or water quality.	Comments noted. Amendments to text under Area 6 and 8 have been made where proposals relate to SPA areas. Reference to invasive species sits under Environment Proposal 7.A.1 and in Biodiversity 7.A.3.	No change
OA10.12	Natural England	6 to 8			Joint Working	Natural England engages with the Lee Valley Park Authority on a regular basis, principally about regulatory matters, and looks forward to working in partnership with your authority and other stakeholders towards achieving shared objectives. Please do not hesitate to contact us for any further information as necessary.	Comments noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA10.13	Natural England				Ref to EA Comments	Natural England support the following EA recommendation: Recommendation: Insert text in all proposals schedules 'Biodiversity' sections text similar to the following 'Work with stakeholders including Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Wildlife Trusts to ensure that access to nature areas that are more sensitive, for example Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's), are managed to minimise damage and disturbance, and to improve the status of these areas.'	Comments noted. Please refer to the comments made under OA9.6 above. There are no SSSIs within Area 7 and proposals take account of the sensitivity of nature areas when seeking to enhance access.	No change
OA11.0	Sport England	6 to 8			Sport England Planning Policy	Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement 'Planning for Sport Aims and Objectives' (2013) details Sport England's three objectives in its involvement in planning matters (a copy of which can be found at: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/aims-and-objectives/); 1) To prevent the loss of sports facilities and land along with access to natural resources used for sport. 2) To ensure that the best use is made of existing facilities in order to maintain and provide greater opportunities for participation and to ensure that facilities are sustainable. 3) To ensure that new sports facilities are planned for and provided in a positive and integrated way and that opportunities for new facilities are identified to meet current and future demands for sporting participation. I have considered the proposals in the consultation document, particularly those relating to sport and recreation in the context of these objectives. In general terms, I would wish to advise that Sport England is supportive in principle of the range of proposals for new or enhanced sports facilities especially for water based sports.	Comments and support welcomed	No change
OA11.2	Sport England	7			Canoe and Angling facilities	In particular, the proposals for the following projects offer potential to grow and sustain opportunities for participation: - Developing and promoting the Wetland Park at Spitalbrook, Admirals Walk Lake and Dobbs Weir angling; - Exploring options for canoe access to Dobbs Weir Pool; - Protection and enhancement of angling facilities at Admirals Walk Lake and south east of Spitalbrook and exploring new angling opportunities to the north west of Spitalbrook; - Establishing Centre for Angling on Nazeing Central Lagoon; - Improving facilities for anglers around Glen Faba Lake and supporting continuation of angling at the Crown Netherhall Lake private fishery;	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
OA11.4	Sport England	6 to 8			Consultation	It is advocated that consultation takes place with the relevant sports governing bodies (such as Canoe England, the Royal Yachting Association, the Angling Trust and British Cycling) to discuss these proposals in more detail as they progress as they can provide support and advice on how the projects can help grow and sustain participation in their sports and co-ordinate input from local clubs.	Agreed, consultation is and will be undertaken with relevant bodies as proposals area are amended and/or developed.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA11.5	Sport England	6 to 8		Angling Trust comments	I have consulted the Angling Trust (the recognised governing body for angling) for their comments which can be summarised as: Access is a major issue as the vast majority of anglers carry a large volume of kit that they use to cover a range of situations. Therefore parking close to fishing points is a necessity and a key reason why there has been a major change in fishing favouring private lakes that have better access.	Comments noted, access for anglers is an issue but the provision of on site parking in every instance is not practicable or appropriate. The Authority has a policy of shared car parks i.e. with the general Park visitor. It should be noted that a large proportion of our angling venues are very old post-aggregate gravel pits often in the centre of the Park several hundred metres from any car parks, or vehicular tracks and are only served by footpaths	No change
OA11.6	Sport England	6 to 8		Angling Trust comments	Protection of fisheries from predators is a key issue as fish populations are under ever increasing threat from changes in ecology and predation) caused by Cormorants and Goosander, Signal Crayfish, Zebra mussels etc). Any proposals in the LVRPA area that would place pressure on fish species could lead to a significant reduction in mature individuals, removing the ability of watercourses to repopulate and the consequent loss of their angling value.	Comments noted. The Authority aims to provide a balanced ecosystem, key agencies will be consulted to ensure no negative impacts arising from works	No change
OA11.7	Sport England	7		Angling Trust comments: Centre for Angling	A centre for angling as suggested in Area 7 would certainly be of interest to the Angling Trust from a development perspective. One of Angling Trust programmes is looking to provide opportunities for families to go fishing together again and a centre could be a good hub from which, with the right local backing, a Let's Family Fish event could be set up which has been successful in drawing thousands of people into fishing last year.	Comments and support welcomed. Feasibility work will help to identify the range of angling facilities that can be delivered at this location and how a Centre for Angling might operate. It should be noted that Central Lagoon is both a large gravel pit and integral to the flood relief system. Currently the biomass is predominantly very large specimen species, suitable for competent/ advanced anglers. Proposal has been amended to provide more detail. (Refer also to SR28.0	Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Recreation & Sport - Undertake feasibility work with stake-holders to develop Establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon, including to include a secure car park, new swims and replacement lakeside building catering for both anglers and general Park visitor. This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre sailing & boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating & sailing groups. Feasibility work will cover the provision of facilities at both Nazeing Central Lagoon and at Holyfield Lake (Area 6) and will need to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6; • the associated constraints and options relating to the shared use of facilities between different water based clubs and groups; • the range & type of angling provision that can be delivered at Central Lagoon; • the scale and design of new built facilities required at Central Lagoon taking account of the Green Belt location; • the flood management role of the Nazeing Central Lagoon; • other environmental and access issues
OA11.8	Sport England	6 to 8		Local Authority Sports Facility Strategies	The local authorities in the area covered by the proposals have their own strategies for sports facilities (especially land based). The Park Framework Plan for this area offers potential for a co-ordinated approach to be taken to help deliver facility priorities that have been identified in these strategies. Before the proposals for this area are finalised, it is requested that the LVPRA consider whether there are any priorities in the strategies that could be delivered within the Regional Park area which have not already been identified. Discussions should take place with the relevant local authority if there is scope for addressing sports facility needs as part of the area proposals.	Proposals have been drafted in consultation with the Authority's Sports Development team who engage with local authorities and other stakeholders regarding priorities for a range of sports and associated facilities. Priority sports for the Authority include athletics, cycling, equestrian, paddle sports, ice sports, tennis, golf and Hockey.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA11.9	Sport England	6 to 8		Local Authority Sports Facility Strategies	The relevant strategies are: Broxbourne Indoor and Outdoor Leisure Facility Strategy (2014) https://www.broxbourne.gov.uk/leisure-sport-and-recreation/indoor-and-outdoor-leisure-facility-strategy . Strategy priorities in relation to indoor facilities include the need for new sports halls, health and fitness centres, activity studios and a purpose built or shared use gymnastics facility for Turnford Gym Club. Strategy priorities in relation to outdoor facilities include new artificial grass pitches for football and rugby, new junior/mini football, cricket and rugby pitches and additional multi-use games areas; Epping Forest Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment (2012) http://www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk/index.php/home/file-store/category/150-ppg17-planning-for-open-space-sport-recreation-assessment . The assessment identified a need for more junior/mini football pitches and cricket pitches; East Hertfordshire Playing Pitch Strategy and Outdoor Sports Assessment (2010) http://www.eastherts.gov.uk/index.jsp?articleid=15677 identified needs for a range of facilities including new junior and mini football pitches in the Hertford/Ware area. The East Hertfordshire Assessment of Indoor Sports Facilities (2011) http://www.eastherts.gov.uk/index.jsp?articleid=24811 also identifies a range of indoor facility priorities.	Comments noted and welcomed. It should be noted that the proposal to renovating swims for disabled anglers on the Cadmore Lane bank of North Met Pit, on Boot Pit at Slipe Lane Pits, and Hooks Marsh has been deleted. (Area 6 proposals)	No change
OA12.0	Transport for London	6 7	6.A.4 Environment	Four Tracking	The area is outside the Greater London boundary, although TfL does have a limited interest in this area. Reference to Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 is made for Areas 6 and 7 made in 6.A.4 Environment. We would suggest slightly re-wording the initial sentence of this section: subject to ongoing work there may be amendments to level crossings and footbridges and we would suggest to word this more positively in terms of maintaining access without specifically referencing "all rail crossings" as such. Our suggested wording would be: "Support ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park <u>maintain good levels of access to the Regional Park and seek to address issues of poor east-west connectivity, particularly for people with reduced mobility, pedestrians and cyclists.</u> "	Comments noted: The Authority recognises the importance of maintaining a network of crossings which can satisfy its operational requirements and the need to ensure safe and convenient access for visitors. As stated above since these proposals were issued Network Rail has continued to reduce surface level crossings on an incremental basis without responding to officers' concerns for the need for an access strategy designed to address operational and visitor needs. The Authority's existing draft proposals state that mitigation will be sought for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2	Amend proposal 7.A.1 Environment as follows: Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 Support ongoing investment in the Abellio Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and work with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 team, the local and county authorities to develop a strategy for retaining crossing points and access into the Park for all visitors and to enable operational management, without large areas of parkland being lost to new bridge landings, new roads or related infrastructure. and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park. Retaining and enhancing these access points into the Park forms part of the Green Arc Strategic Green Infrastructure project 'Lateral Links' to improve connectivity linking the Park with the wider landscape and adjoining urban areas.
OA13.0	RSPB	6 to 8		General Support	We have reviewed the Biodiversity sections of the Area Proposals and associated maps and commend the level of detail. We are broadly supportive of the principles and strategies that have been outlined, but would like to suggest some minor additions in order to better represent the designated features of the Special Protection Area (SPA) within the LVRP.	Support Welcomed	No change

OA13.1	RSPB	6 to 8			<p>Bio-diversity SPA</p> <p><u>Lee Valley Special Protection Area.</u> The Lee Valley was designated as an SPA for the wintering assemblage of gadwall, shoveler and bittern. Spa boundaries were tightly drawn at the time of designation to represent the areas where significant populations occurred. Functionally linked land within the LVRP which gadwall and shoveler would also use, was not included. Naturally it is fundamental to the success of the SPA populations that they have access to adequate functionally linked land from which they will not be disturbed.</p> <p><u>Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS) data.</u> The Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS) monitors non-breeding waterbirds in the UK. The principal aims of WeBS are to identify population size, determine trends in numbers and distribution, and identify important sites for waterbirds. The Lee Valley Gravel Pits WeBS sector encompasses waterbodies within the LVRP to the north of the M25. This includes all of the Lee Valley SPA. Within the non-breeding waterbird assemblage present in this WeBS sector, four species occur in nationally important numbers (more than 1% of the UK wintering population), including the SPA designated shoveler and gadwall. Information from the WeBS data highlights the importance of non-designated waterbodies within the LVRP for these species and demonstrates that they are functionally-linked. At times a significant proportion of the SPA populations are using non-designated sites. Therefore, appropriate management of these sites is necessary to maintain the condition of the SPA.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Agreed that non designated water bodies are important to the overall success of the SPA populations. Text will be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Add following text under: 7.A.1 Biodiversity Fauna and Flora end of first paragraph "Management of waterbodies to take account of their proximity to and their role in supporting the wider Lee Valley SPA" under 7.A.2 Biodiversity Fauna and Flora end of second paragraph "Account to be taken of their proximity to and role in supporting the wider Lee Valley SPA" and under 7.A.3 Biodiversity Fauna and Flora after first paragraph and bullet points add; "Management of waterbodies to take account of their proximity to and their role in supporting the wider Lee Valley SPA."</p>
OA13.3	RSPB	6 to 8	6.A.4, 7.A.1, 7.A.2, 7.A.3, 8.A.1		<p>To help maintain condition of the SPA designated species, we would like to see this bullet point adopted in the following sections: - <u>maintain and manage areas of shallow flood for the benefit of designated SPA species (wintering shoveler)</u> Section 6 - 6.A.4, bottom of page 20; Section 7 - 7.A.1 page 7; 7.A.2 page 12; 7.A.3 - page 18; and Section 8 - 8.A.1 page 6. We would gladly provide more specific habitat management advice if required.</p>	<p>Comments noted and additional text to be added as proposed.</p>	<p>Additional text to be added under: 7.A.1 Biodiversity Fauna and Flora end of first paragraph to follow change detailed above (OA13.1) "Areas of shallow flood to be maintained and managed for the benefit of designated SPA species (wintering shoveler)". Under 7.A.2 Biodiversity Fauna and Flora second paragraph, second sentence add as follows: Conservation and management to be focused on maintaining and improving their importance for bird populations, including designated SPA species... and under 7.A.3 Biodiversity Fauna and Flora after first paragraph and bullet points add the following: "Areas of shallow flood to be maintained and managed for the benefit of designated SPA species (wintering shoveler)" to follow change detailed above OA13.1</p>

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA14.0	Thames Water	6 to 8		General	Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) Property Services function is now being delivered by Savills (UK) Limited as Thames Water's appointed supplier. Savills are therefore pleased to respond to the above consultation on behalf of Thames Water in relation to their statutory undertakings. 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 adjoin areas, Thames Water operate, manage and invest in significant water and wastewater infrastructure in the LVRP. This includes Rye Meads Sewage Works located in area 8 [Note – the main part of the sewage works is not located in the Park]. In operating, managing and investing in their assets Thames Water have to consider what is in the best interest of their customers. This includes considering opportunities for recreation and education, alongside maximising the value of our redundant land, which helps ultimately to keep customers bills lower. In this context we have the following comments on the draft area proposals:	Comments noted	No change
OA15.0	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8		Lea Valley Food Taskforce	Firstly, can I introduce the Lea Valley Food Taskforce. The Taskforce was established under the umbrella of One Epping Forest, to look into the future of the glasshouse industry, suggest new approaches and identify new opportunities to meet local communities' aspirations and government policy. What first emerged was the apparent lack of national direction, support or guidance for this important area to meet the challenges of the nation's food deficit. There is not one single government department or agency whose sole responsibility it is to champion this sector, and this is reflected in lost opportunities, and the loss of a once major UK strength in growing under glass.	Comments noted	No change
OA15.1	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8		Glass-house Industry	The Taskforce has brought together the commercial growers, their umbrella bodies, the Lea Valley Growers Association, the National Farmers Union and a range of statutory bodies including the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority and a number of local councils. As the work has continued, the original councils (London Borough of Enfield, Epping Forest District Council and Broxbourne Borough Council) have been joined by representatives from Essex County Council, LB Waltham Forest, Uttlesford Futures, and East Herts and Harlow DCs. This gives representation across three Local Enterprise Partnerships, increasing the opportunity and ambition of the group. We also are now linking with the London Stansted Cambridge Consortium and the West Essex Alliance whose members we hope will see the benefit of what we are doing and support us in our efforts. With regards to Lee Valley Regional Park we have Del Goddard, Chairman of the LVRP Trust as one of the members (he is also chair of the Task Force Planning Subgroup) and Stephen Wilkinson also attends as an officer of the Authority.	Comments noted This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA15.2	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8		CPO powers & the Glass-house Industry	At our meeting on the 7th January 2015 there were major issues raised with the current Park Development Framework Areas 6, 7 and 8 consultation. The membership was very concerned over what was being proposed and also felt that the timing of the proposals was very ill advised with the judicial reviews still in progress for the Valley Grown Nursery site (Epping Forest District Council) and also the issues with the Borough of Broxbourne housing site. One of the main issues was the proposal to use the Authority's land purchasing powers to acquire and demolish existing growers' businesses in the Lea Valley. We believe these proposals are not in the interest of the public or the British rural economy and have wide reaching reputational damage implications for growers and the rural economy. Several of the companies that the growers supply have already questioned long term viability of the businesses should the proposals be accepted. This amounts to planning blight for the affected businesses.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly. Please note that Proposal 7.A.2 and 3 have been amended and all reference to named sites or areas removed along with reference to CPO powers. Amended proposal text for Environment 7.A.2 is shown opposite. 7.A.3 is the same except for minor changes to make it specific to that area when referencing views etc.	<u>Glasshouses</u> . The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the Park within 7.A.2 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: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the Naxeing Mead & Carthagea areas; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and 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 & Carthagea area; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. 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, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. 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.
OA15.3	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8		Glass-house Industry	We have worked very hard over the last few years to build relationships between the growers and the Authority so we can find compromises which are to the benefit of all parties yet the lack of discussions prior to the proposals being published seems to have destroyed that confidence within the industry.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly	Please note amendments above
OA15.4	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8		Glass-house Industry	I also have been informed by the growers and National Farmers Union that, in order to action this acquisition of glasshouses and for them to move their businesses, the costs could be in the region of £100m. I am sure that in these tough times the Authority just could not afford this sort of money, and the Plan would therefore be unviable and unsound. I also would have thought the contrary, that the Authority might want to dispose of unused or disconnected pieces of land which might be of use to the Glasshouse industry which is showing real signs of growth, partly with the coordinated efforts of the Taskforce.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly	Please note amendments above
OA15.5	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8		Glass-house Industry	What these proposals have served to do is to undermine customer confidence in the Lea Valley rural economy, potentially compromising thousands of jobs, and resulting in large monetary losses to the industry. As such we believe the Authority is failing to recognise glasshouse grower landowners and the thriving rural economy of the Lea Valley. We believe that the only practical way forward is by recognising that the proposals for this part of the Park can only be delivered through the collective efforts of a range of partners, stakeholders and landowners.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan	Please note amendments above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA15.6	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8			Glass-house Industry	With the issues of the timing of the Judicial Reviews and also the very strong views of members of the Task Force can I therefore formally suggest that the consultation is withdrawn immediately. This should allow time for further work and discussions with concerned parties to prevent further escalation of the issues above and to produce proposals which are more acceptable to relevant groups and businesses.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly	Please note amendments above
LB17.0	S J Frederick & Sons	7	Visitors Proposals	7.A.3 Visitors	Temple Farm Roydon	PDF Consultation - Further to our conversation at Waltham Abbey library I reiterate the following points in relation to Temple Farm, Roydon. 1. The proposed shared walk/cycling route is totally unachievable in some situations eg Didgemere Hall private gated driveway (possibly careless drafting) and in other instances it deviates from the existing right of way to such an extent that substantial negotiations would be required to achieve your proposal.	Comments noted. Both Baseline and proposals maps will be checked for accuracy.	Amendments made to both Baseline and Proposals map in respect of green dashed line for Shared Routes and pink line PRW. Routes rationalised
LB17.1	S J Frederick & Sons	7		7.A.3 Visitors	Temple Farm Roydon	2. The suitability of Roydon Station car park as a reliable point of entry into the Park for those people who choose to drive or who are unable to do otherwise has to be called into question because of the lack of control that the Park Authority has over this facility.	Comments noted. Secondary gateway concept is based on encouraging people to arrive by train.	No change
LB17.2	S J Frederick & Sons	7	Landscape Proposals	7.A.3	Temple Farm Roydon	3. Your proposal to improve the "Harsh Visually Detracting Edge/Investment Area" running along the eastern boundary of Temple Farm. You made it clear that in your view the free range poultry enterprise that we use this part of the farm for, is detracting from the area, and that perhaps we might like to take up the offeres available by way of grants to enhance the landscape. I did as previously discussed with you state that to my knowledge the available schemes would not be economically viable for various reasons which include the following; only this part of the farm is suitable for free range poultry; the gross margin of this enterprise is in excess of £250,000 per annum. We do however share your view that landscape enhancement could be welcome in this area if a strategy could be found by which our income is likewise conserved or enhanced. I would be pleased to receive comments on this particular point.	Comments and support for landscape enhancements noted. It is the intention that any improvements to the landscape along the boundaries of the Park would also be compatible with the agricultural use of the land.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB19.0	Nazeing Glass Works Ltd	7		Introduction section & 7.A.2 Landscape Proposal	Nazeing Glass Works <i>"Partnership work- recognising that many of the proposals can only be delivered through the collective efforts of a range of partners, stakeholders & landowners". "Work with stakeholders to improve the impact on the Regional Park of industrial sites (& their intensification), structures & buildings through measures that contribute to a reduction in noise, traffic generation, visual impact & intrusion. High quality development to be sought & 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> As an industrial stakeholder on the Nazeing Marsh since 1928, we at Nazeing Glass Works welcome this bold initiative to landscape, & improve this area, open it up to visitors, & improve the heritage and appreciation of the beauty and potential of the area for high quality tourism. As most of the buildings on our site are between fifty & seventy years old, & our site, although above the 1 in 100 year Flood zone, is surrounded by water on three sides are in discussion with high quality developers who will buy most of the site, demolish the buildings and build high quality, visually attractive homes in a variety of prices & eventually to sell the last part that we own on site, namely the Glass Works, & move it to an attractive nearby site where a visually stunning modern smaller works can be built with the land proceeds, in a smaller (say 17,000 versus 43,000 sq ft area) building with our Museum of 20th century British Domestic Glass, & visitor centre & factory shop	Comments noted.	No change
LB19.1	Nazeing Glass Works Ltd	6 & 7	6.A.4	Lido site	To this end we would like to ask the members of the Lee Valley Authority whether they would consider a 25-50 year lease on the old Broxbourne Lido site at a reasonable, but upward moving annual ground rent? As to time scale we would envisage 5-7 years i.e. 2022-2025, having completed the sale of the rest of the site around 2018. Among the advantages the deal offers to the park, are:- 1. An existing well known small manufacturer with an excellent environmental reputation, at present 250 yards away. 2. Over 80 years existence in the area since 1928. 3. A Museum, Heritage site, with at present around 7,000 visitors a year. 4. A lecture conference facility that could be hired out to local companies. 5. An involvement in an artistic and creative industry. 6. A past history having left Vauxhall in 1928, where glass making can be traced in this area back to 1612, and the Hall family (Stephen and John Hall) which owned Whitefriars and Falcon Stairs Glass works in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. visit and written about by Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn in their diaries. 7. The oldest glassmaking company therefore in the UK. 8. The only hand glass manufacturer remaining - not small studio- (outside automatic production) in the South East of England -(the next nearest is Langham Glass Kings Lynn Norfolk. In sum, history and heritage writ large in the area. The new factory would be planned from scratch with low impact, and visitor attraction and attractiveness at its heart, consulting LVPRA at every step of the way.	Comments noted. The site of the former Leisure Pool/Broxbourne Lido has been allocated for housing in the Broxbourne Draft Local Plan which is supported by the Authority. There is a commitment to update the adopted development brief to identify the potential for housing "to enable the wider development and improvement of the site". Area Proposals will need to be amended to allow for the potential of residential development on the site of the former Leisure Pool previously identified as 'major development site' in the Green Belt.	Please refer to Amendments in Area 6 which state: Proposal 6.A.4 Visitors <u>5. Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North</u> Establish a major visitor hub at Broxbourne as a primary gateway into the River Lee Country Park incorporating existing visitor facilities at Broxbourne Riverside, Old Mill and Meadows and the site of the former Leisure Pool. This will be achieved by: • 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 development of the former Leisure Pool site for a leisure use appropriate to the Regional Park; options to be explored with potential development partners —

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB19.2	Nazeing Glass Works Ltd	7			Nazeing New Road	We also welcome the offer in your plan to pay to upgrade our private road off the B194 Nazeing new road , just over the road bridge over the River Lee, as proposed in the plan. However we would warn you this may be in excess of £100k, as Essex Highway Authorities and EFDC Planners have said the entrance must be improved before any further development using that road can be allowed. £60-£70k of that cost will be to move the BT junction box in the pavement about thirty feet ! We have the plans done to widen and improve the entrance, but not the funds available!	Comments noted. The Visitor proposals map shows improvements to access along the Navigation, i.e. for pedestrians and cyclists. The map notation will be amended to clarify this point.	Amend notation for Visitor Proposals map and clarify that the notation "Improve Access along Navigation" refers to improving the condition of the towpath for cyclists and pedestrians as they move through this area and cross the B194
LB21.0	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6 & 7				These comments include reference to the general policy proposals of the Framework as well as the specific proposals in relation to Sub Areas 6 and 7, within which my client's properties are located. It is noted with interest that LVRPA's position in relation to the long standing growing industry and associated glasshouses within the Valley is made clear from the outset: <i>"To date there have been many questions received during the consultation concerning the impact of the Authority's draft proposals on the glasshouse industry. These proposals seek to integrate areas of <u>redundant</u> glasshouses into the landscape of the Regional Park through partnership work with landowners and the riparian planning authorities. They do not seek to close existing businesses."</i> Such a clear and seemingly unambiguous position is welcomed as it would appear to support the existing growing industry, which is a long standing and vital part of the Lea Valley.	Comments noted	No change
LB21.1	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries			6.A.4 Environment	Glass-houses	The subsequent narrative in relation to Area 6 'River Lee Country Park' is somewhat surprising, therefore; in that it appears to contradict this clearly stated position: <i>"6.A.4 River Lee Country Park (Environment) - Existing glasshouse sites within the RLCP at Paynes Lane, Stubbins Hall Lane, Langley and Mile Nurseries to continue in the short to medium term until the land can be brought into recreational or leisure use, through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary. It is likely that major redevelopment or expansion for new large scale glasshouse use will be resisted."</i> The narrative goes on to say: <i>"Landscape & Heritage - The positive and attractive landscape character of the River Lee Country Park south of Holyfield Lake and Langridge Farm to be protected and enhanced. <u>This strong identity of woodland, wetland, farmland and open parkland to be extended north to Nazeing Road. The green edge of the Regional Park boundary to be protected and enhanced and the open valley floor protected from intrusive development.</u>"</i>	Comments noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB21.2	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	7		7.A.2 Wetland Park - Spitalbrook to Roydon Landscape & Heritage and Environment Proposals	Glass-houses	The apparently negative tone of the narrative continues in relation to Area 7: "7.A.2 Heritage & Landscape (Nazeing Meads & Nazeing Lagoon) - The open character of the valley floor to be protected from development to the rear of properties in Nursery Road, nurseries to the west of North Road & at Sedge Green Nurseries. Over the longterm, non-Park compatible intrusive uses to be removed or their adverse impact mitigated including through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary. Avenue planting & block woodland planting to help provide a greater visual structure to the landscape & to provide visual screening of these intrusive uses when viewed from open parts of the Park.. Productive Landscapes - The Authority will resist significant expansion of existing glasshouse businesses or the location of new glasshouse businesses within the Park. Existing or historical horticultural glasshouse sites within the Wetland Park east at Sedge Green, Nursery Road, off from North Road & Dobbs Weir Road to be brought into recreational or leisure use in the longer term through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary. Development of non-Park compatible uses on former and existing glasshouse sites will also be resisted."	Comments noted	No change
LB21.3	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	7		7.A.2 continued	Glass-houses	continued from above These statements raise strong concerns that it is LVRPA's longer term plan to eradicate existing glasshouse sites, possibly through the use of its CPO powers. Indeed, by seeking to resist major redevelopment or expansion of existing facilities, it is a clear aim of LVRPA to suffocate the remaining industry into submission by preventing their crucial modernisation. This position flies in the face of the recent report on the growing industry in the Lea Valley, which recognises the critical need for economy of scale to compete with modern processes & demand (The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry: Planning for the future, 2012).	Comments noted please see below	Please see below

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB21.4	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries				Glass-houses Of even greater concern is the fact that the seemingly flawed approach of LVRPA is entirely at odds with the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and its 'golden thread' of encouraging economic regeneration through sustainable development. Specifically and unequivocally, paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that for plan-making; <i>"local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs in their area... [and] meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change..."</i> The proposed policies do not achieve these aims in that they are clearly not positive for the established local industry, do not meet established demand, have not been objectively assessed against identified need and offer no real form of flexibility, even with the full knowledge of the rapidly changing nature of the growing industry. Furthermore, para 28 of the NPPF makes specific reference to supporting the rural economy and states that; <i>"Planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development"</i> . The knock-on benefits this has for local services and community is also advocated and it is clear that the proposed LVRPA policies fail to account for such.	.Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out opposite for 7.A.2 Environment. A similar proposal is inserted for 7.A.3 with minor changes the names of roads and Park area. References to named glasshouse areas and sites has been deleted.	<u>Glasshouses</u> . The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the Park within 7.A.2 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: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the Naxeing Mead & Carthagea areas; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and 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 & Carthagea area; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. 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, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. 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.
LB21.5	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries				Glass-houses Presumably, LVRPA are content to encourage the expansion of recreational facilities within the Valley, at the expense of a long established and essential industry which has served the needs of the local community and the wider region for decades, both in terms of essential produce and employment. By seeking to stifle the continued existence of the growing industry LVRPA's proposals will only serve to favour the ever increasing pressures from overseas produce, whilst the home grown provider declines. There can be no question that such an approach is highly unsustainable and entirely irresponsible.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB21.7	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6 to 8			Guiding Principles	The clear reference that LVRPA make to their adopted 'guiding principles' within the consultation document is, on the face of it, commendable: "The Authority's draft proposals... are based on the Authority's adopted (July 2010) guiding principles for the future development and management of the Regional Park. These are: - Partnership work – recognising that many of the proposals can only be delivered through the collective efforts of a range of partners, stakeholders and landowners. - Regional Value – assessing the range of benefits that any particular facility or activity within the Park delivers to the people of Essex, Hertfordshire and London. - Multi-function and synergy – developing proposals which can be used to harness competing demands. - Flexibility – the design and management of facilities and open spaces of the park in a way which responds to changing needs and demands. - Sustainability – ensuring that new development does not prejudice the lives of future generations."	Comments noted	No change
LB21.8	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6 to 8			Glasshouses	Unfortunately, such words are evidently hollow when compared to the very real and purposeful direction of the proposed policies, which effectively seek to facilitate the long term decline of the growing industry in favour of one large attractive Regional Park, where everyone can play but not work; the nature of the work being 'incompatible' with the inappropriately idealistic objectives of the LVRPA. Evidently there is little partnership working, certainly not with the landowning historic industries and not even with the key local authority stakeholders. Apparently, regional value is only regarded as important in so far as the standing of the LVRPA is concerned. Multifunctionalism only extends to compatible leisure and recreational uses and seemingly, flexibility only exists if it is to the sole benefit of the LVRPA. What is most clear is that LVRPA have a very unusual interpretation of sustainability, in that safeguarding the lives of future generations only extends to their use of the Park for recreation and leisure; as the proposed policy approach certainly excludes the reality of safe-guarding local jobs, supporting the local economy and promoting home grown produce.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above
LB21.9	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6 to 8			Glasshouses	The inappropriately narrow approach of LVRPA is best exemplified in the distinct lack of reference to the growing industry and glasshouses throughout the consultation document. When this absolutely intrinsic topic is mentioned, it is only in a negative context. This clear absence of crucial reference must bring the validity of the entire exercise into question; because a so called consultation document which at best ignores a fundamental part of the Valley's make-up and which at worst seeks to undermine it, cannot possibly be considered fully inclusive or adequately engaging.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB22.0	Lea Valley Growers Assc. Letter 11 Feb 2015	6 to 8		Glass-houses	<p><u>Summary of Response</u> - The Lea Valley Growers Association (the 'Association') represents over 100 Glasshouse growers in the Lea Valley who grow healthy fresh produce for the UK with a retail value of £1bn to the British economy. These grower businesses also provide employment for 2,500 people. - We wish to object to the Draft Proposals for the Regional Park, as detailed above, in the strongest terms and formally request a complete review of Park policy for this area as a matter of urgency. - The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (the 'Park Authority') has drafted policies that fail to value the horticultural industry in the Lea Valley, either in historic or future landscape terms, or in terms of its economic value and contribution to sustainable rural communities. The Park Authority is seeking to re-develop sites for leisure use that support our industry and provide livelihoods for communities within the Park boundaries and beyond. - The Association strongly believes that bringing forward the current consultation (previously proposed for April) is not appropriate considering the current judicial review proceedings by the Park Authority against Epping Forest District Council.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.</p>	<p><u>Glasshouses</u> The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the Park within 7.A.2 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: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the Naxeing Mead & Carthagea areas; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and 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 & Carthagea area; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. 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, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. 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.</p>
LB22.1	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			<p><i>continued</i> - The Association believes that the Park Authority should seek to redraft its policies to future-proof the sustainable development of the glasshouse industry in the Park, to reflect the value of retaining and enhancing glasshouse grown food production. - The Association believe Park Authority should seek to work with local partners, including local planning authorities to ensure that positive Park policies for glasshouse retention and development are included in the Park proposal and that food production is included as a key part of their plan. Thus ensuring the value of local food production in the Park, to serve local and wider communities as well as Greater London, is properly acknowledged.</p>	<p>Please refer to comment above</p>	<p>Please refer to 22.0</p>
LB22.2	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses	<p><i>continued.</i> - The Association request that the historic legacy of the glasshouse industry, and its current and future importance, be acknowledged within the proposals. - The Association suggests that other potential benefits of retaining a vibrant glasshouse horticulture industry, in areas like education, leisure and tourism, should be promoted within the park.</p>	<p>Please refer to comment above</p>	<p>Please refer to 22.0</p>

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB22.3	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses	<i>continued..</i> - The Association requests that there should be an independent review of the Park Authority Plan proposals and actions on planning matters concerning glasshouse sites. This review needs to take account of the needs of sustainable communities using the Park. We believe future decision making must be seen to be transparent and fair. Until such a review has been undertaken we ask for there to be a halt on any proposals to compulsory purchase land currently or last used for horticultural purposes in or adjacent to the Park. - The Association would be happy to discuss its concerns with the Park Authority and more widely with MPs, elected officials and other parties who share an interest in there being an open, transparent and fair process operating for those living, working and maintaining land within the Park, and for those who value sustainable food production.	Please refer to comment above	Please refer to 22.0
LB22.4	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Back-ground to Growers Assoc.	Formed in 1911, the Association became a branch of the National Farmers Union of England & Wales in 1926. Lea Valley glasshouse growers pre date the Lee Valley Regional Park by over a century. Lea Valley glasshouses are long established as part of the distinctive landscape character of the Lea Valley, with a history spanning three centuries. Our growers helped feed Britain with cucumbers and tomatoes during two world wars and led the world with the largest concentration of glasshouses in the Lea Valley (1,100) during the 1950's. The Lea Valley is known as the 'Cucumber Capital of England' and remains of national and regional importance for our nations local food supplies. We grow up to three quarters of Britain's cucumbers and half of Britain's sweet peppers, along with various other edible and ornamental produce that supply London and the UK with essential healthy fresh produce. The countryside has always been primarily a place for food production both inside and outside of the Lee Valley Regional Park and the Lea Valley remains the UK's most important glasshouse area for food production. Our role is important both nationally and for the sustainable growth of our capital city. Britain is a nation that cannot feed itself and food production in the UK is more important now than ever, as self-sufficiency levels for healthy fresh salad produce have fallen below 30%. This is against a backdrop of a growing population in the UK as a whole, and a population in London that is growing at double the rate of the rest of the UK.	Comments and background to the Growers Noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB22.5	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Back-ground to this consultation	The Association feels extremely strongly that the Park Authority has not consulted with them or engaged with them in a positive manner that reflects and respects the importance of their industry, its economic significance or importance to communities, the environment and the economy of Hertfordshire, London and Essex. The Association, alongside the Lea Valley Food Taskforce, has already formally requested that the Park Authority withdraw this consultation. Both organisations consider that it is inappropriate to bring forward this consultation, originally scheduled for April, while there are ongoing judicial reviews that are directly related to the proposals contained within this consultation. We believe there is a conflict of interest in running this proposal while these reviews are underway. We feel it would have been more appropriate for the Park Authority to consider the outcome of the judicial reviews and then meet with all stakeholders – not just the statutory bodies the Park Authority is legally obliged to consult with - to discuss the parameters for a properly fit-for-purpose open and transparent consultation.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly.	Please see ammended proposal above
LB22.6	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Back-ground to this consultation	We ask the Park Authority to review its position and look back to its original objectives. The very first recital of the 1966 Act makes it clear the establishment of the Park Authority was to promote the Park's objectives for 'recreation, sport, entertainment and the enjoyment of leisure' over the 'increasing demand for the development of land for housing, industrial and other urban purposes.' There is no mention of promoting the Park's objectives over the use of land for agriculture and horticulture. We believe the promoters of the Park envisaged an increase of land used for the Act's objectives, but for this to complement and not compete with land used for horticulture and agriculture.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly.	Please see ammended proposal above
LB22.7	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Back-ground to this consultation	A decline in the horticulture sectors during the period following the establishment of the new Park Authority gave an opportunity to promote the Park's objectives by developing then redundant horticultural sites for these objectives. However, forty nine years later we are in an entirely different place, and the pendulum of policy needs to swing back towards a balance of land uses that reflects the needs of sustainable communities within and outside the Park. Demand for horticultural and agricultural produce is increasing. We believe it is inappropriate in the context of the present day to use the 1966 Act's objectives to constrain and indeed introduce new proposals to re-use land that could be best used for the development of horticultural businesses in or adjacent to the Park. We believe that the proposals in this plan are not in keeping with the original intentions of the 1966 Act.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB22.8	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses & CPO	<p><u>Recommendation for a new approach.</u> The Association requests that the Park Authority commence a new consultation on how glasshouse development can be positively planned for and for this to be carried out in a positive, open and transparent manner. We ask for the Park Authority as a whole to move away from a policy of challenging local planning authority decision making, and a policy of proposing to acquire land that would be better retained for glasshouse use. We ask for a halt to any proposals for the compulsory purchase of land within the Park that is currently or was last used for horticulture or agriculture, until the overall Park Authority policy has been independently reviewed. We ask that all glasshouse sites, for which proposals have been written to take them out of long term horticultural use and put into low income generating use, to be designated for positive horticultural re-use in the first instance. We believe there is sufficient land within the park for recreational enhancement without the need for the compulsory purchase of glasshouse sites.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly. Please note that Proposal 7.A.2 and 7.A.3 have been amended and all reference to named sites or areas removed along with reference to CPO powers. Amended proposal text for Environment 7.A.2 is shown opposite</p>	<p><u>Glasshouses.</u> The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the Park within 7.A.2 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: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the Naxeing Mead & Carthagea areas; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and 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 & Carthagea area; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. 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, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. 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.</p>
LB22.9	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses	<p>We ask for the Park Authority's decision making to properly take into account the economic, social and environmental impacts of its proposals. We have not seen a sustainability appraisal or any economic appraisal of the impact of the proposals on existing businesses within the Park. We ask for both to be produced.</p>	<p>Comments noted please see above</p>	<p>Please see above</p>
LB22.10	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses	<p>We have suggested in our summary a clear, positive policy approach for including glasshouses in a compatible way in the Park. The Association is happy to present our detailed findings of the implications of the proposed policy and plan, but is concerned that the views of our members and their 2,500 employees are not being addressed in an open and transparent way. We therefore believe the Park Authority's Plan policy within the park should be independently assessed.</p>	<p>Comments noted please see above</p>	<p>Please see above</p>
LB22.11	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Area 5 Glass-houses	<p>The Association has regretfully come to this position because of previous experience of how the Park Authority has been seen to control decisions about land within and adjacent to the Lea Valley Park. For example, no consultation was undertaken by the Park with the Association or its members for the Area 5 Proposals at Sewardstone, which were adopted by the Park Authority in 2013 as follows</p> <p><i>Environment - "Sites in horticultural and agricultural use that lie between the reservoirs and Sewardstone Road to be enhanced with careful screening of the potentially negative impacts of buildings and other features. In the longer term, structures and uses which have a detrimental impact on recreational use, the openness of the area and on views across the valley to be removed, including through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary".</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. Area 5 proposals will be amended in line with Areas 6 and 7 in due course.</p>	<p>No change</p>

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB22.12	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses	We believe this type of negative planning policy is in direct conflict with the promotion of sustainable development and the need to retain and promote the unique food production that has shaped the countryside. The value of the Park to the region and nation as a rural farming resource should be acknowledged in Park Authority policy. Horticultural and agricultural businesses are at the heart of many rural communities. We believe the draft proposals have raised unnecessary and potentially damaging questions about the future of these businesses with the Park boundaries. The Association strongly believes our member's long established businesses should be promoted and proposals that increase their efficiency and modernise growing practices encouraged, not threatened with publicly-funded compulsory purchase.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above
LB22.13	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses	<u>Detailed Response to this consultation.</u> The Association believes the premise to oppose any substantial further development of the horticulture sector in or adjacent to the Park is fundamentally flawed and outdated. The proposed Plan's use of green belt policy also goes against recent developments of that policy in the last few years. The Association responded to the London Assembly 2009 consultation into the promotion of Commercial Food Growing in London. The planning and housing committee conducted a review of the role of the planning system in supporting horticulture in London, with a particular focus on commercial food growing. The aim was to assess how effectively the planning system supports and encourages food growing in London and calls for changes to the planning system to exploit the capital's potential to become more self-sufficient.	Please see comments above	Please see above
LB22.14	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			London Plan 7 food growing	<i>continued .. As a result the following relevant recommendations were made. <u>Recommendation 1</u> The Mayor should include in the London Plan reference to Green Belt Policy (PPG2). To better support the objectives of the London Food Strategy, Draft policy 7.16 (Green Belt) should specifically state that food growing is one of the most beneficial land uses in the Green Belt. Draft policy 7.16 should also include a requirement for boroughs to give added weight to food growing as one of the most productive activities in the Green Belt when preparing policies for their Local Development Frameworks. <u>Recommendation 8</u> The Mayor should add to policy 7.22 under "LDF Preparation" that Food Growing is one of the most productive land uses in the Green Belt and is relevant to Outer London Boroughs This vision reflects current thinking on sustainable development.</i>	Please see comments above	Please see above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB22.15	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Guiding Principles	The Association believes that the Park Authority is not following its own adopted guiding principles (shown in italics below) to shape these proposals • Partnership work – recognising that many of the proposals can only be delivered through the collective efforts of a range of partners, stakeholders and landowners. The Park Authority is failing to recognise the contribution of glasshouse landowners to the thriving rural economy of the Lea Valley and these proposals would damage this situation. • Regional Value – assessing the range of benefits that any particular facility or activity within the Park delivers to the people of Essex, Hertfordshire and London. The Park Authority's proposals fail to recognise the benefits the glasshouse sector brings to the local economy. • Multi-function and synergy – developing proposals which can be used to harness competing demands. These proposals, rather than promoting multi-functional synergies, actively set sectors against each other. Recent planning applications in the horticulture sector have clearly demonstrated how glasshouse developments can bring environmental enhancements to the area, and yet these have been opposed by the Park Authority.	Please see comments above	Please see above
LB22.16	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Guiding Principles	<i>continued ...</i> • Flexibility – the design and management of facilities and open spaces of the park in a way which responds to changing needs and demands. The Park Authority's inability to recognise the changing needs and demands of the growing rural economy demonstrates its inflexibility in practical policy and decision making. • Sustainability – ensuring that new development does not prejudice the lives of future generations. By actively working to constrain the development of the horticulture industry within the Park, the Park Authority is undermining the economic sustainability of those living and working in the Park. We do not think the proposals represent sustainable development or are future-proofed to take into account the increasing food requirements of London or the wider region.	Please see comments above	Please see above
LB22.17	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		General proposals	<u>Specific policy issues raised by this consultation.</u> We are concerned that the Plan proposes new gateways, land uses and features on or adjacent to glasshouse sites, without thought as to how the actual land uses and businesses on these sites should be best developed.	Comments noted	No change
LB22.18	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses	<u>Specific Area Responses</u> The Association recommends that all the proposals should be rethought in accordance with the summary recommendations at the start of this letter, as the proposed policies seek the long term removal of horticultural nurseries from within the Park, rather than re-using existing open space and heritage assets. We have not seen a sustainable appraisal of these policy choices.	Please see comments above	Please see changes made above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB22.23	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	7		7.A.2 Nazeing Meads & Carthage Landscape & Heritage	Glass-houses	<p><u>Area 7 Wetland Park – Spitalbrook to Roydon. Landscape & Heritage – Nazeing Meads & Nazeing Lagoon.</u> <i>"The open character of the valley floor to be protected from development to the rear of Properties in Nursery Road, nurseries to the west of North Road and at Sedge Green Nurseries. Over the longterm, non-Park compatible intrusive uses to be removed or their adverse impact mitigated including through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary. Avenue planting and block woodland planting to help provide a greater visual structure to the landscape and to provide visual screening of these intrusive uses when viewed from open parts of the Park".</i> This is another example of the Park Authority's proposed intention to purchase a thriving operating horticulture area. The Park Authority's strategy of visual screening by planting trees next to existing glasshouses needs to be reviewed as neglecting to maintain these and boundary drainage causes damage to glasshouse businesses. The Association believes the Park Authority should develop positive policies to embrace and encourage the horticultural industry.</p>	<p>This matter has been dealt within correspondence with the relevant parties. Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted</p>	See above amended proposal
LB22.24	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	7		7.A.2 Nazeing Meads & Carthage Environment	Glass-houses	<p><u>Environment – Productive Landscapes. Sedge Green, Nursery road, off from North Road & Dobbs Weir.</u> <i>"The Authority will resist significant expansion of existing glasshouse businesses or the location of new glasshouse businesses within the Park. Existing or historical horticultural glasshouse sites within the Wetland Park east at Sedge Green, Nursery Road, off from North Road and Dobbs Weir Road to be brought into recreational or leisure use in the longer term through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary. Development of non-Park compatible uses on former and existing glasshouse sites will also be resisted. Applications for the development of glasshouse uses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impacts of the development in relation to visual screening and limiting impacts upon recreational visitors and ecology".</i> This is another example of the authority's proposed intention to purchase land rather than work with existing landowners to meet the needs of sustainable communities. This is a thriving operating horticulture area that the proposals threaten to blight in the longer term. Again, the Park Authority's strategy of visual screening by planting trees next to existing glasshouses needs to be implemented in a way that does not damage the glasshouse business.</p>	<p>This matter has been dealt within correspondence with the relevant parties. Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted</p>	See above amended proposal

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB22.25	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	7		7.A.3 Glen Faba & Roydon Environment	Glass-houses	<p><u>Environment – Productive Landscapes - Netherhall</u> “The Authority will resist significant expansion of existing glasshouse businesses or the location of new glasshouse businesses within the Park. Existing or historical horticultural glasshouse sites at Netherhall within the Park boundary to continue in the short to medium term until the land can be brought into recreational or leisure use through the use of the authorities land purchasing powers if necessary. “Applications for the development of glasshouse uses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered to mitigate the impacts of the development in relation to visual screening and limiting impacts upon recreational visitors & ecology. 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 and carry out feasibility studies to identify development and 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 provided there is an overall increase in land devoted to park compatible uses and other PDF objectives are not prejudiced”.</p> <p>The Netherhall proposal is another that affects a thriving operating horticulture area.</p>	<p>This matter has been dealt within correspondence with the relevant parties. Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted</p>	See above amended proposal
LB22.26	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	7		7.A.3 Glen Faba & Roydon Environment	Glass-houses	<p>continued ... The Association fundamentally believes that glasshouse horticulture businesses are a 'Park-compatible' use of land, as they have been an intrinsic part of communities within the Park area for hundreds of years. Thus, the Association believes the premise behind the Park Authority's conditions on accepting land swap proposals is incorrect. We believe the expansion of glasshouse areas should be judged on meeting criteria for sustainable development, rather than any arbitrary cap on the glasshouse area within the Park boundaries.</p> <p>Again, this is an area where the Park Authority's strategy of visual screening by planting trees next to existing glasshouses, and the lack of maintenance of drainage, is causing damage to glasshouse businesses. Land in this area was originally allocated by the Park for displaced growers, however, the Park Authority have not kept this agreement and now refuses to enter into sale negotiations. The economic reality is that to remain competitive and survive, horticultural glasshouse businesses need to modernise infrastructure and facilities, and potentially expand in size. If this process is prevented, then sites can become uncompetitive and untenable as a site for a modern glasshouse business. The premise in these proposals, that these sites have been abandoned, is not correct. These sites have not been 'abandoned'. However, the constraints imposed by the Park Authority have meant it becomes unsustainable to run glasshouse businesses on some sites.</p>	As above	As above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

LB22.27	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Association believes this consultation uses an outdated and inappropriate view of today's glasshouse industry in the Lea Valley. The Park Authority is out of line with the current thinking of local planning authorities. We believe the Park Authority should consult on proposals that genuinely sought to unite rather than divide views across stakeholders in the community – the kind of approach that has been working well within the Lea Valley Food Taskforce. The Association maintains that these proposals should not have been published for consultation at the same time as sites covered by the proposals are subject to ongoing judicial reviews. The Association reiterates its request for these proposals to be withdrawn and a proper stakeholder-inclusive protocol for developing these Plan proposals be developed in its place.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.</p>	<p>See above amended proposal</p>
SR28.0	Level 2 Licenced Angling Coach (DH)	7	7.A.2		<p>Having read your plans proposing an Angling Centre at the ESSA site on the Central Lagoon at Nazeing I feel I must comment and object. As a Senior Licenced Angling Coach of some 9 years standing and experience feel that the choice of site is flawed. If you are coaching beginners then the ideal environment is a small lake with 20 swims with fishing platforms. The stocking of the lake is controlled so that these beginners start regularly catching fish from the outset without long periods of inactivity. I have coached beginners for these years on a small club lake with a high stocking of a variety of fish. This is the way forward as also practiced by Hooked on Fishing based in Ealing where they have a Classroom/ Coaching Facility sited in the middle of a complex of small lakes and ponds. To use the Central Lagoon of some 80 acres that has been ravaged by Cormorants to the extent that is now devoid of the small fish is the wrong way to start beginners Fishing. I applaud the idea of an indoor environment for teaching the theory of Angling but the site is wrong having a limited frontage devoid of fish. In my previous contacts with the LVRPA regarding Coaching, particularly juniors the Parks have always stepped back rather than become involved citing Child Protection as the reason.</p>	<p>Comments and objection noted. Feasibility work will help to identify the range of angling facilities that can be delivered at this location and how a Centre for Angling might operate. It is recognised that Central Lagoon is both a large gravel pit and integral to the flood relief system. Currently the biomass is predominantly very large specimen species, suitable for competent/ advanced anglers. The Proposal has been amended to provide more detail (refer also to OA11.7</p>	<p>Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Recreation & Sport - Undertake feasibility work with stakeholders to develop Establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon, including to include a secure car park, new swims and replacement lakeside building catering for both anglers and general Park visitor. This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre sailing & boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating & sailing groups. Feasibility work will cover the provision of facilities at both Nazeing Central Lagoon and at Holyfield Lake (Area 6) and will need to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6; • the associated constraints and options relating to the shared use of facilities between different water based clubs and groups; • the range & type of angling provision that can be delivered at Central Lagoon; • the scale and design of new built facilities required at Central Lagoon taking account of the Green Belt location; • the flood management role of the Nazeing Central Lagoon; • other environmental and access issues

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR29.0	Towpath Fishery & Ware Angling Club	6 to 8		Fishing	<p>Having been sent a copy of your Park Development documentation I would like to comment as follows. I am reporting as part of the Management Team for the Towpath Fishery which is managed by Ware Angling Club and Hertford Anglings Club and as such we rent waters from the Lea Valley Regional Parks. The Towpath Fishery rents water on the River Lea Navigation between Hertford and Broxbourne and from the Lee Valley Regional Parks it is waters at Dobbs Weir and Carthagen. The Towpath Fishery can give access to approximately 3,000 angling club members. There are also Day Tickets available from the Bailiff for visiting anglers and this could mean a further 500 anglers take up the opportunity to fish the venues. As an action plan the Towpath Fishery are looking to hold Fishing Matches and encourage Junior Angling. This year has already seen this plan taken forward with organised matches and a Junior match with 40 competitors. The management team continue to look at ideas to Promote Angling for the future.</p>	Comments noted	No change
SR29.1	Towpath Fishery & Ware Angling Club	6 to 8		Access to the river	<p>One failure with the modern day angler is that they are reluctant to walk far to pick a spot to fish. (Perhaps they are carrying too much tackle) But in days gone by it was not unusual to see anglers from London catching the early morning trains from out to ensure they got the best swim on the river. Alas now days it seems to be cars are the mode of transport. Therefore accessibility to the river needs adequate, safe and suitable parking. If this request could be developed by the planners, I know that more anglers from both locally and those travelling will take up fishing within the Lee Valley. Our fishing clubs have an excellent working relationship with your Fisheries Team. Within the development plans should any additional waters become available for fishing I hope that consideration could be given to allow us to work in partnership with the LVRP and take on new rents. Thanking you for allowing us to make this representation.</p>	Comments noted and passed to the Fisheries and Angling Manager	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.0	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 to 8			<p>ESSA</p> <p>Further to our attendance at the Upper Lee Valley Regeneration and Planning Committee Meeting 23 October 2014, please find enclosed the Trustee's response to the above proposals. Included within our representation are the results of a detailed feasibility study supported by costing information. We very much hope that Officers will take time to carefully consider all our comments and recommendations. This is the first time we have been notified of these proposals and then only in a public document. The ESSA Trustees are extremely concerned that the published proposals in Areas 6, 7 & 8 contain both inaccurate and detrimental comments about our registered charity and, as detailed in our response Section 2 pages 5-8, we have asked for these to be removed. This is a public document issued by LVRPA following its approval by members and for it to contain such wording as 'underused recreation facilities' and our neighbours 'Broxbourne Sailing Club is more thriving' is particularly galling when, in 2014 we had: 120 volunteers giving a total of 1064 visits and 5955 volunteer hours, who between them provided: 3197 sessions for 2296 children/young persons between 9 and 18 years 352 sessions for 280 Adults</p>	<p>Comments and detail about volunteers and visits noted. All representations have been considered in detail by officers and will be reported to Members for further consideration alongside proposed amendments. It should be noted that the wording "underused recreational facilities" appears in the Carthage Environmental Strategy and is a general issue raised in relation to the Carthage area as a whole and not linked to the ESSA Water Activities Centre; the photograph in the document illustrating this point shows a picnic table. The second quote is from the same document from the section outlining the 'Context and landscape appraisal'. In full the statement reads " - ESSA Water Activities centre: a schools and scouts sailing centre on the west bank of the middle lagoon, - Broxbourne Sailing Club: private watersports centre on the south bank of the north lagoon (larger and apparently more thriving than ESSA)". The Carthage Environmental Statement is a background document.</p>	<p>No change but please see amendment below.</p>
SR30.1	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7			<p>ESSA</p> <p>Throughout the proposals, LVRPA have declared their 'support' for private member clubs, whereas ESSA Water Activities Centre is only mentioned in derogatory terms and in relation to a proposed relocation which would adversely affect our income from session fees and our ability to obtain grant funding. Therefore, we would like: - All detrimental comments removed from all documents produced by LVRPA. - An accurate & balanced representation of our activities within the proposals comparable with the many favourable comments in respect of private member only sailing clubs. - An explanation to be provided to the Trustees as to how the mis-representation of our charity and how unsubstantiated detrimental wording came to be included in these proposals without officers of the Authority checking whether they are accurate. We note that XXX was, at his request, provided with extensive written information on our activities, volunteer numbers & users during our recent lease negotiations. - A written apology to be provided to the Trustees of our charity for the inaccurate and detrimental references contained within a public document issued by the LVRPA. For the avoidance of doubt, ESSA Water Activities Centre is not a private members club: there is no membership fee, only a charge for the session booked and it is managed and run by volunteers. It is therefore fully consistent with LVRPA strategic aims to attract visitors to the park and to encourage facilities to be provided on a 'pay and play' basis.</p>	<p>Comments noted. These have been dealt with through correspondence directly with ESSA.</p>	<p>Please see amendment below</p>

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.2	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7 & 6		7.A.2 & 6.A.4	ESSA	<p>Moving onto the proposals, our key concerns are as follows: 1. Our initial feasibility study of the LVRPA proposal to <u>relocate ESSA to Holyfield Lake</u> indicates that it would take 3 years of planning and execution by paid staff, specialist transportation of our boats, equipment, and storage containers. Removal costs alone would amount to £50,000 with a total cost of over £1m. Consultation with some of our existing group users has revealed that they would not consider travelling the additional distance to Holyfield Lake, indicating there would be a loss of income to the charity at the new location. With no business case for a move, it would be unlikely to attract the substantial grant funding required to give effect to this proposal. Furthermore, the proposed relocation of ESSA to Holyfield Lake is impractical and would be to the detriment of both ESSA and Fishers Green Sailing Club (FGSC) in that ESSA would, on child protection grounds, require the sole use of the existing buildings at the same times as these would otherwise be used by FGSC. We understand that a possible area for ESSA has been identified at Holyfield Lake. However, this would require a new building, new foreshore and utilities to be provided by LVRPA at their cost before the proposed move could take place. Furthermore, there could be a conflict with the proposed expansion of the power distribution station on what we believe to be the identified potential site.</p>	<p>Comments and findings of the ESSA initial feasibility study noted. It is agreed that the proposal to relocate ESSA requires detailed feasibility work. This would need to consider a range of options and the advantages and disadvantages of each. The cost of implementing each option would be a major factor in any decision made. For each option there is a need to consider the cost of moving ESSA to Holyfield Lake alongside the cost of retaining current facilities at Central Lagoon factoring in cost of future upgrades and improvements to facilities. The requirement for separate facilities on child protection grounds is a valid point and an amendment to the draft proposals under 7.A.2 Sport and Recreation was made prior to consultation. Further amendments will be made to proposals under both 7.A.2 and 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation and 7.A.2 Visitors to clarify the need for detailed feasibility work. Please refer to Area 6 document for changes to 6.A.4. (Refer also to SR28.0)</p>	<p>Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Recreation & Sport - Undertake feasibility work with stakeholders to develop Establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon, including to include a secure car park, new swims and replacement lakeside building catering for both anglers and general Park visitor. This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre sailing & boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating & sailing groups. Feasibility work will cover the provision of facilities at both Nazeing Central Lagoon and at Holyfield Lake (Area 6) and will need to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6; • the associated constraints and options relating to the shared use of facilities between different water based clubs and groups; • the range & type of angling provision that can be delivered at Central Lagoon; • the scale and design of new built facilities required at Central Lagoon taking account of the Green Belt location; • the flood management role of the Nazeing Central Lagoon; • other environmental and access issues
SR30.3	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7 & 6		7.A.2 & 6.A.4		<p>2. To achieve the proposed <u>Centre of Angling Excellence at Central Lagoon</u> would require extensive repairs to the fore-shore, new buildings, substantial upgrading of the access track from Meadgate Road to allow vehicle access and a car park with the loss of some of the existing fishing swims. To have an unsupervised building and main services facilities at Central Lagoon would place this area at greater risk of trespass and vandalism in an area where there are already concerns about uses inconsistent with the land uses appropriate to the Lee Valley Regional Park. LVRPA also have proposed to provide angling facilities at Amwell Pits only 4 miles away and much better served by public transport and roads: the area does not require two centres of angling close together.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Feasibility work in relation to a Centre for Angling will need to consider a range of factors including access and security. Proposals will be amended under 7.A.2 Sport & Recreation to make this clearer. It should be noted that Amwell Pits (Area 8) are now in private ownership. It is not therefore feasible to create a centre for angling at this location.</p>	<p>No change under Area 6 but proposal text amended under 7.A.2 Sport & Recreation, please see above.</p>

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.4	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7 & 6	Just 7	7.A.2 & 6.A.4	ESSA	3. The proposal that the <u>general public should have access to the ESSA owned and maintained toilets</u> on our existing site are wholly impractical. LVRPA would have to design and build new facilities meeting current standards. It would also raise serious safeguarding issues due to the age of our users, almost all of whom are aged 9-18 years, with some having special needs.	Comments noted. The shared use of existing ESSA toilets is an option discussed in the Carthagen Environmental Strategy a supporting document to the PDF. Further feasibility work would be needed regarding the provision of toilets and other visitor facilities in this area. Note also changes to proposals for Carthagen given alternative site for wild camping. Amendments will be made under Area 7, Visitors 7.A.2 Carthagen to clarify the position.	Amend text under 7.A.2 Visitors as follows: " Carthagen - Visitor access to be improved by Opportunities for day camping and sustainable 'off grid' visitor accommodation to be developed through; - opening up existing overgrown vegetation (gardens from former cleared dwellings), south of Meadgate Road, to form a series of interconnecting rides and glades with level grassed camping areas, -investigating feasibility of designing & constructing a limited number of carbon neutral sustainable huts, both for hire & as a demonstration project in partnership with higher or further education body, the peninsula of land north of Meadgate Rd in south west corner of north Lagoon would be preferred location, - Exploring options for possibility of creating/ reinstating a pedestrian link through from the Lee Navigation towpath across Carthagen Lock over the River Lee and onto Spitalbrook using existing bridges, - Support facilities to be provided through shared use of existing ESSA toilets and a new small informal car park adjacent to southern edge of Meadgate Road. "
SR30.5	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7 & 6		7.A.2 & 6.A.4	ESSA	4. The proposal is to provide unregulated <u>public day camping</u> at Central Lagoon is impractical. The area around Central Lagoon is the most remote from public footpaths, roads and facilities and there are already concerns about possible trespass in this area. It would be more practical and cost effective to provide day camping at Dobbs Weir Caravan Site which is to be enhanced as a visitor centre as there are already existing facilities and management of the site is already in place. 5. The area identified for <u>LVRPA Schools camping</u> on our site is not practical as it is on our foreshore, furthest from our facilities, on the wettest part of our leased land and next to a public footpath. ESSA already provides camping facilities to scout, guide and other groups nearer our facilities.	Comments noted, the points made relate to the Carthagen Environmental Strategy. The Strategy option for schools camping on the ESSA site has not been included in the Area 7 Visitors Proposals. The reference to 'sustainable huts' is included under Visitor Proposal 7.A.2 but in the context of the need for feasibility work. This aspect of the proposal has now been deleted due to alternative location for wild camping which is now operational.	Please refer to amendments made in response to SR30.4
SR30.6	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA	ESSA Water Activities Centre is a registered charity (RYA Training Centre and AALA registered) and for the last 21 years has been based at Central Lagoon providing the 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. Our philosophy is that any young person should be able to sail without the requirement to pay a membership fee or invest in special clothing or equipment. The Trustees are willing to meet with LVRPA Officers and Councillors to discuss our issues, concerns and recommendations. In order to give officers a better understanding of the work of our charity, we would like to invite you and your colleagues to visit to our site at Central Lagoon at any mutually convenient time.	Comments and request for meeting noted. There is currently an ongoing dialogue with officers over the future of the site.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.7	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	<u>Executive Summary Key Proposals: To relocate ESSA to Holyfield Lake and allow the general public to use ESSA toilets</u> 1. ESSA Water Activities Centre (ESSA) is a registered charity (RYA Training Centre and AALA registered) and for the last 21 years has been based at Central Lagoon providing '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. Our philosophy is that any young person should be able to sail without the requirement to pay a membership fee or invest in special clothing or equipment. ESSA provides the boats, equipment, instructors, waterproofs and safety crew for activities. ESSA Water Activities Centre is not a private members club: there is no membership fee, only a charge for the session booked and it is managed and run by 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 users include scout and guide groups, primary school children, special needs schools and the general public from Hertfordshire, Essex and London. All our adult volunteers are enhanced DBS checked and we have RYA safeguarding procedures in place.	Comments and detail about ESSA's operations noted	No change
SR30.8	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 to 8			ESSA	2. Throughout the proposals for areas 5,6,7,8, LVRPA state that they 'actively support' named private members only sailing clubs. However, there are only consistently negative, detrimental and wholly inaccurate references to and observations about ESSA Water Activities Centre, (itemised in Section 2), with a disproportionate focus on our leased land of approx 3 acres e.g. relocating our boat storage area, altering our camping arrangements etc when compared to the larger schemes of developing Banbury and King George V Reservoirs, and visitor facilities elsewhere in the park where no supporting detail is provided.	Comments noted. The Carthagena Environmental Strategy does contain detail in relation to the ESSA site which has helped inform proposals. However the draft Proposals do not contain the same level of detail and generally recognise the need for more feasibility work to examine options , including in relation to the proposal to relocate ESSA onto Holyfield Lake.	Please refer to amendments under 30.2 above.
SR30.9	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA	3. Central Lagoon is ideal for use by young persons who have never participated in water activities since it has a good area of water, good visibility for safety cover, lack of weeds and has a useable depth of water and it is not shared with any other water activities (Section 3).	Comments noted. Central Lagoon is used by anglers	No change
SR30.10	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA	4. Our initial feasibility study for the proposal to <u>relocate ESSA to Holyfield Lake</u> indicates that it would take 3 years of planning and execution by paid staff, specialist transportation of our boats, equipment, and storage containers. Removal costs alone would amount to £50,000. Consultation with some of our group users has revealed that they would not consider travelling the additional distance to Holyfield Lake, indicating there would be a loss of income to the charity at the new location. With no business case for such a move, it would be unlikely to attract the substantial grant funding required to give effect to this proposal (Section 4).	Please refer to the response made under 30.2 above	Please refer to the response made under 30.2 above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.11	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA	5. The relocation of ESSA to Holyfield Lake is impractical and would be to the detriment of both ESSA and Fishers Green Sailing Club (FGSC) in that ESSA Water Activities Centre would require sole use of the existing buildings at the same times as these would otherwise be used by FGSC. We understand that a possible area for ESSA has been identified by Fishers Green Sailing Club at Holyfield Lake. However, this would require a new building, new foreshore and utilities to be provided by LVRPA before the proposed move could take place (Section 5).	Please refer to the response made under 30.2 above	Please refer to the response made under 30.2 above
SR30.12	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA	6. The proposal that the <u>general public should have access to ESSA Water Activities Centre owned and maintained toilets</u> is not practical. LVRPA would have to build new facilities meeting current standards. It would also raise serious safeguarding issues due to the age of our users (mainly 9-18 years) some of whom have special needs (Section 6).	Please refer to the response made under 30.4 above	Please refer to the response made under 30.4 above
SR30.13	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Accommodation	7. The proposal is to provide unregulated <u>public day camping</u> at Central Lagoon, Northern Lagoon and Carthegena estate. The area around Central Lagoon is the most remote from public footpaths, roads and facilities and there are already concerns about possible trespass in this area. It would be more practical and cost effective to provide day camping at Dobbs Weir Caravan Site which is to be enhanced as a visitor centre as there are already existing facilities and management of the site is already in place (Section 7).	Comments noted, the points made relate to the detail provided by the Carthagena Environmental Strategy. The Strategy option for day camping has been deleted from 7.A.2 due to alternative location for wild camping which is now operational.	Please refer to amendment above under SR30.4
SR30.14	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 to 8		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Angling	8. To achieve the proposed Centre of Angling Excellence at central lagoon would require extensive repairs to the fore-shore, new buildings, substantial upgrading of the access track from Meadgate Road to allow vehicle access and a car park with the loss of some of the existing fishing swims. Central Lagoon is less popular with anglers than the other waters included within the Nazeing Meads permit and has electricity pylons making it less suitable for fishing. To have an unsupervised building with main services facilities at Central Lagoon would place this area at greater risk of trespass and vandalism in an area where there are already concerns about uses inconsistent with the land uses appropriate to the Lee Valley Regional Park. The proposals also refer to developing angling facilities with disabled swims at Amwell Pits which is only 4 miles away from Central Lagoon, is accessible by existing public transport and roads and has a car park. This would be a more cost effective way to achieve the aims of the LVRPA as well as being easier to achieve and more environmentally sustainable (Section 8).	Please refer to the response made under SR30.3 above	Please refer to the response made under SR30.3 above
SR30.15	ESSA Water Activities Centre			7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Accommodation	9. The area identified for LVRPA Schools camping on our site is not practical as it is on our foreshore, furthest from our facilities, on the wettest part of our leased land and next to a public footpath which has been used to cut fencing in order to gain unauthorised access to our site. ESSA already provides camping facilities for scout/guide groups and others nearer our site facilities.	Comments noted, the points made relate to the Carthagena Environmental Strategy. The Strategy option for schools camping on the ESSA site has not been included in the Area 7 Visitors Proposals.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.16	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA	LVRPA Officers have not discussed with the Trustees of ESSA Water Activities Centre the feasibility of any of these proposals and have only presented them as 'fait accompli' in new terms within our lease which were subsequently removed (in July 2014) or presented as draft proposals to Executive Committee and Upper Lee Valley Regeneration & Planning Committee without prior notification to ESSA Water Activities Centre in October 2014. It would have been preferable if LVRPA Officers had discussed these proposals with ESSA prior to publication, which would have complied with their stated aim of engagement with stakeholders and user groups and would have prevented the misrepresentation of ESSA Water Activities Centre in their proposals which are now contained in public documents.	Comments noted. Officers have been in discussion with representatives from ESSA regarding the lease and current proposals to bring areas of land at Carthagena back into open space use as the Authority increases its ownership in the area. Further discussion will be undertaken when the feasibility phase of proposals for the angling centre and a centre for watersports at Holyfield Lake are initiated	No change
SR30.17	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA Background	1. <u>Introduction.</u> ESSA Water Activities Centre (ESSA), formerly known as Enfield Scout Sailing Association, has, since 1981, provided sailing facilities for scouts initially at Banbury Reservoir and was first registered as a charity on 3/9/1993. In December 1994, we relocated to our current site at Central Lagoon, Meadgate Road, Nazeing. A new Constitution was adopted on 14/4/2013 together with the change of name to ESSA Water Activities Centre and it is an independent charity registered with the Charity Commission. The Charity's objectives are to promote the development of young people in achieving their full potential physically, intellectually and socially through the medium of sailing and other water-based activities. The methods of achieving the objects of the charity are through running training courses for all ages, for the development of skills and achievement of qualifications and awards of the relevant National Governing Bodies. ESSA Water Activities Centre is regulated by the Royal Yacht Association (RYA) as a training centre, as well as the Adventure Activities Licensing Authority (AALA) and both regulators regularly inspect ESSA for compliance. On 7 April 2014, we had an RYA inspection which reported that ESSA is "a well managed and organised centre". ESSA is recognised as an RYA Training Centre, open to the general public on a 'pay and play' basis, by booking through our website, and provides all the boats, equipment, instructors, waterproof clothing and safety cover required for children, young persons and adults.	Comments and background on ESSA noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.18	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA Back-ground We also provide sailing and water activity opportunities for brownie, cub, guide and scout groups, schools including those for children with special needs. Our volunteers and young persons using our Centre come from Hertfordshire, Essex, London & from time to time from abroad for Scout/Guide events. This geographical coverage reflects the catchment area of visitors to the LVRPA. ESSA Water Activities Centre also provides camping facilities for Guide and Scout Groups whilst completing activities for their Duke of Edinburgh awards. We also undertake maintenance and training sessions with the volunteer crew during the quieter winter season. The main difference between ESSA Water Activities Centre and other sailing venues within the LVRPA, is that we are <u>open to all on a 'pay and play' basis</u> (2011 Park Development Framework 2: Sailing and rowing map page 45) - we are not a private members club. Our philosophy is that there should be no barrier to any young person who wishes to sail. There is no membership fee: we provide the boats and equipment, enabling anyone who has not tried sailing to do so without incurring the cost of owning and maintaining a boat, purchasing waterproof clothing and a buoyancy aid. All our income is derived from persons attending our courses and activities. As a charity, we have received some small grants towards the cost of buoyancy aids etc (http://www.essa.org.uk/booking/4572367546).	Comments and background on ESSA noted	No change
SR30.19	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA <u>Activities:</u> ESSA Water Activities Centre is open every weekend throughout the year. In addition, during our main activity season (1 April to 30 September) we are open Tues evenings, all day Wed, Thurs and Fri evenings. During the winter season, there is some sailing, power boat courses and volunteers undertake boat and site maintenance and crew training. During 2014, our programme included RYA Stage 1 & Stage 2 Sailing, Dragon boating, wobble boarding, rowing, traditional rafting, canoeing, kayaking, RYA Powerboat Levels 1 & 2, safety boat and first aid courses. We also held multi activity sessions for groups, Duke of Edinburgh Award Canoe Expeditions, preparations for a D of E Cycling expedition and scout/guide group overnight camping for: <u>Age under 18</u> - 2296 children/young persons between 9 and 18 years, Attending 3197 sessions. <u>Age over 18</u> - 280 Adults Attending 352 sessions. <u>Total</u> 2486 children/young persons/adults Attending 3459 Sessions provided by ESSA during 2014. The above exclude Volunteer Leaders who attend and assist their groups mostly on land.	Comments and background on ESSA activities noted	No change
SR30.20	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA <u>Volunteers</u> ESSA Water Activities Centre is managed by volunteers, mostly under the age of 25 years, who cover administration, site maintenance, water safety cover, instructors and some have become our Charity Trustees. There are no paid staff. All volunteers are known as "ESSA Crew". There is no membership fee, and those who provide water activity instruction and safety cover are suitably qualified and hold first aid certificates. The RYA Principal/Centre Manager is responsible for the organisation of ESSA Crew with a process of annual review and a training programme to improve skills to a higher level. <u>In 2014, our volunteer crew numbered 120 persons who made 1064 visits giving ESSA Water Activities Centre 5955 volunteer hours.</u>	Comments and detail about volunteers noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.21	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA Back-ground	<u>Safeguarding</u> Our main objective as a charity is to provide 'grassroots' water activities and qualifications for children and young persons aged between 9 – 18 years. There is therefore a child protection policy in place, and every adult volunteer must hold an Enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service Certificate. Volunteers aged 16-18 must hold an enhanced DBS certificate if they are engaged in any unsupervised instruction role e.g. Assistant Instructor. One of the adult ESSA Crew has been appointed as Safeguarding Officer and with our RYA Principal/Centre Manager have undertaken the appropriate training to fulfil those responsibilities.	Comments about safeguarding noted.	No change
SR30.22	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.1 Sport & rec and Environment	ESSA Back-ground	<u>Maintenance of trees and Central Lagoon</u> With the permission of LVRPA, the trees within our leased site have been maintained by qualified volunteers at our own cost. However, the woodland around Central Lagoon has been neglected for many years, and fishermen have complained that it is difficult to cast with so many willow trees that have fallen into the water. We therefore support the recommendation that LVRPA should carry out long overdue woodland and shoreline maintenance. We have also reported to LVRPA two areas of Japanese Knotweed on the eastern and southern side of Central Lagoon; treatment of these areas has been omitted from the proposals (Area 7 Proposals: 7A1 page 9 Giant Hogweed).	Comments noted - these are site management and maintenance issues and will be passed on to the grounds maintenance team.	No change
SR30.23	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 to 8			ESSA	2. <u>Corrections Required to LVRPA's Documents & Proposals.</u> We would draw attention to the extensive positive comments in the proposals and support offered to sailing clubs and water based activity centres within Lee Valley Regional Park, these include: - Support the range of sailing activities at Hertford County Yacht Club (Area 8 Proposals: page 3) at Stanstead Abbots Lake which cater for the casual sailor through to the serious racing enthusiast.(Area 8 Proposals: 8A1 Page 6). - Support the range of sailing activity and training from beginner to world class sailor offered by the <u>Broxbourne Sailing Club</u> on the North lagoon and the facilities they provide for disabled sailing.(Area 7 Proposals: 7A2 Page 12). • <u>Broxbourne Sailing Club</u> is more thriving (Carthage Environmental Strategy Page 13) • Active recreation ... <u>Fishers Green Sailing Club</u> (Area 6 Proposals: Page 2). - Promote and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Explore options with stake-holders to relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake (i.e. <u>move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake</u> (Area 6 Proposals: 6A4 Page19)). - Explore opportunities to improve facilities at the <u>Lee Valley Boat Centre</u> (Area 6 Proposals: 6A4 Page19). - Explore with Thames Water and other stakeholders the use of <u>Banbury Reservoir</u> for watersports, options to include sailing and paddle boarding.(Area 5 Proposals: 4A1 Page 14 and Page 22 Thematic Proposals)	Comments noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.24	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 to 8		ESSA	<p><i>continued</i> . .Development of new sailing & water sports facilities <u>King George V Sailing Club</u>, there are opportunities to enhance improve and diversify the water sports provision.(Area 5 Proposals: Page 10, 15 and map page 23). • Develop synergies, improve coach/car parking...<u>Herts Young Mariners Base (HYMB)</u> (Area 6 Proposals; 6A4 Item 3, Page 14) • Support and retain the existing provision for...boat hire at Broxbourne Gateway, (Area 6: 6A4 Page 15). Hertford County Yacht Club is indicated on the baseline map (Area 8 Thematic Baseline map) • Maintain and enhance facilities for visitor and recreational moorings, boat repair and maintenance and other boat related services at Stanstead Marina to support recreational use of the waterways (Area 8 Proposals: Page 6) • Opportunities for recreational visitor moorings and boating focal points to be developed at Ware and Stanstead Abbots. Recreational moorings and support facilities to be improved (Area 8 Proposals: Page 11) • Work with and support the operators of water based facilities at <u>Lea Rowing Club</u> and <u>Leaside Canoe Centre</u> together with British Waterways to identify measures to increase levels of public accessibility and participation (Area 2A1 Proposals: page 17)</p>	Comments Noted	No change
SR30.25	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7		ESSA	<p>This is in sharp contrast to the consistently negative, detrimental and wholly inaccurate references to and observations about ESSA Water Activities Centre. Considering in 2014 we had 120 volunteers providing 3459 sessions for 2296 children/young persons and 280 Adults, the following comments in the proposals are wholly misleading and mis-represent the scale and scope of our activities as detailed in our introduction to this re-presentation. 5658-01-05 Baseline Sport & Recreation: ESSA Water Activities Centre is not shown on the map as a Sailing and Water Activity Centre despite being a grassroots charity for children and young persons that has been on the Central Lagoon site for 21 years. 5658-01-023 Proposals Map Area 7: Explore Options To Relocate Sailing Club To Holyfield Lake & Establish New Centre For Angling At Central Lagoon.</p>	Comments noted. The Sport and Recreation baseline map will be amended to include a notation for sailing and water activities on the Central Lagoon. This notation will also apply to the North Lagoon. The Proposals Map will also be revised so that the notation that refers to exploring options to "relocate sailing club" will read "Explore options with stakeholders to relocate the ESSA Water Activities Centre to Holyfield Lake and establish new centre for Angling at Central Lagoon"	Amend the Sport & Recreation Baseline map. Revise 'Sailing' notation to read Sailing and Water activities. Add this notation to the Central Lagoon. Remove blue shading. Revise the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map. The notation that refers to exploring options to "relocate sailing club" to be revised so it reads as follows: "Explore options with stakeholders to relocate the ESSA Water Activities Centre to Holyfield Lake and establish new centre for Angling at Central Lagoon"
SR30.26	ESSA Water Activities Centre		Carthage-na Environmental Study	ESSA	<p><i>continued</i>... ESSA Water Activities Centre is moving to Holyfield Lake (Area 6 Proposals: 6A4 Page19) • Explore options to relocate ESSA Water Activities Centre (Area 6: 6A4 Page 19, Area 7: Page 11 (twice)) • Underused recreation facilities (Environmental Strategy dated September 2012 Page 13) • Rationalise[d] boat parking (Environmental Strategy dated September 2012 Page 14). • Provision to be made for cycle parking and facilities to be jointly used by anglers (No reference is made to ESSA Water Activities Centre users) (Area 7 Proposals: 7A3 page 16) • ESSA Water Activities Centre location is not shown on the Park Development Framework map which only shows the private, member only, sailing clubs (2011 Park Development Frame 2: Sport & Recreation page 41) • Use areas 2 & 3 of our leased land for LVRPA School Camping (Carthage-na ES5 Proposals, page 17 and Fig 45 Long Term master plan): this would reduce our income potential, and there are safety and safeguarding issues • Allow public footpaths to run through our leased site: this would have security and safeguarding issues.</p>	Comments noted. In 2012 the Authority commissioned consultants to produce draft landscape proposals for areas of landscape stress in the northern part of the Park. Hence the 3 background documents for Spitalbrook, Carthage-na and Wharf Road. These are all areas where the Authority is the principle landowner and a more detailed approach to drafting proposals is possible. The Strategy option for schools camping on the ESSA site has not been included in the Area 7 Visitors Proposals, nor has the the proposal for the public footpath.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.27	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7			<p>ESSA</p> <p>Considering the extensive area covered by LVRPA (26 miles), the more important improvements & future work suggested e.g. Thames Water Depot, land adjoining the Waterworks Centre (Area 2A6 sub-area page19), Hackney Marshes (Area 2A7 Page 21 develop sport and recreation facilities), Broxbourne Gateway and other areas, there seems to be a dis-proportionate focus on (Carthagena ES Report Fig 4: Master-plan) land leased by ESSA Water Activities Centre (approximately 3 acres) and how we use it by changing where we store our boats and 'swapping' small parts of our leased land for different usage (Carthagena ES Report page 1) in other areas; and proposing to relocate ESSA Water Activities Centre to Holyfield Lake. The number of recommendations in the Carthagena ES Report and proposals relating to ESSA Water Activities Centre in general are disproportionate when compared to the rest of the Area 6, 7 and 8 proposals. The Charity Trustees are concerned that the above comments give a strong indication of a widespread prevailing negative attitude to ESSA within the Authority and this indicates that LVRPA do not wish to support or develop ESSA Water Activities Centre.</p>	<p>In 2012 the Authority commissioned consultants to produce draft proposals for areas of landscape stress in the northern part of the Park. Hence the 3 background environmental strategy documents for Spitalbrook, Carthagena and Wharf Road. These are all areas where the Authority is the principle landowner and a more detailed approach to drafting proposals is possible. The detail in the Environmental Strategy has not been transposed to the Area Proposals as it is recognised that further feasibility work is needed.</p>	<p>No change</p>
SR30.28	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			<p>ESSA lease arrangements</p> <p>Furthermore, that the numerous references in a public document to our relocation is detrimental to the business and future of our registered charity, furthermore: <u>Length of lease:</u> The ESSA Water Activities Centre Trustees note that some private member only sailing clubs have been awarded long leases of 25 years, which have enabled them to obtain substantial funding for major refurbishment work. However, in 2014 ESSA Water Activities Centre was only granted a 3 year lease with a 6 monthly break clause, which denies our charity the opportunity of accessing the substantial funding required to repair our foreshore and buildings, provide disabled toilets and install a shore lift for use by those with disabilities. <u>Rent charged:</u> There is a substantial detrimental disparity between the rent charged by LVRPA to private member clubs and ESSA. The rent paid by ESSA in 2014 is a full commercial rent with no discounts available to us as a young person's charity, and is approximately £243.75 per acre, whereas the other private Sailing Clubs are charged much lower rents e.g. the lowest being £55.55 per acre.</p>	<p>The Authority when acquiring land has inherited in at least 2 cases private member sailing clubs who enjoyed long leases with renewal rights protected by the provisions of the Landlord & Tenant Act 1954. These arrangements have necessarily been continued. The Authority has a longstanding aim of establishing a Centre of Excellence for Water Sports with land & water at Holyfield Lake being considered a suitable location for this. A further aim is to establish a Centre for Angling with the Central Lagoon identified as the preferred location. This location is at present leased to ESSA & is a shared facility for water sports & angling. The desire to re-locate water sports to a Centre of Excellence at Holyfield Lake is the reason ESSA have been granted a short lease with mutual break clauses. The rent paid by ESSA was freely entered into by their trustees and in the Authority's opinion represents open market value. The Authority is statutorily bound by provisions of S123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to achieve the best consideration for its property assets. The rents quoted by ESSA are historic comparisons & do not represent current open market rental values.</p>	<p>No change</p>

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.29	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA	<p><u>Limit on number of sailing dinghies:</u> There are more onerous conditions applying to ESSA Water Activities Centre than to any other sailing venue in the Lee Valley in that there is a restriction of 20 sailing dinghies allowed on Central Lagoon at any one time. This was the limit set by Broxbourne Sailing Club prior to 2010 when they also sailed on Central Lagoon; the total allowance was 40 dinghies on Central Lagoon i.e 20 each for BSC and ESSA. This new restriction set by LVRPA of 20 dinghies is detrimental to the potential for our charity to generate income and does not take into account that ESSA is the only on-water user of Central Lagoon. The reason given was that sailing interferes with fishing activities around the edge of Central Lagoon (29 swims have been built around Central Lagoon but on average only 3 to 5 swims are occupied by fishermen). This restriction has not been applied to any other LVRPA sailing venue where there is shared use with fishermen. ESSA is a 'grassroots pay and play' multi-activity (2011 Park Development Framework, page 44 water activities) water skills training centre charity for children and young persons and does not have the benefit of a guaranteed annual income from membership fees.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Issues relating to the number of sailing dinghies will be considered as part of the feasibility work for a new centre of sailing excellence at Holyfield Lake.</p>	No change
SR30.30	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7	Cathagena Environmental Study & Area 7 Visitors proposals		ESSA access	<p><u>Footpaths:</u> The Carthagea ES Report has been based on the map produced for the Upper Lee Valley Regeneration & Planning committee of 22.11.12 ULV/72/12 which includes footpaths through our site at Central Lagoon and running alongside plot Shavauveen's fence, and an additional path running through our car park. Our lease provides for our sole occupation of our land leased. Our Trustees have serious concerns about LVRPA creating footpaths to allow the general public access through our site since we have children and young persons using our facilities on a regular basis. The security and safeguarding aspects this proposal should be <u>withdrawn</u>.</p>	<p>Comments noted. In 2012 the Authority commissioned consultants to produce draft landscape proposals for areas of landscape stress in the northern part of the Park. Hence the Carthagea background document. This is an area where the Authority is the principal landowner and a more detailed approach to drafting proposals is possible. However the strategy proposal for pedestrian routes in close proximity to the Water Activities Centre has not been included in Area 7 Visitor Proposals.</p>	No change
SR30.31	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7	Cathagena Environmental Study & Area 7 Visitors proposals		ESSA accommodation	<p><u>School camping:</u> The Report proposes to 'rationalise our boat parking to release this area for day camping for schools (ES5 Carthagea Report page 17). ESSA Water Activities Centre already provides day events and camping for schools, scouts and guides which provides a contribution to our income. Area 2 is the foreshore and, for safety reasons, school age children should not be allowed to camp near the water edge. further-more, this proposal would deprive ESSA Water Activities Centre of the use of the foreshore from which we sail & canoe, reducing our income potential. As to the proposed use of area 3 for school camping, this is the wettest part of our land, the furthest part away from our facilities and toilets and, of more concern, the fence to this part of our leased site runs alongside a public footpath. ESSA has had two recent breakins and theft of equipment by persons unknown who gained access by cutting holes in the fencing. Neither areas 2 and 3 are safe locations on which to have school camping, and we recommend that this proposal is <u>withdrawn</u>.</p>	<p>Comments noted. In 2012 the Authority commissioned consultants to produce draft landscape proposals for areas of landscape stress in the northern part of the Park. Hence the 3 background documents for Spitalbrook, Carthagea and Wharf Road. These are all areas where the Authority is the principal landowner and a more detailed approach to drafting proposals is possible. The Strategy options for school camping on the ESSA site has not been included in the Area 7 Visitors Proposals, nor has the proposal for the public footpath.</p>	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.32	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			Central Lagoon	<p><u>3. Facilities at Central Lagoon</u> Land/Buildings: As an RYA and water activity training centre providing all equipment, we own and maintain the following: • A fully equipped Training Centre with a kitchen, male & female showers and changing rooms • Separate Female & Male Toilets • Separate Class Room • 1 x 30ft container • 7 x 20ft Containers • Sail Storage • Workshop • Fuel Store Unit • Race Hut with Storage • 2 x 30 ft Dragon Boats & trailers • 43 sailing boats • 30 kayaks/ canoes. <u>Water</u>: Central Lagoon is approximately 22 acres, used for water activities solely by ESSA Water Activities Centre with fishing swims around the perimeter. We have unobstructed clear views and wind across the lake, which is ideal for safety cover and a reasonable depth of water, with no surface weed growth, enabling launching of the boats and raft building activities direct from the foreshore. The lake is ideal for use by beginners. Due to the flow of water from Northern Lagoon through to Southern Lagoon, the water in Central Lagoon is always moving which considerably reduces the possibility of blue-green algae or weed growth preventing water activities on the lake. <u>Accessibility</u>: Our site is accessible by minibus, car, foot, cycle and by public transport from Broxbourne Railway Station and local buses. Central Lagoon also has the advantage of being located near to the River Lea to which it has direct access from its leased land which enables ESSA to provide more advanced opportunities for canoeing, kayaking, dragon boating and Duke of Edinburgh Award canoeing expeditions.</p>	Comments noted.	No change
SR30.35	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA re-location	<p>Consideration also needs to be given to the numbers of children and young persons using ESSA Water Activities Centre, as we operate with guide and scouts groups we can have 40 + young person on site, taking part in water activities and overnight camping. At Central Lagoon, our existing site is fenced and secure to prevent strangers coming into our site, whereas at Holyfield Lake there is a much larger area of open land and less security. At Fishers Green Sailing Club, all their boats and equipment are privately owned by individual members who pay storage fees and membership fees, who would, naturally be reluctant to have groups of young persons, even well behaved, camping overnight. There is a further concern for ESSA Trustees: FGSC have regular social evenings and a licensed bar. It would not be desirable to have alcohol available or consumed on the premises by their members when ESSA has children and young persons camping overnight, mainly on Friday and Saturdays.</p>	Comments noted. These are important issues that will need to be considered further as part of feasibility work.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.38	ESSA Water Activities Centre			6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake	<p><i>continued...</i> To make this area useable for sailing and other water activities, LVRPA would have to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a stable and firm foreshore launching sites • water and mains sewage • electricity supply • telephone/internet connections/CCTV • secure fencing with suitable storage area for our equipment and containers. • Car park suitable for minibuses <p>ESSA would also require a new training centre to be designed and built at Holyfield Lake with toilets, changing rooms, showers, kitchen and office as we have received professional advice that it would not be feasible to transport our current training centre and toilet facilities to a new site. Our current Training Centre & facilities measure 2500m x 1331m.</p>	Comments noted. These are important issues that will need to be considered further as part of feasibility work.	No change
SR30.46	ESSA Water Activities Centre			6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake	<p><i>continued...</i> If LVRPA require the general public to have facilities at Central Lagoon, then identical facilities should be provided for the general public and ESSA crew and users. In accordance with the framework these should include toilets, showers (ESSA requires 3 shower units in each), separate entrances for females and males. To ensure safety of ESSA crew and young users the building will require two fully contained and equipped areas separated with two entrances, one facing the access path for the general public, and one only accessed by our crew and users. Needless to say, the sections used by the general public and ESSA Water Activities Centre will have to be completely and securely self-contained with disabled access. The building will require a new hot water system, electricity, external lighting, heating for the winter to prevent pipes freezing, mains water supplies and a new cesspit as the existing cesspit is only suitable for our purposes and not located near the boundary. If LVRPA does continue with their plan for the public to use our privately owned and maintained toilets, then we would require a sub-stancial reduction in our rent paid, as we currently are required to pay a commercial rent for exclusive use, with no discounts as a charity for young persons.</p>	Comments and detaied points about shared facilities noted	No change
SR30.47	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Camping Central Lagoon	<p><u>7. Public Day Camping at Central Lagoon</u> LVRPA has not defined what they mean by 'day camping'. We assume this is when visitors arrive for the day and return home at night. The 'day camping' facility can be from visitors arriving & using LVRPA provided 'pods' (no booking arrangement or fee) through to an organised formal centre to entertain children and young persons during the day with paid activity leaders. The maps show brown 'dots' through the woods along Central Lagoon (LVRPA Long term masterplan Fig.4) and Northern Lagoon, and on the western shore of Central Lagoon which indicate informal unsupervised sites for visitors to 'day camp' which could presumably include BBQ's with the risk of fire. We would point out that fishermen already 'day camp' and their licence includes periods of up to 14 days continuous overnight camping. There is an inherent risk that visitors would not leave in the evening but stay overnight, and risk of continuing trespass. The Trustees of ESSA have concerns about uncontrolled and unsupervised camping overnight when we regularly have guide/scout camping for weekends at Central Lagoon.</p>	Comments noted. Feasibility and business case assessments will be required to scope the options for day campig facilities and the sustainable huts or pods. Provision and operation of these facilities will be regulated.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.48	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Camping Central Lagoon	<p><i>continued</i> ...The LVRPA already has formal camping/ caravan/pre-pitched tent sites at Dobbs Weir & it would seem more obvious to extend this site to include a 'day camp' facility which would then be supervised and the toilet/changing room facilities are already in existence. Another consideration is that the proposed location of day camps at Northern Lagoon are located much nearer to the public toilets at Dobbs Weir than at Central Lagoon. Therefore we conclude that it is impractical and too costly for 'day camping' facilities to be located at Central Lagoon, as the cost of providing and maintaining 'day camping' would not be recovered by pitch fees. We therefore recommend that this proposal is <u>withdrawn</u>.</p>	Comments noted. The Lee Valley Campsite at Dobbs Weir offers a more traditional formal camping experience	No change
SR30.49	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Centre for Angling	<p><u>8. Centre of Angling Excellence at Central Lagoon</u> LVRP currently operates 29 gravel pits & 17 stretches of river that facilitate coarse angling comprising of 25 venues, 12 directly managed by the Fisheries team and 12 run by angling clubs, societies or consortia & one which is jointly managed, throughout their 26 miles, 10,000 acre area. There is no justification provided or evidence of proven demand for the choice of Central Lagoon as the proposed site for a Centre of Angling Excellence. To make Central Lagoon solely for the use of fishermen would leave the 22 acre body of water unused for other activities & this would conflict with the LVRPA's strategic aim & development statement of providing multi-activity areas rather than 'stand-alone' facilities (2011 PDF: Sport & Rec pg 44 & Strategic Aim Shared facilities). Fishing permits at Nazeing Meads covers Brackens Pool, North, Central & South Lagoons of 127.5 acres for which, in June 2014, a total of 110 fishing permits were sold (LVRPA response to a FOI request 11.7.2014 by ESSA WAC). Central Lagoon has 29 fishing swims built by LVRPA Fisheries Depart. However, a survey carried out by ESSA volunteers during the course of 2014 has revealed that on average of 3 – 5 fishing pitches are used by fishermen at any one time. A survey of other Nazeing Mead Lagoons shows they are better used by fishermen than the Central Lagoon. We have established that, due to the flow of water, there are fewer fish available to anglers in Central Lagoon when compared to other areas of water covered by a Nazeing Meads permit.</p>	Comments noted. Feasibility work will help to clarify suitability of Central Lagoon for an angling centre and identify the range of angling facilities that can be delivered at this location and how a Centre for Angling might operate. It should be noted that Central Lagoon is both a large gravel pit and integral to the flood relief system. Currently the biomass is predominantly very large specimen species, suitable for competent/ advanced anglers. The existing shared use restricts the full potential of the lake for anglers, whilst also impacting on sailing activities.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.50	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Centre for Angling	<p><i>continued..</i> Furthermore, there is a warning on LVRPA Fisheries website about electricity pylons making parts of Central Lagoon dangerous for casting. For this & other reasons, we would suggest that Central Lagoon is not a suitable location for an Angling Centre of Excellence and that the proposal should be <u>withdrawn</u>. We would also point out that in order to provide an 'Angling Centre of Excellence' at central lagoon with mains services would require regular supervision, cleaning and maintenance either by volunteer wardens from among the fishermen or paid LVRPA staff as the site would otherwise be vulnerable to vandalism, theft (ESSA WAC Reports to LVRPA Officers and Police), trespass and an increase in litter being left behind (Environmental Strategy page 7). Central lagoon is in a sensitive area where there are already concerns about the risk of increased traveller activity (LVRPA Paper ULV/88/14). According to the maps provided as part of the public consultation, the proposed Centre of Angling Excellence to be based at Central Lagoon would involve the LVRPA incurring the cost of repairing the foreshore and providing further fishing swims in addition to the 29 already available.</p>	<p>Comments noted. As stated above feasibility work will help to clarify suitability of Central Lagoon for an angling centre and identify the range of angling facilities that can be delivered at this location and how a Centre for Angling might operate. Please note that it is a Centre for Angling that is proposed.</p>	<p>No change but mapping will be checked for use of the term Centre of excellence as this is incorrect.</p>
SR30.51	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Centre for Angling	<p>We note that, in order to provide a Centre of Angling Excellence the proposal includes upgrading the access track currently used by ESSA and the local fisherman to that suitable for vehicles, with no fishing swims available along this route, other than the two existing disabled swims at the north western corner. There are no other swims indicated on the western shore, only the shorter northern and southern shores. Creating a Centre of Angling Excellence at Central Lagoon whilst reducing fishing opportunities to facilitate it appears to be inconsistent. We <u>support</u> the improvement to the access track, which is in very poor condition and numerous complaints have been made to LVRPA over the years by users of ESSA Water Activities Centre. The LVRPA response has been that it is suitable for its use. The Trustees consider that this is further evidence of detrimental treatment by the LVRPA as the authority has consistently refused to repair the track for the benefit of existing ESSA Water Activities Centre users but now considers that such work should be carried out to facilitate an angling centre of excellence which would be likely to generate less vehicular traffic than its existing joint use by ESSA Water Activities Centre and Fisheries.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Feasibility work will need to consider access issues both for vehicles and pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	<p>No change</p>

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.53	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7		ESSA	8. <u>Conclusion and Recommendations</u> Conclusions - The consultation draft contains material that is detrimental to ESSA Water Activities Centre which should be removed from the plan. The Authority has failed to make a case for relocating ESSA Water Activities Centre from the Central Lagoon to Holyfield Lake. The proposal is based on the misconception that ESSA Water Activities Centre is a private members club that can be co-located with an existing private members club at Fishers Green and share its facilities. In a members club, the equipment is owned and maintained by its members who would be responsible for moving their own property to a new location. This is not the case at ESSA Water Activities Centre where the substantial number of boats and related equipment are owned and maintained by our charity for the benefit of young people. This response to the consultation sets out the impracticality of the LVRPA proposals and the considerable cost that would fall to be met by the authority with no discernable benefit to the authority or the users themselves. No business case could be made for the relocation and the project would be unworkable. It should therefore be withdrawn.	Following consideration of the detailed comments raised by ESSA amendments have been made to the proposals and the baseline and proposal maps as stated above. The feasibility work will cover a range of issues and start to examine the business case.	Please refer to the amendments made under Area 6 proposal River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation.
SR30.54	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7		ESSA	As to the proposal that the public should be given access to ESSA Water Activities Centre toilets, this proposal has not been thought through by LVRPA and is clearly not based on any knowledge of the existing facilities on our site which would not be suitable for public use. Furthermore, the proposal raises serious concerns on safeguarding grounds alone since our site is used almost exclusively by young people under the age of 18, and this matter was raised at the Upper Lee Valley Regen and Planning Committee Meeting 23 October 2014.	Following consideration of the detailed comments raised by ESSA amendments have been made to the proposals and the baseline and proposal maps as stated above. The feasibility work will cover a range of issues and start to examine the business case.	Please refer to changes proposed under SR30.2
SR30.55	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		ESSA	We recommend: 9.1 <u>Support</u> ESSA Water Activities Centre in accordance with the LVRPA aims of fairness, equality duties, by providing accessible 'pay and play multi-activity centre for water activities.	Comments noted. Proposals are seeking to relocate the sailing and water activity facilities offered by ESSA onto Holyfield Lake within Area 6.	No change
SR30.56	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7		ESSA	9.2 <u>Remove</u> the detrimental references made through the consultation document to ESSA Water Activities Centre. 9.3 Acknowledge that ESSA Water Activities Centre provides an easily accessible RYA Training Centre for children and young persons, and list our Centre along with other sailing clubs on the LVRPA website (as previously requested), and in maps and documents.	Comments noted and references to named facilities has been changed.	Check wording and amend where appropriate
SR30.57	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		ESSA lease arrangements	9.4 In accordance with LVRPA strategic aims & development framework, provide ESSA with a 30 year lease which will enable the charity to obtain funding to repair the foreshore and update our buildings. As our current lease does not expire until 31.1.2017, a Letter of Comfort should be issued to ESSA Water Activities Centre for use when applying for grants over the next two years. 9.5 Alternatively, LVRPA should amend our current lease to a term of 30 years, without a mutual break clause major funders such as Sport England & Landfill Trusts are unwilling to provide grants where lease terms contain break clauses. This would enable the Trustee to commence grant applications for the repair of the foreshore.	Comments noted. These matters are being dealt with directly in correspondence with ESSA	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR30.58	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA lease arrangements	9.6 <u>Reconsider</u> the level of commercial rent charged to ESSA Water Activities Centre, as this was based on an amount by our charity when we were subtenants of Broxbourne Sailing Centre which included the cost of utilities used by ESSA at Central Lagoon. Therefore, the current rent is based on historical 'rent and a utilities charge' which inflated the rent by several thousands pounds, whereas ESSA Water Activities Centre now pays for its own utilities separately. 9.7 <u>Increase</u> the number of sailing dinghies allowed on Central Lagoon to its former level of 40.	Comment noted. These matters are being dealt with directly in correspondence with ESSA	No change
SR30.59	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7			ESSA	9.8 Remove the proposal that ESSA Water Activities Centre should share its toilets with the general public as it is neither cost effective nor feasible and poses a considerable security risk to the children and young persons who use ESSA Water Activities Centre.	Comments noted. The shared use of existing ESSA toilets is an option discussed in the Carthage Environmental Strategy a supporting document to the PDF. Further feasibility work would be needed regarding the provision of toilets and other visitor facilities in this area. Amendments will be made under Area 7, Visitors 7.A.2 Carthage to clarify the position.	Please refer to amendments made in response to 30.4
SR30.60	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 Visitors	Accommodation	9.9 Define and relocate 'Day Camping' to Dobbs Weir Caravan/Camping site or to any new area opened-up by LVRPA next to Broxbourne Railway Station.	Comments noted. Feasibility and business case assessments will be required to scope the options for day camp facilities and the sustainable huts or pods. The Lee Valley Campsite at Dobbs Weir offers a more traditional formal camping experience	No change
SR30.62	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA access	9.11 Improve the access path to ESSA Water Activities Centre for the benefit of our users and of the fishermen already using the central lagoon.	Comments noted. Access improvements will form part of the proposals for this area	No change
SR30.63	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7		7.A.2 Visitors	Accommodation	9.12 For safeguarding reasons, <u>remove</u> the proposal for LVRPA school camping on area 2 and 3 in our site, as this is the wettest ground, near the foreshore and a fence which is along a public footpath (Carthage ES5 Report, page 17). 9.13 For safety of children and security of our site at Central Lagoon the proposals to have public footpaths across our land and car park should be <u>removed</u> . (Carthage ES5 Report Fig 4 long term master plan).	Comments noted. In 2012 the Authority commissioned consultants to produce draft landscape proposals for areas of landscape stress in the northern part of the Park. Hence the Carthage background document. This is an area where the Authority is the principle landowner and a more detailed approach to drafting proposals is possible. The Strategy option for schools camping on the ESSA site has not been included in the Area 7 Visitors Proposals, nor has the the proposal for the public footpath	No change
SR30.64	ESSA Water Activities Centre	7			ESSA	9.14 If ESSA were to be provided with a 30 year lease in line with leases provided to private member only clubs in the Lee Valley, the Trustees could then invest in the site and extend the camping on the dry land between plots Shavauveen and Auburnville. This land was originally included in the draft lease of April 2012 and during the winter of 2011/12 was cleared at our expense. Use of this land was lost during negotiations for our 2013 lease due to the unaffordable rent being charged to ESSA by LVRPA.	Comment noted. These matters are being dealt with directly in correspondence with ESSA.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR31.0	Ramblers Association - Hertfordshire & North Middlesex Area	6 to 8			Shared routes	I'm opposed to the Lee Valley Park's policy of routes shared between walkers and cyclists. Recreational walking should involve mental relaxation as well as physical exercise, and it's not relaxing to have to share a route with someone with a fast bike and Bradley Wiggins fantasies. Many people live near the Park, and the meadows and waterside paths of the Lee Valley Park should be the ideal place for a healthy, relaxing walk, of 30 minutes or all day duration. It's widely recognised that walking is beneficial and should be encouraged. When walkers and cyclists share routes, cyclists are inevitably the dominant users. Recreational walking should be planned to be enjoyable, and sharing routes with cyclists isn't.	These views are understood. The Regional Park does offer a wide range of walking and cycling routes and with the increasing popularity of the Park and of walking and cycling both for leisure and as a means of travel, conflicts do arise. There is no intention on the Authority's behalf as part of the Proposals for Area 7 to provide segregated routes. This position has been endorsed in the Authority's recently completed and adopted Cycling Strategy.	No change
SR31.1	Ramblers Association - Hertfordshire & North Middlesex Area	6 to 8			Shared routes	Two arguments are commonly used for supporting the notion that walkers can happily share routes with cyclists, both fallacious. 1. Collisions seldom occur between walkers and cyclists. That may be so, but it's beside the point. We want more from our walks than to return home uninjured. We want to enjoy our walks, and you can't enjoy a walk if you have to share a route with guided missiles. 2. Everyone walks. This is a remark sometimes made by planning officers, to justify telling recreational walkers what's good for them. Almost everyone does walk, even if it's only across the office car park. Possibly someone walking across the office car park wouldn't mind if a cyclist suddenly sped past them at close quarters, but recreational walkers want higher standards	Noted see comments above	No change
SR31.2	Ramblers Association - Hertfordshire & North Middlesex Area	6 to 8		Visitors	Accommodation	I'm also opposed to any more development in the Park, such as more caravan sites, yurts, lodges, cycle racetracks etc. The Park should be managed as an area for peaceful walking.	The Authority's statutory remit for leisure is wide ranging and allows for active and informal recreation, sport, enjoyment of nature conservation and entertainments of any kind. This has been interpreted through the Park Development Framework process to include the provision of facilities for visitors be that enhanced walking routes or additional visitor accommodation. Camp sites such as those based at Dobbs Weir and the YHA centre at Cheshunt are very popular with visitors to the Park.	No change
SR31.3	Ramblers Association - Hertfordshire & North Middlesex Area	6 to 8			Towpath	The Lee towpath is a statutory public footpath. Although British Waterways haven't dedicated their towpaths as public footpaths, it's not necessary for a route to be dedicated if it can be shown that the public have used it as of right for many years. The Lee towpath was identified as a public footpath under the provisions of the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, not surprisingly, due to the large amount of use from people living nearby. The Act provided for legal adjudication if landowners disagreed that a claimed route was public. A public footpath is a route which walkers have a common law right to use without suffering a nuisance, and cyclists are a nuisance. I remember the towpath as it was 40 years ago. It used to be a lovely footpath, giving peaceful, relaxing riverside walks, locally or to outer or inner London, and we were lucky to have such a lovely footpath. Then Sustrans imposed one of their national cycle routes on it, and ruined it for walkers. Could cyclists be banned from the towpath, so we can have our footpath back	Noted, the towpath is managed by the Canal & River Trust and they have a protocol to ensure walkers and cyclists can co-exist.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR31.4	Ramblers Association - Hertfordshire & North Middlesex Area	6 to 8			Cycling	I used to have a bicycle, and can understand why cyclists like off-road routes. They shouldn't use footpaths, though, and dedicated cycle tracks should be built. If public money isn't available, cyclists should meet the cost. Please abandon the Park's policy of walkers and cyclists using the same routes	Comments noted	No change
SR32.0	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			Access	These plans seem to be heavily weighted towards able bodied users only which could I believe lead to legal action under the Disability Discrimination Act. With an increasingly aging population it should also include improving vehicular access for the less able bodied user. It is not good enough to expect someone to push granny in a wheelchair half a mile from nearest car park up and over a footbridge across the railway line, so they can get to an open space where the grandchildren can play.	Comments noted. The Area Proposals seek to maintain and improve access to the Park for all users and abilities. Within Area 7, apart from the Lee Valley Walk and Lee Valley Pathway access within the Park for pedestrians is limited. Hence proposals are seeking to create a range of new routes. Vehicular access and public transport access into the more centrally located open spaces and parkland areas of the Park is more limited and the Authority has no proposals to develop new roads within the Park.	No change
SR32.1	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			Access	Whilst it would be great that all visitors were able to use public transport to get to the Park, in reality a vast number will be using their own transport, on cost and/or convenience grounds.	Comments noted	No change
SR32.2	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			Access	Account needs to be taken that anglers on most of the Pits do not just pop out for a couple of hours, most go for a least 8 hours and on some waters, they will spend days. As a result the Mr Crabtree image of a bloke with a rod on his back and a basket slung over his shoulder on a bike is no longer valid, as a replacement think of someone transporting 30 – 40 kilos in weight on a barrow (this consisting of rods, reels, bait, hooks, weights etc, clothing, cooking equipment and provisions, plus a shelter). This is not normally transportable by public transport (even if convenient for preferred location, which none of routes in area are.), so some sort of vehicle has to be used and this needs to be catered for in planning access.	Comments noted. This is a valid point. It is the case that the majority of both Angling Rights agreements and the actual Licences (Clubs, Societies and Consortia) have been in place pre LVRPA (1967) and that these agreements were drafted around angling practices of the day, e.g. where anglers used public transport and cycled/walked. The Authority recognises that most anglers now arrive by car or van but unfortunately it is not possible to provide angler specific, on site car parks for all lakes and waterbodies. Hence the policy to promote the shared use of car parks wherever possible with the general Park visitor.	No change
SR32.3	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			Bio-diversity	<u>Water vole & Mink predation.</u> Whilst attempts to make these areas water vole friendly are appreciated, the Authority as part of its non-native invasive species eradication plan must maintain if not increase its control procedures against mink as they prey on water voles and being non-native species, the voles are defenceless against them unlike native predators, all this work will just give mink an increased food source and not help increase population.	Comments noted. LVRPA work in conjunction with partners across the region to monitor and control non-native invasive species including Mink.	No change
SR32.4	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			Acronyms	<u>Acronyms and their impact on readability</u> A Glossary of Acronyms must be produced, these documents are supposed to be read by the general public not experts. The use of acronyms without a glossary renders parts of the documents unintelligible to the general public	Comments noted and agreed a glossary will be provided	Include Glossary

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR32.5	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8		Bio-diversity Otters	<u>Otters</u> The artificial introduction of otters, must not take place, it would be preferred that the natural migration of surplus populations should be allowed to happen, as this would have deleterious impacts on local fish stocks which are already under pressure for other reasons, resulting in low replacement rates. You could end up with local fish populations being decimated and the otters dying of malnutrition once the fish have gone (FYI, this was the fate of an otter near the Olympic Park at Stratford).	Comment noted. Otters became extinct in the Lee Valley in the 1970's and were re-released in the 1990s. Since then the population has become self-sustaining and no further reintroductions are planned. Work will instead focus on ensuring habitat quality is enhanced to benefit a range of species not just Otter	No change
SR32.6	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8		Bio-diversity	<u>Cormorant predation and its impact on fish population and native fish eaters</u> Cormorant predation must be controlled, whilst larger species of fish are safe above a certain size, the juveniles of these are vulnerable, the smaller species are still vulnerable even at breeding age and it is these smaller species that will provide food for birds like herons & king-fishers and young otters. It is now recognised that this is a pan-European problem and guides to the management of the problem have already been produced, which the authority could use to reduce this problem.	Comments noted, the Authority is aware of this issue and works with the relevant agencies to provide a balanced ecosystem.	No change
SR32.7	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8		Cross Rail	Cross-rail 2 and railway crossings The Authority should vigorously defend all existing vehicular crossing points across the railway lines from Cross-rail 2 closures, as this will:- a) Create no go areas on the Hertfordshire side of the Lee Navigation; b) Counteract the intention to protect canal heritage as any canal side dwellings will become worthless and fall into disrepair if they cannot get goods delivered to them, c) If access routes are blocked, in order to achieve visitor access, the Authority will need to create alternate access routes instead (presumably the cost being born by LVRPA not Railway in that case). As most of these routes are not main thoroughfares, perhaps single carriage way bridges (traffic light controlled) could replace them.	Comments noted: The Authority recognises the importance of maintaining a network of crossings which can satisfy its operational requirements and the need to ensure safe and convenient access for visitors. As stated above since these proposals were issued Network Rail has continued to reduce surface level crossings on an incremental basis without responding to officers' concerns for the need for an access strategy designed to address operational and visitor needs. The Authority's existing draft proposals state that mitigation will be sought for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2	Amend proposal 7.A.1 Environment as follows: Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 Support ongoing investment in the Abellio Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and work with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 team, the local and county authorities to develop a strategy for retaining crossing points and access into the Park for all visitors and to enable operational management, without large areas of parkland being lost to new bridge landings, new roads or related infrastructure. and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park. Retaining and enhancing these access points into the Park forms part of the Green Arc Strategic Green Infrastructure project 'Lateral Links' to improve connectivity linking the Park with the wider landscape and adjoining urban areas.
SR32.8	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			Car parking enhancement Will any/all car parks be fitted with electric car charging points or are they to be ignored thus increasing carbon footprint of travel to the park or reducing visitor numbers using these vehicles due to range limit issues on current models on a single charge?	There are no proposals for electric car charging points within existing car parks in Area 7	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR32.9	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8		Bio-diversity	<p><u>Reed-beds restoration and additional planting</u>. In all documents there seems to be an emphasis on the above, I would suggest a moratorium on the planting of new reed beds until the following investigations are performed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil samples taken from both good areas and bad areas, so comparisons can be made and differences examined as to whether restoration is possible (in one case you mention removal of scrub, this would seem to indicate reed bed has functioned sufficiently well enough in land reclamation to encourage secondary colonization!). • An ecological investigation into why existing reed-beds need restoration, i.e. if not substrate what other forces could be at play hampering growth and natural increase. • A survey of the lake bottom profiles to see where suitable new reed beds could be planted, and soil samples taken to see if suitable for purpose. NB As most lakes are former gravel workings, I would not expect them to have the same profiles as natural lakes, which could be part of the problem. • Are the water bodies strong enough ecologically to cope with increased oxygen depletion caused by rotting down of stems etc. as a result of annual die back from these new reed beds, if not then don't plant them or you will create a greater problem i.e. a turgid lifeless waste which will not be inviting to water fowl. 	Comments noted. Reedbeds are an important habitat for a range of wildlife, many areas of reed have been lost due to a number of reasons such as land drainage, development and succession. Much conservation work is about trying to maintain a certain habitat at a particular stage of succession ie halting succession into scrub and eventually woodland. Areas for reedbed creation are chosen carefully to ensure best chances of success. Reedbeds play an important role in improving water quality which will be of benefit to a range of species.	No change
SR32.10	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			<p><i>continued</i> .. • Will the reduction of open water space although increasing nesting space, reduce feeding areas for water fowl to the extent they won't be able to support either themselves or their young. I would not expect large scale soil dumping to be used to create necessary shallow areas for reed beds, due to the cost and unknown quality of soil which would be used, also dredging of lakes to create them could disturb existing ecology and result in gas release from anaerobic bacteria polluting the water fatally for aquatic environment.</p>	A mosaic of habitats is of benefit to wildlife. The Authority would aim not to create a monoculture of any one habitat but a range of key habitats that cater for a range of needs of key species using the area.	No change
SR32.62	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		Opportunities for Visitors	<p>Par2. Is there a need for more accommodation on site in the first place? Should there be so, do they want normal accommodation or would they wish to use new types, as it's no use creating white elephants if they don't.</p>	Comments noted. Feasibility work is proposed to assess opportunities for Visitor accommodation. This will include an assessment of the business case in each situation	No change
SR32.63	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		Opportunities for Visitors	<p>Par3. Improved access routes around Glen Faba area would be of use, although not in plan, if the problematic access from Rattys Lane could be resolved this would create another entry point. Par 3. With the demise of the plans for a power station on the Lafarge site adjoining Rattys Lane, could this area be included within the plan if it was acquired? Par 3 A limitation on access from Fieldes Weir from Lee Navigation towpath to River Stort towpath is the bridge across the weir itself, can it be widened or at least made accessible for wheelchairs (haven't been there for a while but believe it has steps at each end)?</p>	Comments noted. Reasonable path system exists at Glen Faba. Proposals seek to improve links from the stations and promotion of circular routes. Accessibility of routes and bridges will be assessed. It is understood that an application for an energy recovery facility off Ratty's lane is currently under consideration.	No change
SR32.64	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Visitors	<p>As part of improving access from Broxbourne Station, could a mini-roundabout be installed in Nazeing Road opposite Lido entrance, this would be of advantage in promoting safe vehicular access to Carthagena Estate rather than current turns into a fast moving road from narrow entry?</p>	Proposals seek to enhance the crossing of Nazeing Road for pedestrians and cyclists. Major highway improvements would need to be initiated by the County Council.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR32.65	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Visitors		As there are moves afoot to rebuild/replace the bridge in Dobs weir Road, have these plans factored this in? Route safety improvements around Dobbs Weir Road for pedestrians and vehicles are needed now, I believe Essex County Council as highways authority should be doing this, with LVRPA being the driving force behind them. Does a feasibility study need to be done for what is an already recognised problem?	Comments noted. This bridge has been replaced with the addition of a pavement. The Authority did raise the issue of a pedestrian phase to the traffic lights as part of these works but this has not been provided.	No change
SR32.66	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Visitors	Accommodation	As the Caravan park has been already closed once and then re-opened, has LVRPA recognised it is needed or will a sizeable amount of money be spent, for it then to be closed again? I take it this new accommodation will be in a more salubrious area than the current location of Caravan i.e. not in the middle of an industrial area?	Lee Valley Caravan Site at Dobbs Weir is managed by the Lee Valley Leisure Trust Vibrant Partnerships	No change
SR32.67	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Visitors		Yet again an issue with naming of watercourses, map shows River Lee yet it is known as River Lynch when it flows into Lee Navigation at Old Mill, can I take it either name is acceptable? For now I'll use terminology on map	Comments noted. River Lynch flows through the Spitalbrook site joining into the River Lee before Old Mill.	No change
SR32.68	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Sport & Rec		Par 1.Old haul route is not to be just for cyclists & pedestrians, as length of route from Dobbs Weir Road i.e. about 1.5 kilometres, will not assist in delivering this and could result in action under DDA as this would not be an unreasonable action on LVRPA part to cater for disabled persons. Also in case of someone taken ill or having an accident, medical services can reach them easier, on at least one occasion our members have transported paramedics to a casualty(member of public not an angler)some way from a public highway. Suggest small car parks are placed near bridges across the Lee at southern end, this will give anglers somewhere to leave their vehicles from which they can then access the river bank	Comments noted. The Old Haul Road would still be accessible for emergency vehicles and Ranger vehicles. There are no proposals for car parks in association with this route. Parking is available immediately to the south near to Broxbourne Old Meadows and in the north at Dobbs Weir.	No change
SR32.69	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Sport & Rec		Par 2. To my knowledge the fishing rights to both lakes in southeast part and river Lee are privately owned, could you amplify how this can be protected and enhanced? To provide new opportunities for anglers in northwest part of site, has a fish survey been performed to access the stock levels in these lakes i.e. Is there any there? Otherwise stocking will be needed prior to anglers using facility. For use of northwest lakes an access route is needed for anglers to get to them, from Spitalbrook report map a restricted access route is shown, with minor tweaks this could be delivered.	Comments noted. Lakes in south east of Spitalbrook are privately run and considered to be in good condition. Text will be amended. Horseshoe Lake is used for holding fish and may be developed in the future. This will need to take account of access issues.	Remove the following text from 7.A.1 Sport and Recreation; "Protect and enhance facilities for anglers at Admiral's Walk Lake and on the lakes in the south east of Spitalbrook. "
SR32.70	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Sport & Rec		Par 5. Dobbs Weir pool was used in the past for canoe activities, but this was discontinued (worth finding out why), agree with use only within riverine close season to avoid negative interaction with anglers (FYI, all Lee Navigation above Aqueduct Lock is defined as subject to riverine close season). With the flow at Dobbs Weir being variable, I don't believe any ad-hoc canoe activities should take place but only organised activities with the proper safety measures in place, especially during riverine close season as less people about to assist in case of emergencies. If visitor moorings are to be created, I suggest these are in areas where anglers are already affected by the presence of overhead cables, thus resulting in a "win-win" situation, angling area not reduced and boats got somewhere to go.	Comments noted. These are important points and hence the proposal states that options for canoe access at Dobbs Weir will be explored with stakeholders, in order to ascertain the various constraints and issues and decide how these could be managed.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR32.71	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Bio-diversity	Flora & Fauna	Par1. What does positive conservation management entail? This must not result in unfairly restricting other uses of facilities but must be a balanced process i.e. if trees obtrude in areas, consultation with all users must take place rather than a blanket ban on tree-pruning. Par 2. What does BAP stand for?	Comments noted . The term positive conservation management means actively managing a site for its key conservation features and relates to the designated county wildlife sites in particular. BAP is the abbreviation for Biodiversity Action Plan and refers to the BAP for the Lee Valley Regional Park.	Glossary needed for these terms
SR32.72	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Bio-diversity	Flora & Fauna	Par 3. Non-native invasive species removal should include aquatic pests such as Signal & Virile crayfish, Zebra mussels (if possible). Signs should be installed warning of bio-hazards from introducing alien species. As you are wishing to promote water vole population, will the LVRPA be actively controlling Mink numbers as part of this?	Comments noted. The Authority is looking into issues surrounding biosecurity especially in our working methods and those of our contractors. LVRPA already undertakes Mink monitoring and control in conjunction with regional partners.	No change
SR32.73	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Bio-diversity	Flora & Fauna	Par 3 Bullet 1. This must be kept within a reasonable volume, as it will impact on fish holding areas increasing their exposure to predation and if unrestrained reed growth allowed to take place, lakes will regress to damp marshy ground, with negative connotations for bird, mammal and fish populations. Bullet 2. As stated in comments on Area 6 proposal, care must be taken to avoid slugs of de-oxygenated water from these ditches going into surrounding watercourses during high rainfall periods as may cause fish kills with adverse impact to aquatic mammals & angling revenues.	Comments noted. The habitat improvements listed under this proposal are about targeting key areas for enhancement and creating a mosaic of habitats, rather than mono-culture, that compliment each other and provide good quality habitat for a range of species. Permissions will be sought where necessary from EA when undertaking work on a watercourse. The aim of the works is to enhance the waterways for key species but inevitably the benefits should be felt across a much wider range of species	No change
SR32.74	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Bio-diversity	River Lynch	Par 1 Unaware of angling opportunities for this bit, so seems a worthy concept, water voles need all the help they can get. Par 2. If this is bit I explored as part of a possible tender for fishing rights licence, access is so difficult may be self-fulfilling.	Comments noted	No change
SR32.75	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Bio-diversity	Access to Nature	Reptiles would this include Adders and concomitant safety risk due to bites or just native non-venomous snakes lizards etc.?	Comments noted. All native reptiles would be encouraged.	No change
SR32.76	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Bio-diversity	Access to nature	Par 1. Don't agree with it being a pure pedestrian route, existing vehicular route to lakes and the weir pool behind Carthagena Lock should be retained. It used to be possible to fish from Caravan Park, will this still be allowed?	Comments noted. The proposal seeks to establish a pedestrian and cycle route along the old haul route. Angling is available from the opposite side at the lock and the water is not wide enough to cater for angling from both banks	No change
SR32.77	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Community		Par 1 Would outdoor classrooms/shelters be unobtrusive and available for community use as meeting places? Would they have toilet & other facilities? Bullet 1 Not sure about coach parking, is there land available to extend existing car park?	Comments noted. Feasibility work, as mentioned in the proposal, will be the help to decide the scale and type of provision.	No change
SR32.78	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Community		Don't forget anglers can monitor aquatic ecology, we've been doing it for years.	Comment noted. There are a number of ways that anglers can become more involved in the ecological enhancements such as through the Catchment Partnerships (Hertfordshire & Middlesex Wildlife Trust are the main contact for this)	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR32.79	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Land-scape & Heritage		Par 1 Will this result in some of less pleasing bits being hidden e.g. storage area by Carthagena Lock Cut? Par 2 It goes without saying that only native English species should be used.	Comments noted. Future planting and habitat works will seek to improve existing landscape character and will use native species.	No change
SR32.80	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Land-scape & Heritage		What would Acoustic screening comprise of, large wooden panel fencing, earth mounds or belts of close planted trees & shrubs, as former would be intrusive?	Comments noted. The type of acoustic screening would be the most appropriate in relation to its location on an industrial site and the need to be sensitive to the adjoining Regional Park.	No change
SR32.81	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Environment	Water	Par1 Aquatic species need to be considered as well as visible plants i.e. non-native water weeds, alien species of crayfish & shellfish. Par 2 Whilst not within park at this point (confluence is at Fieldes Weir), pressure to be put on EA to resolve issues with the River Stort, as from some documents this would be reason for poor water quality on the Lee below this point.	Comments note. The Authority and other stakeholders are targeting riparian invasive non-native species which have a significant impact on both users of the Park, especially in the case of Giant Hogweed and the habitat condition along the watercourses. Some in-channel aquatic plant are also tackled were applicable and there would need to be discussion about the viability of tackling further species.	No change
SR32.82	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Environment	Crossrail	par 1 Concur with this, however any existing vehicular crossing should be retained either by a new level crossing or bridge, footbridges are not acceptable.	Comments noted. New level crossings are unlikely to be part of Crossrail's proposals given the increase in train services. Vehicle access is likely to be very limited. However the Authority will be lobbying for fully DDA compliant ramps.	Please see changes under SR32.7 above under proposal 7.A.1 Environment.
SR32.83	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.1 Environment	Contaminated Land	From consultation meetings regarding another former Lafarge site (Fieldes Weir power station) the majority of problem was with hydrocarbons at fuelling point. However as this site is close by it had an underground aquifer close to surface so may exist in this area as well, so this would need protecting.	Comments noted.	No change
SR32.84	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Visitors		Bullet 1 As these roads are rather narrow, don't see cycle lanes coming to fruition. Bullet 3 As well as extending routes, there needs to be a frequent service at weekends or you might as well create more car parking spaces as ease of access is a critical factor. Bullet 4 & 5 Concur but need to increase road signs as well, can pique interest of passing motorists and thus increase footfall.	Comments noted.	No change
SR32.85	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Visitors		Par 2 There is already an issue with HGV traffic on Dobbs Weir road, what impact would a lorry ban on Meadgate road have i.e. a change for better or worse?	Comments noted. Difficult to assess the impact of this suggestion.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR32.86	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Visitors	Carth- agena	Pt1. Could some of this space be used to provide an alternate parking area so area by canal bank near Lock can be kept clear? Pt2. Needs to be financially viable. Pt3. Current access is secured by combination lock to prevent theft & poaching, also it utilises part of heritage canal structure, it would need careful thought as to how to improve or replace it, in order to retain canal heritage and site security. Pt4 In favour of car park if close to Towpath as would improve access for anglers, however the odd layby alongside canalside track would be useful.	Comments noted. This proposal has been amended as wild camping now operational on a different site.	Amend text under 7.A.2 Visitors as follows: " Carthagena - Visitor access to be improved by Opportunities for day camping and sustainable 'off grid' visitor accommodation to be developed through; - opening up existing overgrown vegetation (gardens from former cleared dwellings), south of Meadgate Road, to form a series of interconnecting rides and glades with level grassed-camping areas, -investigating feasibility of designing & constructing a limited number of carbon neutral sustainable huts, both for hire & as a demonstration project in partnership with higher or further education body, the peninsula of land north of Meadgate Rd in south west corner of north Lagoon would be preferred location, - Exploring options for possibility of creating/ reinstating a pedestrian link through from the Lee Navigation towpath across Carthagena Lock over the River Lee and onto Spitalbrook using existing bridges, - Support facilities to be provided through shared use of existing ESSA toilets and a new small informal car park adjacent to southern edge of Meadgate Road. "
SR32.87	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Centre for Angling	Intrigued by what a "Centre for Angling" is intended to deliver, please can you expand on this? Hope it's not just going to be a fishing shelter, with car park, some new fishing platforms or will it be more i.e. somewhere to learn to fish? Without knowing what full ramifications of angling centre are, don't see why Water Activities centre needs to relocate, can't they co-exist e.g. as at Stanborough Lake WGC? If sailing etc is concentrated on one lake, which is already used by anglers, opportunity for friction between different sports would be increased. NB We don't see any boats on our own stretch of Holyfield at present, would this change as a result? I would expect anglers to have some input into the option analysis, due to them being impacted by decisions reached.	Comments noted. Feasibility work will help to identify the range of angling facilities that can be delivered at this location and how a Centre for Angling might operate. It should be noted that Central Lagoon is both a large gravel pit and integral to the flood relief system. Currently the biomass is predominantly very large specimen species, suitable for competent/ advanced anglers.	Note changes made to clarify need for feasibility work under SR28.0 and SR30.2 above
SR32.88	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec		Par 2 Agree with renovations to disabled angling sites, but if southern lagoon is to be developed, disabled swims should be installed here as well. Confusion regarding possible dual use of central lagoon heightened by 1st Paragraph. Any changes to access routes must take additional needs of disabled into account.	Comments noted. Unfortunately South lagoon is not considered suitable for disabled angling due to terrain and contamination issues arising from renovations.	No change
SR32.89	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Land based Rec	Par 1 Whilst laudable, walks must have way points in them, so persons finding themselves over-stretched can either a) Rest & recover sufficiently to complete route or b) Abandon walk and use transport to return to start point.	Comments noted. Walking routes are and will continue to be promoted with information that indicates the type of walk, its length and availability of transport.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR32.90	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Land based Rec	Par 2 Have no issue with alternate use for disused sites, but who decides what is an untidy site and what criteria will be used. Wouldn't it be preferred to bring former sites back into horticultural use rather than replace them (especially as the Lee Valley has a long history of horticulture, which is why we have large Italian origin community in locality)? Where can I find a list of Park Act-compliant commercial uses, as these may be more objectionable than current activity?	Comments noted. The landscape strategy identifies where the Park's landscape requires investment and improvement. Park related commercial uses would relate to leisure or sport and can also include visitor accommodation and entertainments of any kind (this is set out in the Park Act 1966 S.12). This proposal has however been deleted.	Delete proposal under Sport & recreation 7.A.2 as follows: Prepare feasibility studies for Park Act-compliant commercial uses that could be located on disused or untidy former horticultural sites along the eastern part of this area in Lower Nazeing, where planning permission is more likely to be granted for leisure/recreational built development. Explore the option of using the Authority's powers of compulsory purchase where opportunities are identified
SR32.91	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Carth- agena	Par 1 Not sure if this is the right place for informal waterside play as it's bordering on deep and/or fast flowing water which is hazardous, plus will not be well received by anglers if they affect where they are fishing at time. It would require clear signage about hazards and discussion with anglers as to areas where informal play can take place without creating a nuisance. Par 1 & 2. As Carthagea is a large area, can this be expanded to say where exactly you are referring to i.e. Lakes, lagoons, towpath, weir-pools (above and below), Rivers Lynch/Lee as this is unclear as to what will be going on where.	Comments noted. The draft interim masterplan for Carthagea set out in the Environmental Strategy indicates the locations for day camping and natural play. However another site is now providing for wild camping so the Carthagea proposal has been amended. More detailed landscape plans are also being drawn up for part of the site.	Please refer to amendments made under 32.86
SR32.92	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Bio- diversity	Flora & Fauna	Bullet 1 Tree removal & reed bed expansion should not be at the expense of other users, also unlimited expansion will decrease biodiversity if not controlled as man-made features will devolve into damp lands devoid of fish and thus those native birds/animals that use them as a food source or wild fowl overwintering places. Previous comment 32.32 applies here as well. Bullet 2 Tree removal along waterways (assume you mean rivers) must be done after taking advice from EA regarding aquatic ecological impact, as if taken to excess will create deserts where no fish are present and thus defeat the object.	Comments noted. The structure of the lakes will naturally restrict the expansion of reedbeds as water levels will become too deep for it to colonise. The variety in habitat of reedbed, pools and open water will benefit the range of seasonal preference or a range of fish species. The majority of the tree removal will be bankside to allow more light to watercourses (rivers and ditches) that have become overshadowed. In-channel features will be left where possible.	No change
SR32.93	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Bio- diversity	Flora & Fauna	2nd sentence Critical omission from this statement, no mention of fish population, they are an important part of the ecology of these sites or are they intended to be just giant duck ponds?	Comments noted. Fish are not mentioned specifically but their importance in a functional ecosystem is noted.	No change
SR32.94	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Bio- diversity	Access to Nature	Would the through wooded areas routes disturb resident wildlife, will any provision to close these at breeding times?	Comments noted. Routes would be chosen to minimise potential disturbance and reviewed as necessary.	No change
SR32.95	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Comm- unity	Carth- agena	Why isn't LVRPA getting professionals in to do this if it's revenue generating? Probably needs further explanation of concept.	Comments noted	Please refer to comments above and amendments under 32.86

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR32.96	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.2 Landscape & Heritage	Nazeing meads & Lagoon	Sentence What type of development are you talking about, increase in horticultural premises or something else? What is defined as non-Park compatible and intrusive are they one and the same or can there be Park-compatible and intrusive uses?	Comments noted. The Authority is seeking, through its proposals to ensure as much of the Park as possible is available for leisure, recreation, sports and nature conservation; Park compatible uses. Those uses or developments that predate the establishment of the Park (or have come about due to other processes), such as horticultural uses, residential and industrial premises are accepted but where opportunities arise to change existing non compatible uses into a compatible use that contribute to the Park, then these should be identified. However this proposal has been amended to tie in with revisions to proposals about glasshouse development in the Park and reflect new work on assessing the landscape..	Amend 7.A.2 Landscape & Heritage as follows Nazeing Meads and Nazeing Lagoon Protect enhance and manage the landscape as set out in hte Landscape Strategy Guidelines for character area A3 Glen Faba and Nazeing Meads. The open character of the valley floor to be protected in line with the proposal for glasshouses as set out under 7.A.2 Environment below. Other forms of development not compatible with the Green Belt to be resisted. Where extensions are proposed to existing local businesses they will be considered against the criteria included in the glasshouse proposal 7.A.2 Environment. –from development to the rear of properties in Nursery Road, nurseries to the west of North Road and at Sedge Green Nurseries. Over the long term, non-Park-compatible intrusive uses to be removed or their adverse impact mitigated including through the use of the Authority's land-purchasing powers if necessary-
SR32.97	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society			7.A.2 Landscape & Heritage	Flood relief Channel	This statement is much too vague, please include more detail as to how improvements are to be made!	Comments noted. Changes have been made to clarify intentions regarding the Flood Relief Channel.	Amend text under 7.A.2 landscape & Heritage second paragraph as follows: The Authority supports initiatives from the Environment Agency to improve the Flood Relief Channel to address landscape be improved to meet visual and biodiversity objectives.
SR32.98	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society			7.A.2 Landscape & Heritage	Carth- agena	Par 1 Not sure where this exactly is, as far as I'm aware towpath from Nazeing Road Bridge upstream to vehicular access to Carthagen Lock cut is only for cyclists and pedestrians. From that barrier a track for vehicles & other users extend almost to Dobbs Weir and then it comes to a dead end. If this track could be repaired and maintained suitable for both vehicles and others to this point all well and good, with a turning bay at the Dobbs Weir end added. However it would be advisable not to make it fit for vehicles all the way to Dobbs Weir Road as it would then create a short cut resulting in unwanted increased traffic flow.	Comments noted. There are no proposals to do this. Please see amendments made to proposal text to clarify position.	Amend proposal under 7.A.2 Landscape & Heritage under sub heading Carthagen as follows: Carthagen Work with the Canal and River Trust to repair and maintain the section of access track that services Carthagen and known as Meadgate Road principle access track alongside Lee Navigation for cyclists and pedestrians.

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR32.99	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society			7.A.2 Environment	Glasshouse Industry	Pars 1 to 4 Completely against this as stated earlier (55), the Lee Valley has a history of having a horticultural glasshouse industry, denying that history through its proposed eradication is an act of heritage vandalism. With so many already demolished for housing, you should be protecting what's left not making the situation worse. It is also does not make economic or environmental sense, as glasshouses will move elsewhere either throwing local residents out of work, or increasing the carbon emissions by workers having to travel further to work, plus any produce will have to transported further as well. Can you quantify what extra income will be generated if this proposition is put into effect as against losses to the local economy engendered by eradicating the glasshouse industry. The benefits to the area's economy gained from the horticultural trades should not be overridden and destroyed by a possible slight inconvenience caused to visitors and what limited ecological benefits would be gained from returning small areas back to nature. Could this be expanded as to what sort of sites are you talking of? Definition of PDF needed in this document, would Authority consider land swaps on like for like basis as well?	Comments noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 7 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 7.A.2 and 3 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	<u>Glasshouses</u> The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the Park within 7.A.2 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: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the Naxeing Mead & Carthagea areas; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and 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 & Carthagea area; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. 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, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. 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.
SR 32.100	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7	Environment proposals Map	7.A.2 Environment	Contaminated Land	par 1 Shouldn't mitigation action be taken with regard to contaminated land as soon as identified to reduce spread of material rather than when you might need it? Where is St Pauls field as it is not indicated on map, perhaps Environment map s/be updated with contaminated land areas shown.	Comments noted. Costs of remediation could be significant.	No change
SR 32.101	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Visitors		Par 2 Concur, need a car park that anglers can use, previous comment re another access via Rattys Lane would be of benefit for Hertfordshire residents.	Comments noted and support welcomed. There are no proposals to promote access from Ratty's Lane. This may come forward as part of the County and local authority plans within the area.	No change
SR 32.102	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Visitors		Agree with bullet 2, bullet 3 if they could use bankside affected by overhead cables this would be beneficial.	Comments noted	No change
SR 32.103	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Sport & Rec		Par 1 Add angling to list of activities to be protected, enhanced and promoted as this just seems to confirm perceived anti-angling stance of LVRPA without it's inclusion.	Comments noted. Angling will be added.	Amend Proposal 7.A.3 Sport & Recreation as follows: "Protect, enhance and promote the Wetland Park north for informal recreation, angling , walking and cycling, based on the enjoyment of the waterside environment, open farmland and wildlife"
SR 32.104	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Sport & Rec	Horse Riding Routes	Would this create something else for other users to have to dodge?	Comments noted. Although no proposed routes included on the mapping, this is one of the few areas within the Park where there could be potential for horse riding routes away from the main strategic walking and cycling routes.	No change.

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR 32.105	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Sport & Rec	River Cruising	Does it need it need enhancement?	Comment noted. This would be a matter for the C&RT.	No change
SR 32.106	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Bio-diversity	Flora & Fauna	Previous comment (??) apply to this NIA definition?	This comment made twice for Flora & Fauna? Checked other versions of response but no further detail.	No change but NIA will be included in glossary
SR 32.107	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Bio-diversity	Flora & Fauna	Bulet 3 If existing reedbed needs restoration, might this be an indicator that creation of extra area is pointless i.e. this is not a good place for reeds to grow? Bulet 4 It seems a very large length of bank to have to need this, are only some trees being removed or is it all? Bulet 5 This seems unnecessary, don't otters build their own under normal conditions, is the old one occupied? If so what happens to it when new one completed as it's protected and surely evicting it counts as an offence? Bulet 2 & 6 These two s/be run in numeric sequence as hopefully improving ditches for voles will also provide herons with additional food source.	Comments noted. The reedbed restoration will involve the removal of encroaching trees (willow and alder). As previously mentioned this is an intervention to prevent succession from taking place to retain habitat as reedbed. There are no artificial Otter Holts currently on site, they will find natural areas to lie-up but the creation of artificial holts increases the opportunity for them to use the site. It will be located in a site with minimal potential for disturbance	No change
SR 32.108	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Bio-diversity	Access to nature	Par 3 Same question as in Comment 32.94 (Would the through wooded areas routes disturb resident wildlife, will any provision to close these at breeding times?)	Comments noted. As previously stated all routes would be chosen to minimise potential disturbance and reviewed as necessary.	No change
SR 32.109	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Land-scape & Heritage		Par 1 Would solar farms be regarded as inappropriate development?	Solar Farms may be appropriate subject to landscape and ecological considerations.	No change
SR 32.110	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	7		7.A.3 Environment	Glass-house Industry	Parts about greenhouses sound a lot more reasonable that those in this document for 7.A.2 (same reference). I have ethical qualms about land swap condition, seems like demanding money (land has a value) with menaces (no land no expansion allowed).	Comments noted	Please see amendments proposed under 32.99

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

SR 32.132	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8		Improvement to angling sites	It is perceived by my members that the higher echelons of the authority are at the least dismissive of anglers if not taking an anti-angling stance, we don't find this to be so at a lower level, in our frequent interactions with the Fisheries Management team. We think the higher echelons should be reminded of the considerable sums paid to the Authority annually by anglers (According to LVRPA published accounts in the last 3 years Fisheries income was 127,000 (2012), 134,000 (2013) & 144,000 (2014). We feel we should be getting something back in return for this other than just a place to fish. FYI we do a lot of our own maintenance where allowed and bailiff these waters as well. With the planned increase in visitor numbers especially around angling areas, can some minimal facilities be provided whilst not expecting LVRPA fisheries to directly compete with Commercial fisheries i.e. they have loads of fish, toilets, on-site car parking, café, and/or tackle shop, some minimal toilet facilities could at least should be provided, there are two sites I know of that don't even have a Portaloo present i.e. Turnford Pits & Fishers Green Complex (N.B. HSE Regulations state a minimum of 1 if this was a workplace and with weekend attendance being higher s/be 2, and these consortia have at least 2,500 members). This would avoid accusations of indecent exposure for male anglers caught short and render fisheries more family friendly as females would not have to disappear off to find a secluded spot for a call of nature (which is both stressful and demeaning for them), as a bonus passing visitors would also be able to use them.	Comments noted. The Authority recognises the need to improve the range of visitor facilities available throughout the Park. Existing facilities should be accessible to all visitors and offer as a minimum toilets, shelter and information about the Park. Proposal identify key 'visitor hubs' within the Park where a suite of facilities will be provided or already exist, including refreshments, cycle and car parking, indoor space for meeting, education etc. Area 7 is not well served by visitor hubs with only Dobbs Weir area and the Roydon Mill Lesiure Park offering some visitor facilities. Proposals are seeking to improve upon this situation but the scope is limited. Temporary facilities in less well connected areas are difficult to maintain and prone to vandalism and are not considered a viable solution.	No change	
SR 32.133						email re not being consulted 12 Jan when in fact their email address not working		
GI33.3	Waltham Abbey Town Council			NGAR	Under the environment objective, we would also like to see a commitment to strenuously object to the Northern Gateway Access Road across Rammey Marsh. Enfield Borough Council, as part of its development strategy, the North East Enfield Area Action Plan, has brought forward this proposal to build a road across the Marsh to the detriment of this local area.	Comments Noted but refer to Area 5 which has already been adopted. Note also that references to NGAR were removed from the North East Enfield Area Action Plan which was adopted in June 2016 and it is s not therefore being taken forward.	No change	
GI33.4	Waltham Abbey Town Council			Green Belt	We would also like to see a commitment to the protection of the Green Belt, wherever possible, in particular where the Green Belt is essential to maintaining the green boundaries between the London Boroughs and Waltham Abbey, e.g. Sewardstone Road	Comments Noted but refer to Area 5 which has already been adopted	No change	
GI36.0	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.3 Visitors	Access	Ref Section 7 that relates to the Roydon Area. Lots of words, some repeated. Our thoughts are that any 'upgrades' suggested for the Roydon area seem to involve other bodies such the Canals and River Trust – now a charity and seeking funding before undertaking additional works – will LVRPA be paying C&RT for their work and subsequent upgrades over time?. We note that LVRPA are hoping to upgrade the canalside pathways from Roydon station – good in some part but I can see the pathways from Roydon station to Harlow being additionally used to gain access to LVRPA and who will fund the maintenance of these areas? C&RT will say they don't have the funds to do so.	Comments noted. The aim of the proposals under Visitors is to improve access into the Regional Park from surrounding communities and to enhance access within the Park, connecting strategic routes and open spaces. There has been investment in a number of routes such as the Lee Valley Walk, Stort Navigation, Lee Valley Pathway both by the Authority and partners such as C&RT. More can be done however to create circular routes and connect with public transport services to improve opportunities for all visitors.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI36.1	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.3 Visitors		We agree with improved signage – that in turn brings in additional visitors. However not all visitors will use the train (if they stop at Roydon – this is rather hit and miss of late!) Where will these people park, in Roydon? I can therefore see more parking at Franco's Restaurant (old station ticket office) or the entrance to Briggins Estate, which is not acceptable – visitors won't pay to park at Roydon station.	Comments noted. Access by car is an issue throughout the Park. Proposals for this area focus on connections with public transport to try and offer alternatives and reduce the number of visitors that use a car	No change
GI36.2	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.3	Flooding	We note the reference to flooding in our section and I would agree nearer to Dobbs Weir, on the fields, the surface can get pretty wet especially coming down the footpath from Parkfields area. At present Roydon Countrycare maintain these paths – what hope of any future input from LVRPA to maintain footpaths?	Comments noted. The Authority carries out footpath maintenance works on those areas within its ownership.	No change
GI36.3	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.3 Visitors		We note that some narrow boats that are moored illegally will be dealt with – at present they disappear and then return – will there be frequent monitoring?	Comments noted. This would be a matter for C&RT to resolve.	No change
GI36.4	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.3 Land- scape & Heritage		We note that Netherhall ruin is mentioned on several occasions – I wonder what the owner thinks about the proposals? Has he been consulted?	Comments noted. Unfortunately the Authority does not have details about the owner of Netherhall.	No change
GI36.5	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.3 Visitors		There are a number of people (ramblers) who use Glen Faba Road (from Low Hill & Netherhall Roads) as access to the adjacent fields – there appears no proposals to make a car park in this area which is also used by fishermen. At present visitors park along the road which is only a single track width.	Comments noted. There are no proposals to provide a car park in this location. However provision is proposed to the south of Glen Faba Lake with access off Dobbs Weir Road.	No change
GI36.6	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.1 Visitors	Dobbs Weir	There is much reference to areas of Dobbs Weir (which come under Roydon Parish) which is Ok. It is to be hoped that the pedestrian crossing over the bridge will appear when the new bridge is installed (Summer 2015). There was reference to the car park loos being upgraded. Will these include showers? I was thinking about the numbers of narrow boats that use this stretch – they may find a shower useful. Will the car park at Dobbs Weir, currently owned by Roydon Parish Council & leased to LVRPA, will remain as is at present or undergo an upgrade? Maybe when they have finished the bridge, the car park will need resurfacing. Will there be any financial request to Roydon Parish Council towards any work relating to the toilets/car park?	Comments noted. The bridge was completed in 2016. There are no proposals to install showers within the toilet block.	No change
GI36.7	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.3 Visitors	Roydon Marina Village	One item that concerns us is the road to Roydon Marina – privately owned and very narrow in places but the report does mention Roydon Marina working with LVRPA. At present the vehicles coming from Herts over the crossing and turning into the Mill are a hazard and likewise those coming up the road from the Marina never stop at the junction with the B181 and come right out in front of any traffic coming from either direction – this has been mentioned before (to Highways) but with any increased traffic this junction needs to be well marked out/signposted and adhered to.	Comments noted. This matter would need to be addressed by the County Council and would be an issue with any increased activity on site.	No change
GI36.8	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.1 Visitors	Cycle Hire	We note cycle hire features – at Dobbs Weir café – where will they find room to store them? Likewise with Roydon – where will this be located? We have raised concern with Network Rail about the state of the old engine shed – that would make an ideal café with cycle hire facilities. Cycle safety is a concern and there appears to be no mention of 'medical/first aid points' in the report.	Comments noted. The Authority's adopted Cycling Strategy addresses these issues and feasibility work will examine potential for cycle hire and issues of storage and safety in this area.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI36.9	The Roydon Society	7		7.A.3 Visitors		Local residents have expressed concerns about the operation of Roydon BR station for a number of years. These concerns have covered the closure of the ticket office, the faulty ticket machine/permit to travel machine, the lack of cover to stand under when the weather is inclement, the lack of train information (if a train is running late etc) and more recently scheduled trains just not stopping at Roydon. These concerns need to be taken into account if LVRPA are suggesting using the station to bring in more visitors.	Comments noted. There is now a shelter on the London bound platform and the ticket machine is operational.	No change
GI36.10	The Roydon Society	7			Funding	Whilst the report reads like a progressive wish list for the future, these suggested recommendations will require funding in a period of austerity. Is LVRPA depending on close working agencies/authorities to fund some of these initiatives? And once put in place, what infrastructure will be available for maintenance/upgrades?	Comments noted. The Authority recognises that partnership working is key to funding delivery.	No change
GI37.0	Roydon Parish Council	7		7.A.1 & 7.A.3 Visitors		The Parish Council would like to make the following comments with regard to this consultation and in particular the Parish area (within Area 7) which includes Roydon Station and Dobbs Weir:- A number of suggested improvements to the area within the Park require the co-operation of other organisations. For example the car park at Dobbs Weir is owned by Roydon Parish Council and Roydon Station and the canal towpaths nearby are also the responsibility of other organisations such as the Canal & River Trust (C&RT) which has very limited funds. The financial implications for each organisation are not detailed so at this point the consultation seems to be very much a wish-list.	Comments noted. Partnership working is an important mechanism throughout the Park and essential to achieve the remit of the Park Authority and deliver projects, particularly as the Authority only owns over a third of the Park. The Proposals build on an agreed way forward set out in the adopted Key Aims and Principles document and the Thematic Proposals. More detailed feasibility work involving key agencies, landowners and organisations such as the C&RT will be required to progress and agree funding streams for a number of proposals..	No change
GI37.1	Roydon Parish Council	7		7.A.3 Visitors		At Roydon Station improved signage into the Park would be of benefit but there is an assumption that all visitors will arrive by train and perhaps hire cycles, although there is no indication as to where these are stored or where other related facilities would be located as the station site is very compact. At present, there is very little in the way of parking for cars etc - perhaps additional land can be found for this. The increased use of towpaths at this location would need to be discussed with C&RT particularly with regard to on-going maintenance.	Comments noted and agreed further feasibility work is required to consider the details of these proposals.	No change
GI37.2	Roydon Parish Council	7		7.A.3 Visitors		Continuing up from the Station, a concern is the road to Roydon Mill - the report mentions the Marina working with LVRPA but the road to the mill is single track with passing places and not particularly suitable for increased traffic above and beyond what the Marina brought to the area. Vehicles turning into the Mill from the High Street (from Hertfordshire) cause a hazard because, whilst waiting to turn, traffic then backs up across the level crossing. Likewise traffic exiting the Mill sometimes does not wait before coming onto the High Street and again this can be dangerous. Better signage here would help	Comments noted	No change
GI37.3	Roydon Parish Council	7		7.A.3 Environ- ment	Flooding	Flooding is a concern at a number of locations particularly nearer to Dobbs Weir/Glen Faba. Footpaths leading from the Park into Roydon in the Parkfields area can also flood.	Comments noted	No change
GI37.4	Roydon Parish Council	7		7.A.3 Visitors		There are a number of people who use Glen Faba Rd as access to the adjacent fields – there appears no proposals to make a car park in this area which is also used by fishermen. At present they park along the road which is already single track.	Comments noted. There are no proposals to provide a car park in this location. However provision is proposed to the south of Glen Faba Lake with access off Dobbs Weir Road.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI37.5	Roydon Parish Council	7		7.A.3 Visitors	Moorings	We note that illegal mooring of narrow boats will be dealt with but better monitoring is required. The Parish has had a number of issues with rubbish and the use of barges as rubbish tips.	Comments noted. This would be a matter for the C&RT	No change
GI37.6	Roydon Parish Council	7		7.A.1	Dobbs Weir car park	The Parish Council owns the Dobbs Weir car park and there is quite a lot mentioned about upgrading and improving facilities and access here such as the toilets and incorporating cycle hire facilities. The Parish Council needs to be fully engaged during this process. It is noted that pedestrian access will improve once the Dobbs Weir Bridge (and its separate pedestrian section) is in place. Cycle safety and medical points along the river also need to be addressed.	Comments noted. The Parish Council will be involved in these proposals	No change
GI39.0	Individual 1 A. Burgess	7		7.A.1 Land-scape & Heritage & Environment	Land-scape	My comments relate to the Roydon section of area 7 and I write as someone who enjoys walking and appreciates the landscape with its biodiversity. I am also a tree warden. <u>Landscape</u> This part of the Park is valued as a quiet area enjoyed by walkers and bird watchers. It is visually attractive in spite of neighbouring developments. Notably, it is important to maintain and enhance a strong shelter belt along the edge of industrial buildings at Dobbs Weir. At the edge of Roydon village the open farmland may in future need protection. The E.F.D.C. Draft Local Plan is not due for about a year and by the time Preferred Options are published, this part of the Park may no longer figure in possibilities for development. Any moves for removing clutter and unwelcome intrusions are to be welcomed in the area generally. Relocation of greenhouses, though welcome, would be highly problematic for new locations.	Comments noted and reference to the importance of a strong landscape screen to industrial estate welcomed. Please note minor amendments made to this proposal.	No change
GI39.1	Individual 1 A. Burgess	7		7.A.1 Visitors	Access	<u>Access</u> Access is important but signage should be as discrete as possible commensurate with clarity. Walkers do find the presence of cyclists obtrusive. Clearly this is an issue for users of the towpath which is in many parts the only route. Efforts should be made to encourage cyclists to respect walkers - should they be made to dismount? Any new paths elsewhere could allow separation of the two users.	Comments noted and the issue of shared paths is understood. The Regional Park does offer a wide range of walking and cycling routes and with the increasing popularity of the Park and of walking and cycling both for leisure and as a means of travel, conflicts do arise. There is no intention on the Authority's behalf as part of the Proposals for Area 7 to provide segregated routes. The Authority's recently completed Cycling Strategy has endorsed this approach.	No change
GI39.2	Individual 1 A. Burgess	7			Bio-diversity	<u>Biodiversity</u> The Park has already gained a reputation for enhancing biodiversity and I appreciate further initiatives as indicated, such as establishing reed beds. Willow as the predominant tree of the area tends to need controlling. Several years ago I contributed native black poplar cuttings for a tree nursery at Amwell but I do not know how well they have fared or been used. Roydon Countrycare fifteen years ago planted cuttings along the Stort at what is now the Marina and they have become a feature in the landscape. With the increase of boats cruising and being moored along the Stort there is a real danger of water quality being compromised and threatening wildlife.	Comments noted. As a ready coloniser much work is focussed on the removal of willow species from the margins of the lakes and waterways. Several strikes have been taken from the Black Poplar nursery to establish trees in locations in the Regional Park. Issue of water quality covered in Environment proposals	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI41.0	Individual 3 A Caslake	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA I write as a volunteer at ESSA Water Activities on the central lagoon, Nazeing. I feel it is totally wrong to suggest moving this centre to share with another centre. Many ESSA users are from the Scouting / Guiding community and these groups do not normally make use of locations that are "open to all". Regular users trust the ESSA team and the site. I feel that LVRPA do not understand what ESSA actually is. It is a teaching centre mostly aimed at young people. It is NOT a club where members pay a fee and have racing events followed by alcoholic drinks at the bar. Not a good idea to have racers and beginners out at the same time. It is not an easy facility to run, applying for grants etc to keep user costs down. But, as JFK said, "We do it because it is hard, not easy". ESSA has existed at its current location since 1993. I would like someone from LVRPA to come and explain to me what it is doing wrong. You say you do not wish to close existing businesses. How about existing charities ?	Comments noted. It is agreed that the proposal to relocate ESSA requires detailed feasibility work. This would need to consider a range of options and the advantages and disadvantages of each, including cost of moving ESSA to Holyfield Lake alongside the cost of retaining current facilities at Central Lagoon with future upgrades. The requirement for separate facilities on child protection grounds is a valid point and an amendment to the draft proposals under 7.A.2 Sport and Recreation was made prior to consultation. Further amendments will be made to proposals under both 7.A.2 and 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation and 7.A.2 Visitors to clarify the need for detailed feasibility work. Please refer to Area 6 document for changes to 6.A.4. Refer also to SR30.2 above.	Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Recreation & Sport - Undertake feasibility work with stake-holders to develop Establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon, including to include a secure car park, new swims and replacement lakeside building catering for both anglers and general Park visitor. This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre - sailing & boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating & sailing groups. Feasibility work will cover the provision of facilities at both Nazeing Central Lagoon and at Holyfield Lake (Area 6) and will need to consider: • relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6; • the associated constraints and options relating to the shared use of facilities between different water based clubs and groups; • the range & type of angling provision that can be delivered at Central Lagoon; • the scale and design of new built facilities required at Central Lagoon taking account of the Green Belt location; • the flood management role of the Nazeing Central Lagoon; • other environmental and access issues
GI49.0	Individual 11 C McGuire	6 to 8		Horticulture	I read with interest your proposals re horticulture. Do you wish to miss out on the possibility of a large slice of 4 billion pounds turnover per year; well I inform you. That is what the Cherry Industry is worth to Spain, including canning , preserving and fresh crops. Due to climate changes and water supplies the industry has to relocate northwards, Essex and Hertfordshire have been researched 4 years ago and it looks good. The soil tested. Well its up to you.	Comments noted	No change
GI51.0	Individual 13 J Nokes	7		7.A.2 Visitors	Dobbs Weir This road is very busy with lots of impatient drivers and as it is on a bend not good visibility. When traffic builds up drivers constantly ignore the lights - <u>Safe Crossings Now Please</u>	Comments noted. Road improvement scheme now complete but pedestrian crossing is still required.	No change
GI51.1	Individual 13 J Nokes	7		7.A.2 Visitors	Meadgate Road Work in this area is overdue. It has got worse over the last year. The road is constantly obstructed with 4 or 5 heavy goods vehicles parked waiting to go into Lignacite and all the verges parked with vans from another company. Where the vehicles have tried to pass all the verges have been completely torn up - photo 1 (photo evidence supplied)	Comments noted.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI51.2	Individual 13 J Nokes	7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Central Lagoon	<p><u>Central Lagoon - Nazeing</u> Establish a Centre for Angling. What exactly does this mean? Why did the park choose Central Lagoon out of the 29 lakes and 17 stretches of water they boast as available for angling? Central lagoon has hosted sailing for more than 50 years and currently is home to ESSA water activity centre - the only water activity centre run by volunteers for youngsters to get their first taste of water activities. Encouraging youngsters to get involved and take responsibility. With all the developments and improvements proposed in this area, visitor hub, new bridge, better road, encouraging visitors I do not believe this would be the best place for angling - in the words of Steve Parker secretary of the Kings and Cheshunt Angling Society "Most anglers go fishing to get away from it all". Southern lagoon or Glen Faba lakes would seem to offer more. As Guide Leader for Nazeing Guides and Brownies we have used ESSA for a number of years. It provides an ideal location for the youngsters to enjoy their first taste of water sports. Central lagoon provides a small area of water, clear of obstructions and hazards. It is close to the main road allowing parents easy access, they can then leave the children for their activity. As youngsters become more independent it is close to Broxbourne station so they can walk and also has safe access by bike.</p>	Comments and concerns noted. It is agreed that the proposal to relocate ESSA requires detailed feasibility work which will include the requirement for separate facilities on child protection grounds . The Central Lagoon has a long history of carp angling and a new centre in this location will also require detailed feasibility work and planning. Please refer to GI41.0 above.	Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Recreation & Sport - Undertake feasibility work with stake-holders to develop Establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon, including to include a secure car park, new swims and replacement lakeside building catering for both anglers and general Park visitor. This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre- sailing & boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield-Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating & sailing groups. Feasibility work will cover the provision of facilities at both Nazeing Central Lagoon and at Holyfield Lake (Area 6) and will need to consider: • relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6; • the associated constraints and options relating to the shared use of facilities between different water based clubs and groups; • the range & type of angling provision that can be delivered at Central Lagoon; • the scale and design of new built facilities required at Central Lagoon taking account of the Green Belt location; • the flood management role of the Nazeing Central Lagoon: • other environmental and access issues
GI51.3	Individual 13 J Nokes	6 & 7		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Fishers Green Sailing Club	<p><u>Fishers Green Sailing Club</u> I visited Fishers Green and feel that access is not suitable . The lake is a lot further, access is from the notorious Crooked Mile road down a very long drive into the middle of the park, followed by a approx 20 minute walk to the actual club. This rules out any youngsters attending on foot or on their bikes. The lake itself although bigger appears to be dotted with hazards (islands) and has a large weir at one end. (photo 2) <i>Photo of island supplied</i> The report states that the Lee Valley Park wants to create a Centre of Excellence for sailing. This cannot be created by putting everyone in the same place. Beginners and experts have different needs. A sailing club has a membership who pay to belong. They decide their sailing programme. This generally includes a Day of racing and of race training. They do not have beginners out when they are racing. When sailors are racing they want to win and they hate having anyone in their way. Youngster who are learning do not know how to keep out of their way and can be really upset by the experienced sailors. (I know, as a youngster at Herts Young Mariners I was subjected to abuse because I managed to in someones way when I was learning to sail some 40 years ago).</p>	Comments and detailed points regarding shared use of facilities and water space noted. These matters would need to be fully considered as part of any feasibility work. Proposal 7.A.2 Sport & recreation has been amended to make this clear.	Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Recreation & Sport - Undertake feasibility work with stake-holders to develop Establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon, including to include a secure car park, new swims and replacement lakeside building catering for both anglers and general Park visitor. This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre- sailing & boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield-Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating & sailing groups. Feasibility work will cover the provision of facilities at both Nazeing Central Lagoon and at Holyfield Lake (Area 6) and will need to consider: • relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6; • the associated constraints and options relating to the shared use of facilities between different water based clubs and groups; • the range & type of angling provision that can be delivered at Central Lagoon; • the scale and design of new built facilities required at Central Lagoon taking account of the Green Belt location; • the flood management role of the Nazeing Central Lagoon: • other environmental and access issues
GI51.4	Individual 13 J Nokes	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	As a Water Activity centre the youth groups have exclusive use of the building with all adults DRB checked - If Lee Valley does move ESSA to Fishers Green would they provide a new Building or tell the Sailing club they are not able to use their building at certain times?	Comments noted. The matter of shared facilities is an important consideration for further feasibility work. Please refer to comments above	Please refer to the proposed changes above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI51.5	Individual 13 J Nokes	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	In the report there is mention of replacing the buildings at Central Lagoon - This is a good idea - BUT work with ESSA water activity centre so that they can continue on Central Lagoon and during School times the buildings could offer an excellent facility for school to enjoy the outdoors. I feel that schools would appreciate a location that had a boundary.	Comments noted, please see related coments above.	Please see related amendments above under GI51.3
GI51.6	Individual 13 J Nokes	6 & 7		7.A.2 Visitors	Meadgate Road	Look forward to seeing the improvements in Meadgate road - I believe Lignacite are currently making another entry to the factory from the main road which might help a bit.	Comments noted. The Authority has not received any notification of an application for a new entrance	No change
GI54.0	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	These comments are submitted with the intention of supporting, and improving, the opportunities for ESSA at the Central Lagoon, in alignment with the policies and intentions of the Lea Valley Regional Park Authority as set out in the "Area 7 Draft Proposals Schedule". ESSA is a small independent water sports facility located on the south west bank of the Central Lagoon, Nazeing. ESSA has been in this location since 1993. ESSA provides opportunities for local individuals and groups, particularly youth groups, to learn to sail and do other water activities. As a member of a Hertford youth group with a water-based remit, this facility is extremely important as it is our best accessible and economical local sail-training facility. In the Draft Proposal for Area 7, development of the environs of Central Lagoon is discussed in some detail with various possibilities proposed. There is mention of opening this area of the park to a greater amount of public access. The land adjacent to ESSA to the north contains former residential plots that might be redeveloped to "open woodland" for "Day Camping". There is mention of providing a "Centre for Angling" and of relocating ESSA to Holyfield Lake. There is the suggestion of a new set of amenities and car park in that vicinity. There is alternatively, mention of use of ESSA facilities as public toilets for passing visitors and for users of the open woodland.	Comments noted. Information about ESSA, its operations staus and activities also noted.	No change
GI54.1	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	<i>continued..</i> ESSA is an independent RYA Training facility and whilst it is open to members of the public by prior arrangement, for reasons of safeguarding it is not appropriate for members of the public to enter unannounced to use amenities. ESSA is not a sailing club and instead is a Charitable Trust that provides water-sport opportunities to members of the local community, typically Scout and Guide groups. Some of these groups come from far away to use the venue, to stay for days at a time. ESSA has been in its present location since 1993 despite the access being poor and an urgent need for investment in the infrastructure. This clearly emphasises that the water sports venue is highly popular and attractive to individuals and groups within the local community and it is hoped that Lea Valley will recognise this is a significant asset within the Lea Valley Park. It is hoped the LVRPA will do everything it can to support it. The ESSA trustees clearly wish to make progress in the level of provision ESSA can make to the community, and ESSA deserves the opportunity to continue in the secure knowledge that Lea Valley Park will give them full support for many years to come.	Comments and information about ESSA and its operations noted. ESSA have provided detailed comments on the draft proposals.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI54.2	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	<p>ESSA</p> <p><u>Comment upon plans for the use of the Central Lagoon.</u> Presently the use of the lagoon is primarily two-fold – for ESSA and for Anglers. Several swims were located around the lake, some of these have fallen into disrepair. These two activities can, with a little mutual tolerance, coexist on the lake, as is also the case on the Northern Lagoon.</p> <p>One of the proposed plans is for a “Centre for Angling” to be established on the Central Lagoon, with a amenities, unspecified, to cater for both anglers and the General Park Visitor. The plans state this may require ESSA to relocate to Holyfield Lake. “This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating and sailing groups.”</p> <p>It appears that at the time of this statement the options have not been discussed with ESSA and the other stakeholders; nevertheless the Consultation Process does invite response upon this. The ESSA Trustees had been asked to consider relocating to Holyfield Lake in 2010 and rejected the proposal on several grounds; those grounds have not changed since then – please refer to ESSA Trustees for full details.</p>	<p>It is the case that the proposal to relocate ESSA requires detailed feasibility work as does the proposal for a ‘Centre for Angling’. ESSA have provided detailed comments on the draft proposals. Amendments will be made to proposals under both 7.A.2 and 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation to clarify the need for detailed feasibility work. Please refer to Area 6 document for changes to 6.A.4</p>	<p>Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Recreation & Sport - Undertake feasibility work with stake-holders to develop Establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon, including to include a secure car park, new swims and replacement lakeside building catering for both anglers and general Park visitor. This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre sailing & boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating & sailing groups. Feasibility work will cover the provision of facilities at both Nazeing Central Lagoon and at Holyfield Lake (Area 6) and will need to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6; • the associated constraints and options relating to the shared use of facilities between different water based clubs and groups; • the range & type of angling provision that can be delivered at Central Lagoon; • the scale and design of new built facilities required at Central Lagoon taking account of the Green Belt location; • the flood management role of the Nazeing Central Lagoon; • other environmental and access issues
GI54.3	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	<p>Centre for Angling</p> <p>The proposals refer to a “Centre for Angling” on the central lagoon – this might be considered of restricted overall benefit to the community. Anglers prefer privacy and seclusion. This proposal seems of little merit to the myriad of community of youth groups and independent water sports enthusiasts from the local area up the valley to Ware and to Hertford. Sailing and Angling coexist on the Northern Lagoon and both may continue to be accommodated if ESSA is sustained in its present location. Further it is noted that the attraction of the Central Lagoon for anglers is restricted to the number of swims, and that one of the planning diagrams proposed shows swims only on the East side of the lagoon - 5658-01_004_LVRPA_Area7_Base_SportRecreation, although elsewhere in the Proposal there is talk of renovated disabled access swims on the East side. If the Lea Valley feels strongly that amenities and facilities are required in this area, the investment might be done in conjunction with ESSA which draws the majority of users to the Central Lagoon. Whilst there might be the possibility of investing where Meadgate Road reaches the river-bank, investment near ESSA could be of mutual benefit, however there are issues of privacy and safeguarding to be taken into account. ESSA would benefit from improvements to the track, and perhaps from interest from members of the public using adjacent public amenities, nevertheless, for reasons of safeguarding, seclusion and privacy is significant to ESSA.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Angling is a very popular activity within the Regional Park and although both angling and sailing have managed to co-exist on the Central Lagoon this has required restrictive practices for both operations which are not sustainable. The larger size of water on the North Lagoon, the lower number of fish and the more advanced sailing skills of those sailing with the Broxnourne Sailing Club has enabled a much more successful co-existence of sailers and anglers on the North Lagoon. The proposed detailed feasibility work will need to consider the advantages and disadvantages of moving ESSA to Holyfield Lake alongside the cost of retaining current facilities at Central Lagoon, factoring in cost of future upgrades and improvements to facilities. Further amendments will be made to proposals under both 7.A.2 and 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation to clarify the need for detailed feasibility work. Please refer to Area 6 document for changes to 6.A.4</p>	<p>Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Recreation & Sport - Undertake feasibility work with stake-holders to develop Establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon, including to include a secure car park, new swims and replacement lakeside building catering for both anglers and general Park visitor. This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre sailing & boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating & sailing groups. Feasibility work will cover the provision of facilities at both Nazeing Central Lagoon and at Holyfield Lake (Area 6) and will need to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6; • the associated constraints and options relating to the shared use of facilities between different water based clubs and groups; • the range & type of angling provision that can be delivered at Central Lagoon; • the scale and design of new built facilities required at Central Lagoon taking account of the Green Belt location; • the flood management role of the Nazeing Central Lagoon; • other environmental and access issues

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI54.4	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Visitors	ESSA	The proposals mention the possibility of opening the former residential land between the river and the Central Lagoon for "day camping". The woodland and temporary shelters therein may not bring in as many visitors as these again require a degree of seclusion, however they may create issues such as littering, whilst the cost of servicing the necessary amenities might not be recovered.	Comments noted. Feasibility work for the proposed day camping will need to take account of operational issues such as services and day to day management issues. Hence the proposal state "investigating the feasibility of designing and constructing a limited number of carbon neutral 'sustainable' huts...."	No change
GI54.5	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Visitors	ESSA	Investment in the track along the East side of the Central lagoon from Meadgate Road to ESSA would be appropriate if LVRPA were to support the community effort and opportunity that ESSA has been providing since 1993. Investment in ESSA is deserved. ESSA had 3000 visits last year. Due to difficulty obtaining grants for investment, pending securing a long-term lease, considerable investment in ESSA is highly sought after by the users and trustees. The many attractions and benefits of water sports are clearly recognised by those whom it is not appropriate to belong to a Sailing Club. The benefits of water-sports activities to the community are substantial in terms of enhancing interpersonal communication and community cohesiveness. Supporting cooperative investment from Lea Valley, in recognition of the demand for ESSA, would enhance what is already a significant asset to the community. Nevertheless the Trustees of ESSA are merely seeking to be given a long term lease in their present location so that they can seek the investment from further afield, such as Sport England, and the Landfill Trust. Investment is urgently required to improve the foreshore, and grant applications demand a long term lease.	Comments noted.	No change other than those made under G154.3 above
GI54.6	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Visitors	ESSA	For the LVRPA to utilise the land between the river and the Central Lagoon for public recreation – Day Camping, investment in access would be beneficial – and that would assist ESSA too. A car-park, toilets and waste facilities would support local Anglers. The Meadgate Road, and the track to the swims and to ESSA deserves investment. ESSA is already paying a significant rent for the short term leasing agreement, this may be considered a greater contribution to the Park than may be collected by Day Camping visitors and anglers whose numbers must be low since they seek seclusion. In consideration it would make sense for LVRPA to support the Trustees of ESSA by providing a robust lease that allows ESSA to source funding for investment; and LVRPA would also be able to support ESSA through investment in the track to ESSA and the East-side swims, and to Meadgate Road, to enhance car parking and shared public amenities. This would enable ESSA to grow and offer better facilities to young people and community groups. In supporting and promoting ESSA, the LVRPA would be promoting the interests of many Park visitors	Comments noted, feasibility work will need to consider these issues and the investment options.	No change other than those made under G154.3 above

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI54.7	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA	<p><u>Comment upon the Suggested of Relocation of ESSA to Holyfield Lake.</u> - Already there is an independent private, sailing club at Holyfield Lake. Considerable investment would be required to relocate ESSA to Holyfield Lake. A new training building would be required, due to safeguarding issues of sharing facilities with the existing club. There would be issues relating to Safeguarding if the same facilities were to be used by the two different groups at the same time.</p> <p>Access to ESSA from the North, despite the poor track, is easier than to Holyfield Lake. ESSA is certainly much more accessible from Hertford and Ware. For ESSA, the visitors from Hertford and Ware can cycle along the river-side safely and conveniently. Holyfield Lake is too far away to undertake this readily. ESSA is readily accessible on foot from Broxbourne mainline rail station, and as such may attract visitors from London. Holyfield Lake is less accessible by rail. The nearest station is Cheshunt and from there, Herts Young Mariner's Base is accessible.</p> <p>The private users of the sailing club may not appreciate the medley of young people sailing for the first time, an activity which is best kept secluded and to some extent private, not only for safeguarding reasons but for other practicalities.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is agreed that the proposal to relocate ESSA requires detailed feasibility work. This would need to consider a range of options and the advantages and disadvantages of each. The cost of implementing each option would be a major factor in any decision made. For each option there is a need to consider the cost of moving ESSA to Holyfield Lake alongside the cost of retaining current facilities at Central Lagoon factoring in cost of future upgrades and improvements to facilities. Likewise issues of access, particularly using public transport and cycle/walking routes will also need to be considered. The requirement for separate facilities on child protection grounds is a valid point and an amendment to the draft proposals under 7.A.2 Sport and Recreation was made prior to consultation. Further amendments will be made to proposals under both 7.A.2 and 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation to clarify the need for detailed feasibility work. Please refer to Area 6 document for changes to 6.A.4</p>	<p>Amend Proposal 7.A.2 as follows: Water Recreation & Sport - Undertake feasibility work with stake-holders to develop Establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon, including to include a secure car park, new swims and replacement lakeside building catering for both anglers and general Park visitor. This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre- sailing & boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating & sailing groups. Feasibility work will cover the provision of facilities at both Nazeing Central Lagoon and at Holyfield Lake (Area 6) and will need to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities to Holyfield Lake in Area 6; • the associated constraints and options relating to the shared use of facilities between different water based clubs and groups; • the range & type of angling provision that can be delivered at Central Lagoon; • the scale and design of new built facilities required at Central Lagoon taking account of the Green Belt location; • the flood management role of the Nazeing Central Lagoon; • other environmental and access issues
GI54.8	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	<p>Personal Interest</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As an adult member of a Hertford Youth Group with intentions to support the ongoing use of ESSA and Central Lagoon for water activity training. 2. Volunteering at ESSA for several years has provided personal skills and social benefits. 3. Recognition that ESSA is an excellent venue for socialising amidst many community groups. 4. Recognition that a prosperous ESSA at the Central Lagoon brings more benefit to Lea Valley than other uses. 5. Recognising that the independently run charitable organisation is a key asset in the community, and that the Trustees of ESSA have maintained that Central Lagoon is the preferred location. 	<p>Comments Noted</p>	<p>no change</p>
GI54.9	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>ESSA presently serves a large number of individuals and community groups within the Lea Valley and further afield. ESSA is on an excellent location from the perspective of accessibility and seclusion. ESSA deserves investment both in terms of obtaining a longer lease that can be used to facilitate investment grants, and in improvements to road access and car-parking. Investment in these would support other users of the Park too. Provision of additional nearby amenities such as toilets and waste collection would be needed if Day Camping and "Centre of Angling" were introduced. While these may be of general benefit, they may not draw sufficient members alone to be worthwhile; done in conjunction with a little investment for ESSA, there might be mutual benefit. Safeguarding issues would need to be respected.</p>	<p>Comments noted and have been addressed above</p>	<p>Please refer to responses above.</p>

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

GI54.10	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	<p><i>summary continued</i> .. Presently ESSA is a source of visitors and income to the Central Lagoon area which may not be replaced solely by day-campers and a Centre of Angling.</p> <p>It would not serve the public interest by relocating ESSA to Holyfield Lake. Relocating would require investment and introduces safeguarding issues as well as problems of accessibility.</p> <p>The Trustees of ESSA and the Users of ESSA prefer for Lea Valley to endorse and promote ESSA as an independent charitable trust for the benefit of the local community – and for the Park.</p>	Comments noted and have been addressed above	Please refer to responses above.
GI56.0	Individual 18 B Smith	6 to 8			Glass-house Industry	<p>For your information I have directed my "objections" to your plans to take into ownership any land or property currently part of the Lee Valley Growers Industry to the Prime Ministers Office some days ago. I totally object to the Lee Valley Park Authority continuing to "Empire Building!"</p> <p>Many years ago, much of the Lee Valley was open Marshland & Common land which has been steadily, since 1945 been fenced by local Councils and others against Public Common Land Legislation, sold for Mineral Extraction, left to be become derelict and then absorbed into ownership of the Lee Valley Park in a disgraceful corrupt manner contrary to the original origins of "Commons and Public Ownership!.</p>	Comments noted. The Regional Park was set up by an Act of Parliament in 1966 to regenerate and manage derelict, contaminated and disused land as a leisure, recreational, sporting and nature conservation resource for the benefit of people within the Greater London, Essex and Herfordshire area.	No change
GI59.0	Individual H & R Arthurs					<p>Keen cyclists and also Park volunteers (litter picking) Richard also works for Sustrans checking signs and paths. They take cycling groups on routes around Park and think provision is good. They have experienced aggression from joggers (ears covered by headsets earplugs etc so don't hear bicycle bell) and speeding cyclists but generally think it works well. Email identified incorrect sign in Nazeing with photographic evidenc. It should point right to the traffic light at Nazeing New Road, but points straight across to a footpath.</p>	These comments were acknowledged and issue of incorrect sign is being rectified.	No change
OA60.0	HMWT				NIA	<p>1. Conservation priorities. The Wildlife Trust's promote a landscape-scale approach to conservation to secure more, bigger, better and joined-up wildlife sites. The Park Authority is in a prime position to achieve this within the Regional Park and the wider Lea Catchment Nature Improvement Area. The LVRPA has the ability to do this more effectively due to the amount of land it owns, unlike the Colne Valley Regional Park which does not own land and has to rely on other landowners to achieve all its goals. It is our view that the regional park's highest conservation priority should be to ensure that the SPA/Ramsar remains in favourable condition. Following this it should ensure all SSSIs remain in favourable condition. In addition favourable ecological condition should be sought for all local wildlife sites within the Park boundary. The regional park sits within the middle and lower Lea parts of the Lea Catchment – http://www.riverleacatchment.org.uk/ - we urge the regional park to work with us as catchment hosts to conserve and enhance the river Lea and its tributaries. The Park has the opportunity to facilitate river restoration and help private landowners to contribute to delivering landscape scale objectives.</p>	The Authority plays an active role within both the Lea Catchment NIA and Catchment Partnerships, fully supporting a landscape-scale approach to conservation and working with partners to achieve this. The Regional Park is home to a range of designated areas and will focus attention on these to ensure they are maintained in favourable condition.	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA60.6	HMWT	6 to 8			Bio-diversity	7. Early successional habitats. Much of the Lee Valley has been the subject of quarrying for aggregates over the past century. During this process bare sands and gravel were exposed and provided habitat for rare nesting migratory birds such as little ringed plovers and common terns. As these habitats initially mature an interesting flora often develops with uncommon communities of plants within shallows around gravel pits allowed to flood. However, in time (often quite rapidly) natural succession means such habitats are lost to more common habitats of scrub and secondary woodland. Experience gained at 70 Acres Lake at Waltham Abbey (funded partly by LIFE Nature from 2002-2006) showed there is potential to ecologically 'turn back the clock' by clearing scrub and exposing sands and gravels with excavators. This large scale perturbation should be considered on a rotation on the Lee Valley's gravel pits (subject obviously to survey for existing value). Without such interventions we are likely to lose some of our biodiversity which is associated with these early successional habitats. The Trust would be happy to work in partnership with LVRPA to this end – ideally the identification of a programme of interventions and plan these over the next 25 years.	Comments Noted	No change
OA60.7	HMWT	6 to 8			Bio-diversity	8. Grasslands. Over the last 20 years much of the regional park's grasslands and fen have been lost to scrub and woodland with a corresponding loss of those species associated with those grasslands. If we are not to lose more of these grasslands, the Park should take action over the next 10 years to halt such losses and restore grasslands and fen which are in danger of being lost. A landscape-scale approach should be taken such that such sites are linked throughout the Park.	Comments noted and agreed. The Authority plays an active role within both the Lea Catchment NIA and Catchment Partnerships, fully supporting a landscape scale approach to conservation and working with partners to achieve this. The Regional park is home to a range of designated areas and will focus attention on these to ensure they are maintained in favourable condition. This approach is also being supported via the work on the Lee Valley BAP.	No change
OA60.8	HMWT	6 to 8			Contamin-ation	9. Contaminated land. One of the Park's original objectives was to decontaminate land and bring it into use for recreation and conservation. This seems to have stopped in recent years. It is our view that there are some significant opportunities to create new wildlife habitats through the treatment of contaminated land. The Park should look for innovative ways to restore such land for the benefit of both people and wildlife, for example, through using material generated by development projects such as tunnels, to cap and create new habitats on currently contaminated and unavailable land.	Comments noted, the issue of contaminated land is ongoing. the Authority's Contaminated Land Policy sets out measures to assess risk in terms of public access and safety. This maintains large areas of land for wildlife free from intensive public access.	No change
OA60.10	HMWT	6 to 8			Access to nature	11. People and wildlife. Given there are 10 million people within an hour's drive of the regional park, the park authority should continue with its excellent work in promoting and providing sustainable access to the Lee Valley. It should continue to develop innovative opportunities for wildlife watching with associated interpretation.	Comments noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA61.0	Canal & River Trust				<p>The Canal & River Trust is a statutory consultee under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Trust is a company limited by guarantee and registered as a charity. It is separate from government but still the recipient of a significant amount of government funding. The Trust has a range of charitable objectives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To hold in trust or own and to operate and manage inland waterways for public benefit, use and enjoyment; • To protect and conserve objects and buildings of heritage interest; • To further the conservation, protection and improvement of the natural environment of inland waterways; and • To promote sustainable development in the vicinity of any inland waterways for the benefit of the public. 	Comments Noted	No change
OA61.1	Canal & River Trust				<p>We work extensively with private, public and voluntary partners to conserve, enhance and improve our waterways within the Borough and nationally. We believe that our expertise and responsibility for waterspace, combined with the ownership of docks, canals and waterside properties, puts us in a unique position to facilitate redevelopment for economic, social and environmental gain. The canals in particular have historically experienced a prolonged period of decline. However, in recent years, the canals and navigable rivers have experienced significant development pressures from mixed use, commercial, residential, tourism/recreation and other developments. Attractive waterside environments have stimulated this interest and been at the heart of some of the most significant regeneration schemes in London (and the borough), including the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park.</p>	Comments Noted	No change
OA61.2	Canal & River Trust				<p>Our waterways are helping to stimulate regional, sub-regional and local economies and are being used successfully as tools in improving community well-being, urban and housing offers; attracting and generating investment; place making and shaping; as well as in delivering wider public benefit. They are also making an increasingly important contribution to the visitor economy and there is a growing national awareness of the added value and commercial betterment deriving from the presence of waterways in developments.</p>	Comments noted, within the Park the waterways are a core leisure and ecological asset contributing to the visitor experience and attractiveness of the landscape.	No change
OA61.3	Canal & River Trust				<p>The health and performance of the inland waterway network is directly linked to the quality of the neighbourhood and environment through which waterways passes. The public benefit delivered by the inland waterway network in turn is substantially dependent upon its health and performance. The Town and Country Planning Association's Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways (2009) outlines the value of the waterways to local economies and health and well-being aims, providing a comprehensive framework for assisting in the delivery of high quality public waterspaces and waterside developments, and should be referenced within these documents: http://www.tcpa.org.uk/pages/inland-waterways.html</p>	Comments Noted	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA61.4	Canal & River Trust				We passionately believe that our network of multi-functional canals, navigable rivers and docks have significant untapped potential to deliver leisure, recreation, tourism, culture, heritage, biodiversity, education, sustainability and regeneration opportunities. For example, our waterways can help to deliver the LDF's objectives by, amongst other things: 1. Encouraging high quality, mixed use, waterside regeneration schemes with an appropriate mix of moorings can help to transform London's inclusive canals and navigable rivers and improve access to the towpath and the water for active use as open-air gyms or as quiet places to address inequalities in physical and mental health;	Comments noted. This approach can be adapted to ensure that within the Hertfordshire and Essex area of the Park the waterways and associated towpaths continue to provide recreational walking and cycling opportunities, space for educational activities and contribute to healthy living and emntal health programmes. The waterways are also an important habitat for a range of species creating a wildlife corridor the length of the Park.	No change
OA61.5	Canal & River Trust				2. Promoting the waterways as 200-year old 'working heritage' which are part of the third largest heritage estate in England and attract innovative and entrepreneurial businesses on and by the water; 3. Place-making with the waterways integrated at the heart of new and existing communities contributing towards high quality environments; 4. Transforming the city with well-maintained and managed waterways in iconic locations with high quality modern architecture, complementing 200-year old working heritage that can help to improve Londoner's health (open air gyms), welfare (strong focus for communities) and development (opportunities for volunteering, education, etc); 5. Helping London to mitigate and adapt to climate change; and 6. Providing a truly sustainable 100-mile long, transport network right across London for walking, jogging, cycling, waterborne passengers and freight.	Comments noted. This approach can be adapted to ensure that within the Hertfordshire and Essex area of the Park the waterways and associated towpaths continue to provide recreational walking and cycling opportunities, space for educational activities and contribute to healthy living and emntal health programmes. The waterways are also an important habitat for a range of species creating a wildlife corridor the length of the Park.	No change
OA61.6	Canal & River Trust			general	We have the following specific comments to make on the Park Development Framework: We note that the Lee Navigation is spelled inconsistently throughout the documents as either the Lea Navigation or the Lee Navigation. The correct spelling is Lee Navigation and we request that this is used consistently throughout the documents. Please also note that the Canal & River Trust uses an ampersand (&) within its title, we would appreciate the correct form being used throughout the document.	Comments noted. Within Area 7 there are no incorrect spellings of Lee or Canal & River Trust	No change
OA61.8	Canal & River Trust	6 to 8		facilities for boaters	The Trust supports the policy of providing additional facilities for recreational and leisure boaters. The Trust would appreciate being kept informed with regard to these improved/new facilities so that we can pass this information on to our customers. Any additional facilities should include pump-outs, refuse stations and water points. The Trust looks forward to working with LVRPA in a collaborative manner to enhance the use of the Park by recreational boaters.	Comments noted and colaborative working endorsed	No change
OA61.9	Canal & River Trust	6 to 8		residential moorings	The Trust acknowledges the reluctance of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority to make provision for on-line residential moorings within the Park. The Trust's position remains that, given the demand for residential moorings within the London waterways, opportunities for residential moorings in appropriate locations within the Park should be considered on a case by case basis.	Comments noted. Officers from the Authority are working with the C&RT on a Mooring Strategy	No change

AREA 7 DRAFT CONSULTEE RESPONSES PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 14 March 2018

OA61.11	Canal & River Trust				Access	Proposals to improve pedestrian and cycling facilities within the Park are also supported by the Trust. The Trust has run a successful campaign on our towpaths called "Share the Space, Drop your Pace", which encourages pedestrians, cyclists, anglers, canoeists, boaters and other users to share the space considerately. The Trust would be happy to grant a licence to LVRPA to adopt this campaign for the paths within the Park. A copy of the Trust's "Better Towpaths for Everyone" document can be viewed here: https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/media/library/5481.pdf . Please contact this office for further information.	Comments noted and support for a 'shared use' of towpaths is welcomed	No change
OA61.13	Canal & River Trust	6 to 8			Partner-ship working	The Trust also sees an opportunity for greater collaboration between CRT and LVRPA. Given the intrinsic relationship between the two organisations, the Trust considers there to be opportunities for greater coordination in terms of signage, volunteers, debris/litter management and other matters where core ideals are shared.	Comments noted and future collaboration welcomed	No change
PE64.0	Individual R Ottery					keen to see dedicated separate cycle lane, for access	Comments made at the Ware consultation event. These views are understood but there are no proposals to provide segregated routes. The Authority has recently reviewed its approach via workon a Cycling Strategy. Whilst this recommends improvements to the network and entrances to the Park it does not require segregation of routes.	No change
PE69.0	Individual L Faulkner & R Parish					Commodore Liz Faulkner and Vice Commodore Ray Parish from Hertfordshire County Yacht Club interested in proposals around Stanstead Innings and Stanstead Abbotts. Largely happy with the way things operate at the moment. They have been sent maps for Visitors and Sport and rec to take a closer look. Currently do the circular walk via underpasses and not sure what more can be done to improve the underpasses themselves.		