

ID. No.	Organisation name or individual	Area 6, 7, 8.	Map Ref	Schedule ref	Site name or issue	Consultee Comments	LVRPA Response	Proposed Amendment
LA1.10	Broxbourne Borough Council	8		8.A.1	Turnford Surfacing	The Turnford Surfacing Site is a former aggregate site in Hoddesdon which has also more recently been used for storage purposes. It is an unsightly disused site which would benefit from redevelopment. The Council has for some years been promoting the site for housing overlooking the Regional Park, thereby improving the entrance into the Park from Rye Road & making a contribution towards the Council's housing supply. The development brief for the site also seeks provision of commuter car parking for Rye House Station, improvements to access at the New River Bridge & the Railway Bridge, landscaping to improve the Lee Valley towpath & contributions which enhance & manage the LVRP. The Council believes this redevelopment proposal would benefit the amenity of the local area, support the provision of housing and improve the Park's gateway entrance. The Framework identifies this site as a potential visitor hub with the possibility of it providing a Brewpub, a picnic area, seating, cycle hire, boat hire & moorings. Whilst the Council does not oppose the consideration of part of the site being developed for these uses, it would question the viability and deliverability, particularly given that the site is within private ownership. Given that the Council's proposal for the site has not resulted in a planning application, we would be happy to meet & scope out what may be possible & deliverable to meet the aspirations of both authorities. That might include a mixed use scheme with the inclusion of commuter parking and some housing & I would ask that the Authority takes a pragmatic & realistic position about this issue & that a position is not reinforced which continues to leave the site derelict for the next 20 years.	Draft proposals for the site sought to demonstrate how this site might be brought back into a Park compatible use. However the draft Local Plan has now been issued for consultation. Policy HOD2 Turnford Surfacing Site seeks redevelopment of the site in accordance with the development brief; for residential development and commuter parking. The Authority also understands the need for consistency in respect of how it treats previously developed land within its ownership and previously developed land in private ownership. For this reason the Authority acknowledges the draft Local Plan policy. However the Authority will be seeking benefits financial or otherwise to be negotiated as planning obligations in order to secure a development that complements and enhances the Regional Park, the site's waterside location, and respects its location adjacent to a Schedule Ancient Monument and important ecological assets.	Amend visitor proposal 8.A.1 as follows: delete the whole of paragraph commencing "Undertake a feasibility study with stakeholders to assess potential for a new visitor hub...." through to "Associated boat hire/water bus facilities and visitor moorings could be located at Rye House Quay". Amend second paragraph as follows: "High quality sustainable design will be sought for any development proposals put forward for the ex Turnford Surfacing site which lies adjacent to the River Lee Navigation and forms part of an important entrance point into the Regional Park. Development proposals will need to new-visitor development proposals in this area that respond to the site's waterside location, adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument and related heritage assets, its ecological potential and especially its proximity to protected sites of national and international sites of ecological significance. Pedestrian accessibility should be improved with a widening of the towpath and enhanced links through to Rye House Station and the relationship with the RSPB Rye Meads reserve enhanced with new interpretation and signage along the Toll Road. The Authority will be seeking benefits, financial or otherwise, to be negotiated as planning obligations in order to secure a development that complements and enhances the Regional Park."
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.	Support noted and welcomed	No change
LA1.13	Broxbourne Borough Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors		The Council is supportive of a number of other projects and schemes outlined within the thematic proposals, including - Refurbishing Rye House Bridge	Support 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. It is noted draft Local Plan policy INF8 seeks an additional walking and cycling route on east side of West Anglia railway. Presume this is not relevant to Area 8.	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 which lies within Area 6, has been concluded; the site has permission for housing with a play area & visitor parking. Proposals for Britannia Nurseries will be amended. For Turnford Surfacing please see comments above under LA1.10 above. There are regular discussions between officers of the Authority and Broxbourne in respect of the Broxbourne Local Plan which was issued for consultation last year. The Authority made detailed comments on this document at that time.	See above LA1.10 for amendments on Turnford Surfacing. Area 6 will include amendments relating to Britannia Nurseries.

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 the regular meetings (Duty to Co-operate) between officers from both authorities.	No change
LA2.0	East Herts District Council	8			Local Plan	Thank you for providing us the opportunity to respond to your consultation on the Lee Valley Regional Park Development Framework (LVRPDF). This representation focusses on Area 8 of the Park covering Rye Meads to Ware as this area lies within the East Herts administrative boundary. However, some comments may be relevant to the Park in general. East Herts Council is generally supportive of proposals to improve and enhance the quality and use of the park as a valuable biodiversity and recreational resource. However, the Council is keen to express that such improvements should not occur in a manner that may conflict with local and National Planning Policy Framework objectives.	Comments and support noted	No change
LA2.1	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Entrances	The Council supports the proposed improvements at the Park entrances and enhancements to non-vehicular routes to encourage access through more sustainable means of transport. A balance needs to be found between encouraging access to the park, particularly where this involves improving vehicular access and car parks, and the ambitions to maintain and improve the environment within the Park.	Noted and agreed	No change
LA2.2	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	Marsh Lane is a narrow residential road with a footpath on only one side which already suffers from informal footway parking due to the narrowness of the road. It is essential that improvements to this access do not conflict with the residential use of this road. Where the road narrows to a lane, this is used as a footpath as well as vehicular access. This in itself raises highway safety concerns, particularly if proposals include the intensification of this access to the Park.	Concerns for residents safety noted. This is however an existing established entrance point into the Park on foot, cycle and by car. There would need to be a joint approach with the District Council and local community to address improvements & potential traffic calming. The car park is of a poor standard and requires enhancement.	Amend text under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestains and cyclists. and e Enhance the existing public car park at Stansted Innings.
LA2.3	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Green Belt	Where visitor attractions, camping and touring uses are proposed it is essential that these do not conflict with the wider objectives of the Green Belt, and that new buildings are located as close as possible to existing built structures in order to minimise their impact on the openness of the Green Belt and to reduce the perception of encroachment into the countryside. New facilities may act as a precedent for inappropriate development, particularly where an element of residential activity is involved. This will need careful management during the application stage. The Council would welcome the opportunity to assist with these issues as part of any pre-application process	Noted - the proposals refer to the need for feasibility studies for new visitor facilities/attractions This work would address Green Belt issues and be a collaborative approach with a range of stakeholders.	No change

LA2.4	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Green Belt	With regard to promoting informal waterside recreation at Riverside Green, it would be useful if there was some clarification as to what this would entail. Again, this could be an issue in terms of increasing the intensity of activity at this location. The settlement of Stanstead Abbots St Margaret's lies within a key strategic Green Belt gap between settlements and therefore it is important to ensure that development does not extend the built form of the settlement and impact upon the openness of this gap around the village. Proposals that include extending the car park at the Lee Valley Marina and adopting and improving Netherhall Lane may increase the urban nature of this location and intensify activity, increasing the perception of encroachment of the built form into the countryside	Riverside Green is an important waterside open space adjoining the settlement of Stanstead Abbots St Margaret with associated adjacent visitor facilities (pub, local shops nearby railway station). There are no proposals to develop this site but rather to maintain & promote its current use for informal recreation. Netherhall Lane is an existing road access point into the Park in very poor condition. Improvements would benefit all visitors to the Park. Please note changes to proposal for Ryegate Farm set out below. Proposals and map notation refer to improvements at the existing car park serving Stanstead Innings. There are no plans to extend the car park at the Lee Valley Marina Stanstead Abbots.	No change, but note changes to Ryegate Farm proposal and Stanstead Marina below.
LA2.5	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors	camping accommodation	There is some concern that increasing and introducing camping and caravanning to previously unused parts of the Park will have a detrimental impact. Not only will there be an increased level of movement and activity, not just on the local roads but within the Park itself. It will be necessary to ensure that the ancillary buildings necessary to service such uses do not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the area and on the environment that attracts users to the Park in the first place.	Concerns noted. Proposals refer to exploring opportunities for visitor accommodation at two locations, 1. camping and caravanning at Stanstead marina and 2. camping and bunk house style at Ryegate Farm. Proposals for visitor accommodation at Stanstead Marina have been deleted. At Ryegate Farm the Authority is seeking to explore the development potential of the Farm and its curtilage and proposals have been amended accordingly. Note amendments under the Community Proposal to ensure consistency with Visitor Proposal.	Delete proposals under Visitors 8.A.1: for camping etc at Stanstead Marina as follows - Explore opportunities for introduction of camping and touring caravanning at Lee Valley Marina, Stanstead Abbots, adjacent to the Stanstead Mill Stream in the eastern section of the marina site. Amend proposals for Ryegate Farm - Explore development potential of Ryegate Farm and its curtilage. Prepare feasibility study for the development of a sustainable camping and outdoor activity base at Ryegate Farm suitable for cub/scout groups, and similar organisations. Farm buildings to provide office and indoor space as well as bunk house type accommodation. To include access improvements along Netherhall Lane (and possible adoption of the road) for operational purposes to service the facility —
LA2.6	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Sport & Rec	Rye Park karting site	There have been a number of changes recently on the Rye Park site, including the introduction of a children's play centre (Rye-Assic Adventure Park) which contains both indoor and outdoor activities. The park is a considerable attraction and perhaps is an opportunity to enhance the connectivity of this site with the Rye Meads Nature Reserve.	Comments noted and agreed	No change
LA2.7	East Herts District Council			8.A.1 Sport & Rec		The Council supports proposals to enhance facilities in a manner that maintains the openness of the area and avoids harming the environment that attracts users to the location. Any intensification of activity needs to be carefully managed to ensure they do not prejudice the objectives of the framework	Comments noted and agreed	No change
LA2.8	East Herts District Council	8	Biodiversity Proposal Map	8.A.1 Biodiversity		The Council supports the proposals to enhance and expand designated and non-designated sites in the Park and ambitions to increase the Higher Level Stewardship programme. The Council also supports the creation of a dark corridor. More information is necessary to clarify what this entails. Does this mean a limit to 'urban' development within a certain distance of the corridor in the form of a buffer? This could be identified on the Framework proposal maps and would strengthen the ability to manage development within this buffer. The Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further, particularly if this ambition could be supported by a policy in the emerging District Plan.	Support noted and welcomed. The proposal for a dark corridor is part of maintaining a wildlife corridor alongside the Navigation. The waterside space would not be lit at night and riparian habitat and vegetated edges would be enhanced to contribute to the dark corridor. Lighting from nearby or adjoining properties should also be kept to a minimum. The dark corridor will be mapped on the Biodiversity map. The Authority would welcome policy support for this concept in the Local Plan.	Amend Biodiversity Proposals Map to identify dark corridor. Note also that Ryegate Farm is not in Higher Level Stewardship.- this was an error in the Biodiversity Proposal Text and will be deleted as follows: Work with Natural England to agree management of Higher Level Stewardship areas on farmland east of Rye Meads Nature Reserve.

LA2.9	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Community	Ryegate Farm	Where this section refers to the proposals for Ryegate Farm, the use of different terminology could create confusion. A facility for scouts and cubs as referred to in '8.A.1 Visitors' has a different connotation to an outward bound learning facility with a permanent outdoor activity base. The former suggesting a more small-scale seasonal activity, while the latter suggests a more intensive level of activity. As with the comments above it is important that this activity and associated built development are carefully managed.	Comments noted. At Ryegate Farm the Authority is seeking to explore the development potential of the Farm and its curtilage and proposals have been amended accordingly. Note amendments under the Visitor Proposal to ensure consistency with Community Proposal.text.	Amend proposals for Community 8.A.1 Ryegate Farm - Explore development potential of Ryegate Farm and its curtilage. Prepare feasibility study for the development of a sustainable camping and outdoor activity base at Ryegate Farm suitable for cub/scout groups, and similar organisations. Farm buildings to provide office and indoor space as well as bunk-house type accommodation. To include access improvements along Netherhall Lane (and possible adoption of the road) for operational purposes to service the facility —
LA2.10	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Landscape & Heritage		<u>Landscape</u> The Council supports this statement. The statement does however read like there are proposals for small-scale extensions to the settlement of Stanstead Abbots St Margaret's. East Herts' emerging District Plan seeks to contain development within the settlement of Stanstead Abbots St Margaret's within the existing built up fabric and not to extend development beyond current limits. The statement could be changed to indicate that "development will be expected to respect and respond to the existing well-defined settlement edge of Stanstead Abbots St Margaret's and not extend into the Park. Where in exceptional circumstances, development is considered appropriate, it should use a materials palette of clay tile, slate, russet and gault brick to reflect existing materials and the local character."	Support noted. Current text was informed by the Draft Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 but has now been amended to take account of new work on a Park wide draft Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Strategy.	Amend proposal text as follows: " Protect enhance and manage the landscape as set out in the Landscape Strategy Guidelines for Character Areas A2 Rye Meads and G1 Ryegate Farm/Terbets Hill. " Large scale development is considered unsuitable in this area due to the relatively coherent and intact landscape character. Sites not currently in Regional Park compatible use to be managed to reduce their adverse impact on visitors. The adverse impact of adjacent industrial and residential uses along the Park's western boundary, on the enjoyment of the waterway corridor to be mitigated through screening, habitat creation and the integration of areas of open land. The adverse impact of built development on the open character to be reduced and the impact of new development to be minimised where it would adversely affect the rural character or disrupt the continuity of the Regional Park. In particular small scale settlement extensions will be expected to respect and respond to the existing small scale, contained pattern In Stanstead Abbots St Margaret's development will be expected to respect and respond to the existing well-defined settlement edge and not extend into the Park.
LA2.11	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Landscape & Heritage		<u>Heritage</u> More detail would be welcome on the proposal to introduce interpretation between the links to international motorsport. What would this entail?	The Rye House Speedway and Karting venues were the starting point in the careers of Jenson Buton, Lewis Hamilton and the late British Indycar driver Dan Wheldon. Proposals have been written to allow flexibility in how this might be interpreted or information supplied i.e. signage, phone apps/audio guides.	No change
LA2.12	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.1 Environment		The Council supports the ambitions in this section, particularly the approach to design and prevention of encroachment.	Support noted and welcomed. However this comment duplicates the comment made under 8.A.2 Environment which is more relevant.	No change
LA2.13	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.2 Visitors		The Council is concerned about the introduction of urban features such as parking and visitor facilities within this section of the Park. This part of the Park is within a strategically important Green Belt gap and this will need to be taken into consideration when developing these proposals. The Council would welcome the opportunity to be engaged in the preparation of any proposals of this nature	A feasibility study is proposed to consider the potential for visitor facilities at Amwell Nature Reserve. Such a study would seek to address the current inadequate parking situation. As stated in Visitor Proposal 8.A.2 this would require joint working between a range of stakeholders and the District Council would be a key partner.	No change

LA2.14	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.2 Biodiversity	Tumbling Bay	The current East Herts Local Plan 2007 contains a policy on the Tumbling Bay area. The policy (WA10) states that <i>"the District Council will support and encourage the use and appropriate proposals in respect of the Tumbling Bay area, as identified on the Proposals Map, for recreational purposes, including informal non-motorised boating & angling as far as is compatible with the nature & landscape conservation interests of the locality. Open spaces for walkers and cyclists will be encouraged, and essential small-scale facilities for outdoor sport and recreation may be permitted in accordance with Policy GBC1(b). Activities generating undue noise or disruption that would affect local amenity will not be supported."</i> However, this Policy has not carried forward into the emerging District Plan because there were no firm proposals in the Park Framework. The Council would welcome the opportunity to engage in proposals to open up the Tumbling Bay area, particularly where a new policy in the District Plan would be mutually beneficial along with a corresponding designation on the Policies Map. We would therefore propose a Duty to Cooperate Meeting to discuss these proposals further. The Council supports in principle, proposals to create visitor facilities that are unique & that respond to the heritage & natural environment of the locality. However, the proposed visitor facilities will require other ancillary features such as access, parking areas, lighting & security features & will therefore need careful management in terms of their design and regard to Green Belt policy.	A Duty to Cooperate meeting was held in July 2015 which discussed future options for Tumbling Bay, and this subject has been raised with C&RT, although it is understood this site is not a high priority for the Trust. Support through the Local Plan for this proposal would be welcomed. Feasibility work involving all key stakeholders is referenced in the proposals. This is considered essential in order to examine options for visitor facilities at Amwell Nature Reserve. The proposal states: <i>"Development at this ecologically sensitive location would be a collaborative process with key stakeholders and would require Natural England permissions. It would need to take account of its location within the Green Belt and be of a scale and design appropriate to the open character, ecological value and landscape quality of the Park"</i> .	No change apart from minor amendment to insert "involve" as follows: "Development at this ecologically sensitive location would be involve a collaborative process with key stakeholders and would require Natural England permissions...."
LA2.15	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.2 Community	Amwell	Reiterating comments above, would the proposal for a small-scale visitor centre in the form of a moored barge or railway carriage be able to accommodate an indoor classroom space? The Authority therefore needs to be clear on what form each proposal will actually take. The potential impacts of a moored barge or railway carriage are very different to that of a visitor facility with indoor classroom space and outdoor shelters. Again, the former suggests a more minimal and seasonal activity, whereas an indoor classroom with outdoor shelter is a more substantial and permanent facility with a greater visual impact and a greater level of activity.	Feasibility work will need to determine the nature and scale of any visitor and education related facilities taking account of issues such as Green Belt, access and the ecological sensitivity of site and surrounding area. The District Council would be fully involved in any feasibility study.	Minor amendment to text under Visitor Proposals to replace the word 'facilities' with 'centre' - this provides consistency across the proposals and map notations. Proposals text will read as follows: "Prepare a feasibility study with HMWT and other stakeholders for the provision of new, a small scale visitor centre facilities at the Amwell Nature Reserve, to cater for both the general Park visitor and those visiting the nature reserve".
LA2.16	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.2 Landscape & Heritage		The boundaries identified (backyard and garden areas) in this section are considered weak boundaries in Green Belt terms and could therefore benefit from enhancement. As with section 8.A.1 Landscape and Heritage above, the Council suggests a minor amendment to make it clear that small-scale development is an exception and if it should occur it will need to be compliant with Green Belt policy and then respect and respond to the local vernacular.	Current text was informed by the Draft Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 but has now been amended to take account of new work on a Park wide draft Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Strategy.	Amend Proposal 8.A.2 landscape & heritage as follows: "Protect enhance and manage the landscape as set out in the Landscape Strategy Guidelines for Character Area A1 Amwell floodplain" "Protect and enhance the positive landscape character of Amwell Village, in particular, the historical value and interest of the New River, Emma's Well and the village, the mature deciduous and evergreen trees, interesting buildings and the crossing of the New River which together provide a special environment and unique Regional Park entrance. Backyard and garden areas of residential and commercial properties adjoining the Regional Park to provide a buffer between built development and the openness and rural character of the Regional Park. Protect the frontages of rural lanes (such as Amwell Lane and Lower Road) consisting of hedgerows, trees and open areas (including domestic gardens and existing amenity planting) to maintain the landscape quality and amenity value of the Regional Park. Any small scale....existing development and landscape."

LA2.17	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.2 Landscape & Heritage		The Council would welcome the opportunity to engage in an appropriate response to protecting landscapes outside of the Park that have a significant contribution to the landscape quality, nature conservation value and rural character of the Park. These areas could form the basis of a landscape policy that would be mutually beneficial to the Park Framework and the emerging District Plan	Agreed. A landscape policy within the draft District Plan that took account of landscape outside the Park would be supported by the Authority.	No change
LA2.18	East Herts District Council	8		8.A.2 Environment		The Council supports the ambitions in this section, particularly the approach to design and prevention of encroachment.	Support noted and welcomed	No change
LA2.19	East Herts District Council	8			Duty to cooperate	East Herts Council would like to thank the Regional Park for the opportunity to engage in this consultation and hope that the comments above will assist in the preparation of the final Framework proposals for Area 8. We would welcome the further opportunity to engage on the development of these proposals and would like to discuss whether it is appropriate to support the Framework through more detailed policies in the emerging District Plan. At the moment the draft District Plan policy refers to the need for proposals to have regard to the Park Framework. However, there are proposals contained in the Framework that extend beyond the Park where the Framework has limited influence. These ambitions could therefore require the support of the emerging District Plan in the form of a policy approach or even a designation on the District Plan Policies Map. Therefore it would be beneficial to have a Duty to Cooperate Meeting to progress these ideas further. Officers are in the process of finalising the District Plan policies so this should be arranged within the next few months.	Noted. The Authority holds regular duty to cooperate meetings with the District Council and will be making detailed comments on the draft District Plan in due course	No change
LA2.20	East Herts District Council	8			Planning process	The Council would like to reiterate its support for the ambitions of the Framework with the condition that all developments have regard to local and national policies, particularly Green Belt. The Council therefore suggests that when proposals are developed, the Park Authority engages with Development Management Officers through pre-application discussions and throughout the planning application process	Noted and agreed; the Authority will engage with the Council at the earliest opportunity.	No change
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 also been informed by the draft Landscape Sensitivity Study.	
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
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
LA5.7	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.	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. The Authority does not hold this information, nor has it been provided by local authorities. However designated and undesignated assets will be identified at pre-application stages	No change
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. The Authority has recently adopted a Cycling Strategy. Area 8 Proposals seek to encourage access to the Park by public transport, cycle and by foot.	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.	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. The Authority's recently adopted Cycling Strategy was developed in collaboration with the riparian authorities is an example.	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
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 will liaise with the County on issues relating to ROWN and would welcome support for improving access into the Park. Within Area 8 the Authority is seeking to establish a route for the Lee Valley Pathway and the County has been involved with this project. Routes provided by the Authority are designated as permissive routes.	No change

LA5.15	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Cycling	<p>• 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.</p>	<p>The Authority will obtain all necessary permissions for any new cycle routes and ensure they meet required standards. Within Area 8 most shared use routes are in place - completion of the final section of the Roydon Loop remains a proposal and as stated this will require partnership working with landowners, and other stakeholders which would include the County Council.</p>	<p>No change. Area 8 mapping does show the Lee Valley Pathway overlapping with a public footpath for short sections but this is a route suitable for cyclists. Add notation to Proposals Maps for the public footpaths.</p>
LA5.16	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Bridleways	<p>• 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).</p>	<p>Bridleway H25 is shown on the Visitors Thematic Proposals map and 8.A.1 Visitors refers to "Explore options to develop a bridle path circuit or network using and expanding existing bridle paths" The Authority would welcome further information from the County on this matter.</p>	<p>No change</p>
LA5.18	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Rights of Way	<p>Reference should also be made to the County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) which is subject to ongoing updates.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Authority would be happy to reference any specific improvements but to date none have been highlighted.</p>	<p>No change</p>
LA6.0	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8			General	<p>Public Health responsibilities transferred from the NHS to HCC in April 2013. Our ambition for Hertfordshire is to see: • 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.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
LA6.1	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8			Community - Health	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No change</p>

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 Heath - Facilitate people pursuing healthy lifestyles". Specific reference under Area 8 Community is on proposals supporting heath walks. 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.	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.	No change to Area 8 but amend introduction text for Areas 6 and 7
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). 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.	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
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.	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.	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 Area 8 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
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. Proposals for events in Area 8 are identified at Rye House and the RSPB centre also run an events programme.	No change

LA6.15	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	8		8.A.1	Community	We would recommend that 8.A.1 – working with Broxbourne and east Herts to develop a programme of health walks in the area - is taken forward in the knowledge that there is a well-established Hertfordshire Health Walks scheme, funded by Public Health and managed by the Countryside Management Service. We would recommend that any work here is joined up to make the most of resources available. See http://www.hertslink.org/cms/healthwalks/ for further information.	Comments noted and agreed. There may be options available to develop more walks that use the Park area in East Herts, building on existing model in Broxbourne where a number of routes make use of the River Lee Country Park.	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.	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 noted and welcomed	No change
LA8.0	Hertfordshire Health Walks	8			Community	I notice in the Lea Valley Park Development Framework document, Area 8 Draft Proposals Schedule there is an intention to offer Health Walks in the Lea Valley regional park area. As the largest Walking for Health scheme in the country with 40,000 attendances and over 50 walks each week, Hertfordshire Health Walks already have an enormous amount of expertise in this topic and would be able to contribute a lot to the development of this type of work. Please could you bear us in mind when developing Health Walks to make sure we are working as effectively as possible? I would be delighted to discuss our experience of Health Walks with you further.	Comments and opportunity to work in partnership noted and welcomed. It is noted that HHW have a number of routes but not many that use the East Herts part of the Park. Broxbourne cover the other areas well.	No change
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 Environmental Proposals 8.A.1 and 8.A.2 under sub section Water to insert the following text: 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 quality and recreational activity.

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
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.	In relation to Area 8 Proposal 8.A.2 Biodiversity the term 'other stakeholders' will be added to cover other interests in this area.	Amend 8.A.2 Biodiversity as follows: "Explore options with HMWT, and the C&RT and other stakeholders to incorporate, open up and manage Tumbling Bay as part of te Amwell Nature Reserve."
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.	NNIS are an issue across the whole Park and need to be tackled on a landscape scale to see the benefits. Additional reference to NNIS to be added to Area 8 Biodiversity Proposals under 8.A.1.	Amend 8.A.1 Biodiversity proposal text as follows: Flora and Fauna - "Protect, restore and enhance existing habitat potential throughout the area including removal of non native invasive species and Work with other landowners to improve the ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals and bats along the waterways and between key sites; Rye Meads, Rye Meads Pits and other lakes, Ryegate Farm and Stanstead Innings and with sites to the south and north such as Glen Faba and Amwell."

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 were opened up. There is always the potential to in-build seasonality into the terms of use and restrict access during certain times of year. Within Area 8 the Access to Nature sites are existing nature reserves at Amwell and Rye Meads. These sites are appropriately managed in accordance with their SSSI status, by the HMWT and RSPB respectively. Proposals recognise the need to work in partnership to protect the SSSIs and improve site status as required by Natural England. The other site identified is Stanstead Innings which has been created as an Access to Nature Site and is managed sensitively by the Authority taking account of its status as a Local Wildlife site. The new canoe route relates to Area 6 and the route shown on map is incorrect. New wording will be added within Area 6 proposals as per example given	No change to Area 8 but amendments in Area 6. This relates also to 10.13 below.
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 welcomed	No change
OA9.8	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Environment	<u>Water Framework Directive (WFD)</u> There are three waterbodies that fall into the Park boundary: 1. GB106038033200. Small River Lea (and tributaries) 2. GB106038077851. Lee (Woollens Brook down to Tottenham lock) 3. GB106038033240. Lea Navigation (Hertford & Ware). 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.	Comments noted. Reference to the Thames River Basin Management Plan will be added to Environment Proposal text for Area 8	Amend text under 8.A.1 Environment as follows: "Work with Thames Water and the Environment Agency and relevant stakeholders to improve water quality to meet Water Framework Directive objectives and ensure proposals support the implementation of the Thames River Basin Management Plan and its identified actions to secure improved water and ecological quality. " Amend text under 8.A.2 Environment as follows: "Work with the Environment Agency and the Canal & River Trust to improve and maintain water and ecological quality to meet Water Framework Directive objectives, and the actions identified within the Thames River Basin Management Plan and to enhance ecological conditions and recreational amenity."

OA9.9	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Environment	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.	Comments noted, reference to the Thames River Basin Management Plan has been added to Area 8 Environment Proposals as suggested. ,	See above amendments.
OA9.10	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Environment	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: 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 Park noted	No change
OA9.13	Environment Agency	8		Environment	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 8 - 8.A.1 Rye Meads, Ex-Turnford Surfacing site – potential visitor hub; camping / outdoor activity base at Ryegate Farm; camping / caravanning at Lee Valley Marina, Stanstead Abbots; consolidation and enhancement of leisure activities at Rye House Stadium / Rye House Kart Raceway; maintain and enhance facilities for moorings, boat repair and related services at Stanstead Marina. 8.A.2 Visitor facilities at Amwell Nature Reserve	Comments noted	No change
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 and Environment Proposal text for Area 8 has been 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 and support noted and welcomed	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. Graham White was included as a consultee.	No change
OA10.9	Natural England	8			Rye Meads to Ware	Rye Meads treatment Works to Ware (This area includes Rye Meads SSSI and Amwell Quarry SSSI – both part of Lee Valley SPA): Similarly support here is broadly the same as for Area 7, also taking into account the LVRPA ensure favourable condition status across the Lee Valley SPA in order that the Biodiversity Section 28G duties can be discharged appropriately.	Agreed	
OA10.10	Natural England	8	Bio-diversity Proposals Map - Wildlife Refuge	8.A.1 Biodiversity. Flora & Fauna	Rye Meads SSSI possible extensions	There are a few suggested changes to make in relation to wording within the proposals schedule, as follows in red highlights: Aspiration to add to Rye Meads SSSI - Natural England notes and welcomes this proposal, accounting for the context set out in the text of 8.A.1 of the draft Proposals Schedule, namely: Biodiversity Flora & Fauna: "Explore options to expand the SPA and SSSI to include Rye meads Pits north of the Toll Road and an expansion of the SSSI to Stanstead Inning wildlife refuge site."	Comments noted and amendments to text to be included as suggested.	Amend 8.A.1 Biodiversity Flora and Fauna proposal as follows "Explore options to expand the SPA and SSSI to include Rye meads Pits north of the Toll Road and an expansion of the SSSI to Stanstead Inning wildlife refuge site."
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. Reference to the Lee Valley SPA Site Improvement Plan will be included under Biodiversity proposals for 8.A.1 and 8.A.2.	Amend text as follows: 8.A.1 Biodiversity. "Protect Rye Meads SSSI (part of the Lee Valley Special Protection Area 2000) as an internationally important wetland for breeding and wintering birds, with priority given to the key habitats, open water, reedbed, tall fen vegetation and flood meadows. Work with RSPB, HMWT and TW to improve the site status so all units are in 'Favourable Condition' as required by Natural England and with reference to the Lee Valley SPA Site Improvement Plan. 8.A.2 Biodiversity "Work in partnership with HMWT to protect Amwell SSSI (part of the Lee Valley Special Protection Area 2000) as an internationally important wetland with priority given to the key habitats, of standing open water, reedbed and wetland scrape. Future management of the site to be focused on maintaining the 'favourable' status of the site as required by English Nature-Natural England with reference to the Lee Valley SPA Site Improvement Plan and to supporting the nationally important numbers of wintering wildfowl

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 welcomed.	No change
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. Within Area 8 the Access to Nature sites are existing nature reserves at Amwell and Rye Meads. These sites are appropriately managed in accordance with their SSSI status, by the HMWT and RSPB respectively. Proposals recognise the need to work in partnership to protect the SSSIs and improve site status as required by Natural England. The other site identified is Stanstead Innings which has been created as an Access to Nature Site and is managed sensitively by the Authority taking account of its status as a Local Wildlife site. New wording will be added within Area 6 proposals as per example given.	No change. Same response made to EA see EA9.6 above
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
OA11.3	Sport England	8			Karting & Angling	In particular, the proposals for the following projects offer potential to grow and sustain opportunities for participation: - Enhancing leisure facilities at Rye House Stadium and Rye House Kartway; - Enhancing angling facilities at Marsh Lane Lakes; - Safeguarding Rye Meads Pits for angling; - Providing opportunities for disabled anglers at Amwell Pits.	Comments noted	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 are amended and/or developed	No change

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. Work is underway on a revised Biodiversity Action Plan.	No change
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
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	No change

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			Bio-diversity SPA	<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. <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 PA populations are using non-designated sites. Therefore, appropriate management of these sites is necessary to maintain the condition of the SPA.	Comments noted and agree that non designated water bodies are important to overall success of the SPA populations. Within Area 8 most waterbodies form part of the SPA; Amwell and Rye Meads. Stanstead Innings is managed to contribute positively to the wider system. Proposals seek to protect more water and associated land at Tumbling Bay by working with stakeholders to bring this into the Amwell Nature Reserve complex and introduce appropriate management regimes.	No change
OA13.3	RSPB	6 to 8		6.A.4, 7.A.1, 7.A.2, 7.A.3, 8.A.1		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.	Comments noted. Additional text will be added to highlight this need for functionally linked habitats to support the SPA. In this area Gadwall and Bittern also added.	Additional text added under 8.A.1 under Biodiversity Flora and Fauna as follows: "Work with other landowners to improve the ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals and bats along the waterways and between key sites; Rye Meads, Rye Meads Pits and other lakes, Ryegate Farm and Stanstead Innings and with sites to the south and north such as Glen Faba and Amwell. Maintain and manage areas of shallow flood for the benefit of designated SPA species – wintering Shoveler, Gadwall and Bittern ".

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
OA14.1	Thames Water	8		Access & Operation-al requirements	Area proposals 8 include land that lies within Thames Water's ownership. The majority of Thames Water's landholdings are in operational use or are retained for future operational use. By their nature, this means that it is not normally possible for Thames Water to provide public access to these operational areas and their operational and security requirements must take precedence. Thames Water supports the aim of improving access, recreational and leisure opportunities in the Lee Valley, but this must not conflict with their health and safety and operational requirements.	Comments Noted	No change
OA14.2	Thames Water	8	8.A.1 Environment	Rye Meads Sewage Works	Thames Water support in principle the section on the environment which relates to Rye Meads Sewage (Waste Water) Treatment Works and states: <i>"Work with TW and the EA to improve water quality to meet Water Framework Directive objectives. Ensure future upgrades at Rye Meads Waste Water Treatment Works to increase the existing treatment capacity and to meet the required chemical and biological standards for discharged effluent do not have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Rye Meads nature reserve and the Lee Valley Special Protection Area."</i>	Comments noted	No change
OA14.3	Thames Water	8		Infrastruc-ture	A key sustainability objective for the preparation of Local Plans is for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states: <i>"Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:.....the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater...."</i> Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: <i>"Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment.....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas."</i>	Comments noted	No change

OA14.4	Thames Water	8			Water & waste-water infrastructure	The new web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 includes a section on 'water supply, wastewater and water quality' and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that "Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development" (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).	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 Corepresentation 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	No change
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.	No change under Area 8

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.	No change under Area 8
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.	No change under Area 8
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 noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly.	No change under Area 8
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.	No change under Area 8

LB18.0	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Turnford Surfacing This objection is made on behalf of Elvidge and Jones Properties as owner since c2007 of the former Turnford Surfacing site located on the north side of Rye Road in Hoddesdon and relates to The Authority's proposal to use the site for a new visitor hub including riverside café and park information point, Micro-brewery and Brewpub, picnic area with seating, cycle hire facilities, water bus, boat hire and visitor moorings. In summary the objection is to:- a) complete lack of any contact with the land owners over these proposals; b) conflict between the Authority's proposals and the Development Brief adopted by the local planning authority, Broxbourne Borough Council, in June 2011 for residential development of the site, including provision of a minimum of 20 parking spaces to be provided at the front of the site for commuter car parking in association with Rye House Station; c) the totally unrealistic and wholly aspirational nature of the Authority's proposals for the site; and d) conflict with advice in the NPPF regarding the need to demonstrate that a Local Plan is 'sound'.	Comments and objection noted. Draft proposals for the site sought to demonstrate how this site might be brought back into a Park compatible use. However the draft Local Plan has now been issued for consultation. Policy HOD2 Turnford Surfacing Site seeks redevelopment of the site in accordance with the development brief; for residential development and commuter parking. The Authority also understands the need for consistency in respect of how it treats previously developed land within its ownership and previously developed land in private ownership. For this reason the Authority acknowledges the draft Local Plan policy. However the Authority will be seeking benefits financial or otherwise to be negotiated as planning obligations in order to secure a development that complements and enhances the Regional Park, the site's waterside location, and respects its location adjacent to a Schedule Ancient Monument and important ecological assets.	Amend visitor proposal 8.A.1 as follows: delete the whole of paragraph commencing "Undertake a feasibility study with stakeholders to assess potential for a new visitor hub...." through to "Associated boat hire/water bus facilities and visitor moorings could be located at Rye House Quay". Amend second paragraph as follows: "High quality sustainable design will be sought for any development proposals put forward for the ex Turnford Surfacing site which lies adjacent to the River Lee Navigation and forms part of an important entrance point into the Regional Park. Development proposals will need to new-visitor development proposals in this area that respond to the site's waterside location, adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument and related heritage assets, its ecological potential and especially its proximity to protected sites of national and international sites of ecological significance. Pedestrian accessibility should be improved with a widening of the towpath and enhanced links through to Rye House Station and the relationship with the RSPB Rye Meads reserve enhanced with new interpretation and signage along the Toll Road. The Authority will be seeking benefits, financial or otherwise, to be negotiated as planning obligations in order to secure a development that complements and enhances the Regional Park. "
LB18.1	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8			Turnford Surfacing <u>Planning History</u> - The site has an established use for general industrial purposes (B2) with associated storage and offices, having been occupied by various manufacturing related operations since at least 1982. It is known by the name of the company which occupied it for the longest period of time, namely "Turnford Surfacing" as a tarmac manufacturing plant. Planning permission (7/0514/88) was granted in October 1988 for a mobile asphalt plant, improved vehicular access and landscaping. Subsequent permissions were granted for an extension to the office building and for stock bays and portacabins. The activity operated 24/7 with HGVs regularly visiting during the night since this is when most motorway and main road repairs are under-taken. Turnford Surfacing was taken over around the turn of the century by Bardon Aggregates who continued to operate the plant until c2007/8, at which point it was purchased by the objectors. Having long held an aspiration to use part of the site to provide parking in association with Rye House station, Broxbourne Council granted itself planning permission (7/0798/08) in Dec 2008 for change of use of the front part of the site from parking ancillary to the existing use to parking for public use in association with Rye House station. That permission was not implemented and subsequently lapsed.	Details of site history noted	Please see proposed amendments above

LB18.2	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8			Turnford Surfacing	The new owners entered into lengthy discussions with Broxbourne Council over the potential of developing the majority of the site for residential purposes whilst providing the public parking on the frontage. This led ultimately to the Council adopting a Development Brief for the site in June 2011. The introduction to the Brief states:- <i>"This development brief has been prepared by the Council in order to guide development proposals for the Turnford Surfacing site in Hoddesdon. It proposes the redevelopment of the majority of the 1 hectare site for housing. The brief also proposes that a minimum of 20 parking spaces are provided at the front of the site for commuter car parking"</i> . The Brief recognises that the site lies within the Lee Valley Regional Park	Comments noted	Please see proposed amendments above
LB18.3	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8			Turnford Surfacing	Throughout the length of these negotiations, the site was in use for external storage. In June 2011 retrospective permission (07/11/0433/F) was sought to regularise this B8 activity on a temporary basis with permission being granted to 31st December 2011. The Council was averse to granting a longer period of temporary use because it was keen to see the site come forward for residential development. Upon the expiry of that permission, the lawful use of the site reverted to B2 general industry. Once the Development Brief was adopted, and having regard to the prevailing poor economic conditions, the site was marketed on an informal basis by Derrick Wade Waters Chartered Surveyors. Initially considerable interest was expressed by a local volume house builder but that failed to transpire to a firm offer. However in late 2013/early 2014 another developer entered into protracted negotiations with a view to bringing forward residential development. Although these talks stalled for a while over technical issues, their interest remains and continues to be progressed.	Noted	Please see proposed amendments above

LB18.4	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8		Turnford Surfacing	<p><u>Designations</u> - The site was removed from the Metropolitan Green Belt through the Local Plan Second Review. No object-ions were received during the Local Plan process to that amendment to the Green Belt boundary. The site is not subject to any specific land use allocations on the December 2005 Adopted Proposals Map. However, it was identified in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (September 2010) for possible housing development with the site frontage being set aside for commuter car parking for Rye House Station in accordance with the emerging Development Brief for residential use, as was then under consideration by the Council. As explained above, that Development Brief was adopted by the Council in June 2011 following co-operative working with the land owners. In October 2014 the Council agreed to develop a formal plan to ensure there is a co-ordinated and systematic approach to delivering projects in the Rye Park area. The Council has been making significant investments in the Rye Park area for some years and a number of additional projects are either underway or will commence in the near future. The Rye Park Project Plan Panel has been appointed by the Leader as an informal advisory panel which will report its advice to the Cabinet for consideration. The intention is to produce a draft Rye Park Plan for public consultation in the first part of 2015. It is anticipated that the former Turnford Surfacing site will be allocated for housing together with a car park to serve the station in The Rye Park Plan.</p>	Coments noted	Please see proposed amendments above
LB18.5	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8		Turnford Surfacing	<p><u>Physical Characteristics</u> - The site has a long frontage to the river Lee, being sandwiched between the river to the east and the railway line to the west. It comprises an area of approximately 1ha the vast majority of which is covered with concrete. It has a narrow frontage to Rye Road with Rye House Station situated on the opposite side of Rye Road a short distance to the west, the other side of the bridge over the railway. There is no public footpath connecting the site to the station. Moreover, Rye Road becomes single carriageway in order to cross the New River and Railway Bridge. Rye Road is also unadopted between Plumpton Road, past the site boundary and up to Fisherman's Way. Beyond Fisherman's Way the surface of Rye Road is public footpath with public right for pedestrians and private rights only for vehicles.</p>	Noted	Please see proposed amendments above
LB18.6	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8		Turnford Surfacing	<p>Discussions that have taken place to date with the Highway Authority have established that the necessary works to facilitate redevelopment of this site (for whatever purpose) will require negotiations with both Network Rail as owners of the single track bridge over the railway line and with Thames Water as owners of the bridge over the river Lee. Further issues to be addressed by redevelopment are the existence of a surface water sewer crossing the middle of the site and a pressure main at the entrance, and the fact that the previous use of the site may have given rise to contamination. Thus it is readily apparent that the costs associated with redevelopment are likely to be above average and therefore a high value end use will be required to make redevelopment viable.</p>	Noted	Please see proposed amendments above

LB18.7	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8			Turnford Surfacing Objection. <u>Lack of any contact with the land owners.</u> As detailed above the land owners have been in discussions with the Local Planning Authority about this site since shortly after they acquired it. At the request of the LPA they have marketed it for housing and continue to invest in bringing it forward for residential development, together with some public parking for the station, in accordance with the Development Brief. For The Lee Valley Park Authority to then announce proposals for alternative uses which conflict with the Development Brief and for which there has been no prior consultation, is totally unacceptable and seriously in conflict with advice at paragraph 155 of The NPPF regarding Plan making, namely that " <u>early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and business is essential</u> " (my emphasis). Given the conflict with the Council's Development Brief it also appears that there has been no prior liaison between the LVRPA and BoB; this conflicts with the "Duty to Co-Operate" set out in The NPPF. As stated at para 178, " <u>Government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities</u> ". Failure to co-operate is a serious issue and has been the basis for many Local Plans being found "unsound" at examination.	Comments noted	Please see proposed amendments above
LB18.8	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8			Turnford Surfacing <u>Conflict between the Authority's proposals and the Development Brief.</u> That the local planning authority has produced a Development Brief for this site to encourage its redevelopment for residential purposes together with provision of a minimum of 20 parking spaces to be provided at the front of the site for commuter car parking in association with Rye House Station is because the Council's evidence base demonstrates that this is what is required. There is nothing in the documents on the web site of The Park Authority which support the consultation exercise to suggest that there is any evidence of a need in this locality for a new visitor hub including riverside café and park information point, Micro-brewery and Brewpub, picnic area with seating, cycle hire facilities, water bus, boat hire and visitor moorings. The residential element is required to help meet the Council's housing requirement to 2031. It has yet to be announced exactly what Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) the emerging Plan will be required to meet but it is already known that Green Belt and green field land will be required to meet that need. As a previously developed site within the defined town boundary, which is exceptionally well located to both a railway station and a large employment area, The Turnford Surfacing site is eminently suitable for housing development and should be prioritised over green field land.	Comments noted	Please see proposed amendments above

LB18.9	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8			<p>Turnford Surfacing</p> <p>In order to conserve & enhance the natural environment para 109 of S.11 of The NPPF encourages the remediation of despoiled, degraded, derelict & contaminated land whilst paragraph 111 states that "Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed provided that it is not of high environmental value". Since publication in March 2012 of The NPPF government has placed increasingly greater weight on bringing back into use brownfield sites to help reduce the need for green field development to meet acute housing need. Indeed, it is currently consulting on ways of "Building More Homes on Brownfield Land" & aims to set a target of having local development orders in place on more than 90% of suitable brownfield land by 2020. If government proposals are adopted, LPAs will be required to identify in their Development Frameworks land which follows the definition in the NPPF of "previously developed" & also meets the following criteria: <u>Deliverable</u>. The site must be available for development now or in the near future. This will be a site not in current use, or a site in use (though not for housing) or under-utilised where the LA has evidence that the owner would be willing to make the land or buildings available for new housing, provided planning permission can be obtained. <u>Free of constraint</u>. LPAs should not identify as suitable for housing any land which is subject to severe physical, environmental or policy constraints, unless the constraints can realistically be mitigated while retaining the viability of redevelopment.</p>	Comments noted	Please see proposed amendments above
LB18.10	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties				<p>Turnford Surfacing</p> <p><i>continued.</i> - Contaminated land should also be excluded if there is clear evidence that the cost of remediation would be out of proportion to its potential value, making redevelopment unviable.- <u>Capable of development</u>. The site must be in a condition and location that would make it a genuine option for developers: that is, it must be clear to the LPA that there would be interest from developers in purchasing the site and building housing there in the near future. - <u>Capable of supporting five or more dwellings</u>. This criterion is intended to provide a proportionate threshold and is in line with the Government's advice in Planning Practice Guidance to LPAs when conducting their Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments. For this reason local planning authority progress in meeting the Government's 90% objective will be measured in relation to sites capable of supporting five or more dwellings. However authorities should also aim to get permissions in place on smaller sites whenever possible because of their valuable contribution to meeting overall housing supply. The former Turnford Surfacing site fulfils all of these criteria. As such, I would anticipate that the Council's emerging Local Plan would promote this site for housing through a Local Development Order. It is estimated as being capable of delivering between 45 and 50 dwellings which is a not inconsiderable number for a developed urban area.</p>	Comments noted.	Please see proposed amendments above

LB18.11	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties			Turnford Surfacing	There is a need for public parking to serve the railway station because the lack of parking currently impacts upon surrounding residential roads. The Brief explains that the layout must incorporate adequate turning space to avoid users having to turn within the residential development to the north. The Council is promoting improvements to this area which include creating footpaths between the station and Rye Road across the Station Bridge together with improving lighting and providing disabled access to one of the station platforms. Provision of a safe pedestrian route between the proposed car park and Rye House Station, as well as extension of the existing footway from the junction with Plumpton Road along Rye Road to the site boundary, is an essential requirement of any redevelopment of this site. Water bus, boat hire and visitor moorings could no doubt be accommodated on the river without adversely impacting upon residential redevelopment of the site. Hence no particular objection is raised in principle to that aspect of the Park Authority's proposals subject to consultation with the land owners regarding details.	Comments noted, the Area proposals also seek major environmental improvements around Rye House station and Rye Road to establish an attractive entrance into the Park for visitors.	Please see proposed amendments above
LB18.12	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8		Turnford Surfacing	<u>The unrealistic and wholly aspirational nature of the Authority's proposals for the site.</u> The text supporting draft proposals for Area 8 states that the "Adopted guiding principles guiding these proposals" include, inter alia, "Partnership work – recognising that many of the proposals can only be delivered through the collective efforts of a range of partners, stakeholders and landowners". Had an approach been made to the land owners it could have established at an early stage, and certainly before proposals were put out to public consultation, how unrealistic the idea of a new visitor hub including riverside café and park information point, Micro-brewery and Brewpub, picnic area with seating and cycle hire facilities are for this site. Firstly, there is no evidence of any form of feasibility study having been undertaken to establish need and viability. Secondly, there is a public house (The Rye House) almost opposite this site on the south side of Rye Road. In an age when public houses are closing at an almost alarming rate, it is naïve in the extreme to simply presume that the market could support another so close by.	Comments noted	Please see proposed amendments above
LB18.13	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	6 & 8		WWC & Turnford Surfacing	Whilst not wishing to comment in detail, the objectors can see a logic in The Authority's proposals to further develop the White Water Centre at Waltham Cross a few miles to the south so that it becomes a major visitor destination and world class venue for canoeing, kayaking and rafting with a state of the art gym and physiotherapy suite being added together with a new outdoor classroom and cafe. An active leisure zone or adrenaline sports hub and possibly some overnight accommodation, as proposed, would also seem a possibility. Given their many years of business experience in this area, the objectors consider it most unlikely that another major visitor facility could be supported in such relatively close proximity.	Comments Noted	No change

LB18.14	J. Orsborn on behalf of Elvidge & Jones Properties	8			Turnford Surfacing Conflict with advice in The NPPF regarding the need to demonstrate that a Local Plan is "sound". The way in which the Authority's proposals are implemented is by policies in the Park Plan being incorporated into the Development Plan of the relevant LPA. Once adopted by the Park Authority, section 14(2) of the Park Act requires their inclusion in the Local Plan. Advice in The NPPF regarding Plan making is clear that a Local Plan must be based on an adequate and up-to-date evidence base. In the absence of evidence to support the Authority's proposals, their incorporation in the emerging Broxbourne Local Plan could lead to it being found "unsound" at Examination, particularly when there is clear evidence of the need for housing to which this site could make a worthwhile contribution. Moreover, in accordance with advice at para 182 of the NPPF Broxbourne Council's Local Plan must be both justified (putting forward the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives based on proportionate evidence) & effective (namely capable of being delivered within the plan period). Incorporation of The Park Authority's proposals for the former Turnford Surfacing site would not meet these critical tests. It is noted from a report to the Council's Planning and Regulatory Committee on 27th Jan 2015 that whilst Broxbourne is broadly supportive of the principles of the Authority's proposals it intends to challenge projects which conflict with the Council's ambitions, one of which is the Authority's proposals for the Turnford Surfacing site. The objectors welcome that decision.	Comments noted	Please see proposed amendments above
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			Glass-houses	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 every-one 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 stake-holders. 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 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 to proposals have been made under Area 6 and 7
LB21.9	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6 to 8			Glass-houses	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 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 have been made under Area 6 and Area 7.
LB22.0	Lea Valley Growers Assoc. Letter 11 Feb 2015	6 to 8			Glass-houses	<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 Lea 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.	Objection and comments noted	No change

LB22.1	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8				<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.	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
LB22.2	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses	<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.	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
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 Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7

LB22.4	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8			<p>Back-ground to Growers Assoc.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Comments and background to the Growers Association noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
LB22.5	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8			<p>Back-ground to this consult-ation</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments</p>	<p>Please refer to Area 6 and 7</p>

LB22.6	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Back-ground to this consult-ation	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.	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
LB22.7	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Back-ground to this consult-ation	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.	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
LB22.8	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses & CPO	<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.	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
LB22.9	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses	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.	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7

LB22.10	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses	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 <u>independently assessed</u> .	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
LB22.11	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Area 5 Glasshouses	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 <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>	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
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 country-side. 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.	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
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 refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7

LB22.14	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8		London Plan 7 food growing	<p><i>continued ...</i> As a result the following relevant recommendations were made. <u>Recommendation 1</u> <i>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.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendation 8</u> <i>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</i> This vision reflects current thinking on sustainable development.</p>	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
LB22.15	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8		Guiding Principles	<p>The Association believes that the Park Authority is not following its own adopted guiding principles (shown in italics below) to shape these proposals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
LB22.16	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8		Guiding Principles	<p><i>continued ...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
LB22.17	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8		General proposals	<p><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.</p>	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7

LB22.18	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	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 refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
LB22.27	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses	<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.	Please refer to Area 6 and 7 for comments	Please refer to Area 6 and 7
SR26.0	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8	Visitors	8.A.1 Rye Meads and Stanstead Abbots Visitors	Marsh Lane	As residents of Marsh Lane, the Scout Group wishes to register out opposition to plans to improve and promote visitor access at Marsh Lane, Stanstead Abbots, with improved car park facilities at Stanstead Innings (page 4). We are a large and active Scout Group with our Scout Headquarters in Marsh lane, which is narrow, unlit, without pavements, unadopted and in a very poor state of repair. The Scout Group has 140 youth members aged 6 to 14 years old, plus over thirty adult volunteers. We offer activities for our members on all days of the week and weekend, creating significant vehicle and pedestrian traffic in Marsh Lane. We are very aware that marsh lane struggles to cope with our own traffic flows and we would be very concerned for the safety of our members and for other users of Marsh Lane if there were to be any significant increase in traffic. We are aware of traffic incidents in Marsh Lane in recent years (e.g. minor collisions, road rage) and we would be concerned that there would be a rise in such incidents proportionate to any traffic increase. We would strongly recommend that LVRPA staff personally visit Marsh lane to see for themselves how unsuitable Marsh lane is for any significant traffic increase.	Objection and comments noted. Concerns for residents safety noted. This is however an existing established entrance point into the Park on foot, cycle and by car. It is identified as such in existing public information about the Park. There would need to be a joint approach with the District and County Councils, local community and businesses to address improvements & potential traffic calming. The car park is of a poor standard and requires enhancement. Indeed enhancement would help to prevent parking of vehicles each side of Marsh Lane inner track from the Height Barrier to the existing Car Park.	Amend text under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. and e Enhance the existing public car park at Stansted Innings. (Refer also to LA2.2 response).

SR26.1	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8	Visitors	8.A.1 Rye Meads and Stanstead Abbots Visitors	Marsh Lane	I have detailed our full concerns below, which we share with many other Marsh Lane residents and other local people. 1. There is no estimate of the number of additional vehicles that would result from this plan. Other parts of the Lee Valley further south attract a large volume of visitors arriving by car. Marsh Lane is not able to accommodate an increased number of vehicles safely for the following reasons: i) With no other access road to or from the car park, all vehicles coming and going would be trying to pass each other on Marsh Lane, which is too narrow to accommodate this. ii)The car park is very small. Active promotion of the site as an access point to the Lee Valley Regional Park could quickly result in more cars than parking places. As noted in (i), Marsh Lane is narrow and cannot accommodate parked cars. Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent this because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced.	Concerns about vehicle movements and use of Marsh Lane noted. This is however an important access into the Park. As ownership and status of Marsh Lane is complicated any efforts to improve the condition and safety of the route to the car park for all users/visitors will require a partnership approach with the Local and County Councils and local community.	Amend text under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. and-e Enhance the existing public car park at Stansted Innings. (Refer also to LA2.2 response).
SR26.2	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8	Visitors	8.A.1 Rye Meads and Stanstead Abbots Visitors	Marsh Lane	<i>continued</i> iii) We already have significant volumes of cars using Marsh Lane to pick up and drop off children at the Scout HQ. The Scout HQ is in use every day of the week because there are two Beaver Scout colonies, two Cub Scout packs, a Scout troop, weekend activities and private hires for parties and other groups. In addition, there is an industrial unit opposite the Scout HQ and an abattoir at the end of Marsh Lane, with cars and other large commercial vehicles coming and going all day. There is also a sailing club (Hertford County Yacht Club) at Stanstead Innings and boats are transported down the lane on trailers. There is already significant congestion on the lane outside the Scout HQ as cars attempt to park and turn. If additional traffic through to the LVRP entrance is added, there will be chaos. It will be unsafe.	Comments and concerns about the volume of traffic noted. This suggests that action to resolve capacity, parking and general safety issues would be beneficial. Revisions to the draft Proposals seek to ensure a partnership approach to resolve these outstanding matters.	Amend text under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. and-e Enhance the existing public car park at Stansted Innings. (Refer also to LA2.2 response).
SR26.3	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8	Visitors	8.A.1 Rye Meads and Stanstead Abbots Visitors	Marsh Lane	<i>continued</i> iv) There are no pavements on all but a small stretch of Marsh Lane. Most of the pavements that do exist are not in use for pedestrians because residents and visitors to the Scout HQ have to park on them as the lane is so narrow. Consequently, pedestrians walk in the road. Additional cars will make it unsafe for: - Residents, half of whom have young families. - The groups using the Scout HQ. There are large numbers of children on the road at these times - not just those being dropped off/picked up by car, but also those arriving and leaving on foot. - The many walkers and cyclists, particularly families at weekends and holidays, who currently use Marsh Lane to access the Lee valley. Upgrading the car park would, if anything deter walking and cycling down marsh lane as people would no longer consider it safe. v) Access by emergency vehicles could be compromised by increase congestion. vi) There are already problems at the bottom of Marsh Lane with drivers confused about which way to go. This results in cars driving into the abattoir and then having to reverse along the single track and turn back at the bend. This will result in accidents if there are more vehicles on the road.	Comments and concerns about the volume of traffic noted. This suggests that action to resolve capacity, parking and general safety issues would be beneficial. Revisions to the draft Proposals seek to ensure a partnership approach to resolve these outstanding matters	Amendments to proposal text as above SR26.0

SR26.4	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8	Visitors	8.A.1 Rye Meads and Stanstead Abbots Visitors	Marsh Lane	2. Marsh Lane is a private, unadopted lane. This results in the following issues: i) The road is not publically maintained. The lane is already in a state of significant disrepair with very large potholes and it is not suitable to promote as a visitor access point by car. Residents such as us are not able or willing to fund the impact of more damage to the road caused by LVRP traffic. ii) We are already concerned about cars speeding along the lane. No speed limits can be set because it is unadopted by the council. iii) There is no public lighting on the road or in the Stanstead Innings car park. As it is an unadopted road, the Council will not provide street lights. iv) Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent unsafe parking because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced.	Comments noted. A partnership approach to resolving access and safety issues involving the County Council Highways and District Council as well as the local community will be required to deliver the Authority's proposals.	Amendments to proposal text as above SR26.0
SR26.5	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8	Visitors	8.A.1 Rye Meads and Stanstead Abbots Visitors		3. Whilst Stanstead Abbots appears to have good access by public transport, the buses are infrequent and do not run on Sundays or public holidays. The trains serve limited destinations only. It is unrealistic to think that the majority of people can be encouraged to come to Stanstead Abbots by public transport.	Comments noted. Much of the Park suffers from inadequate public transport facilities and connectivity. Although limited in this area the public transport provision is linked to the local area and via the train into London Liverpool Street station (2 trains an hour).	No change
SR26.6	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8	Visitors	8.A.1 Rye Meads and Stanstead Abbots Visitors		4. We question whether LVRPA has the funds available to maintain any increased use of the site, as it will not generate any revenue: i) Over time, warden resources have been reduced and they now have to cover a wider area; consequently they patrol Stanstead Innings less frequently. ii) More visitors will generate increased litter and dog fouling. The site is already often badly littered, with dog waste bins overflowing, dog fouling problems and rubbish dumped by fishermen at the lakes. iii) The LVRP sign at the height restrictor is faded and has not been maintained.	Comments noted - the maintenance of parkland and open spaces owned by the Authority is undertaken by a ground maintenance team. Fisheries Bailiff also carries out regular litter collection. Comments will be passed to both above for attention.	No change
SR26.7	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8	Visitors	8.A.1 Rye Meads and Stanstead Abbots Visitors	Visitor facilities	5. There are no toilets, or other facilities, at Stanstead Innings. There are no public toilets in Stanstead Abbots or at St Margaret's station. It is therefore not appropriate for attracting more visitors.	The Authority is seeking to develop a network of facilities that offer a core level of service such as toilets, shelter, staff presence and Park information located close to sites of interest within the Park. Where this level of provision is not possible or appropriate, facilities nearby the Park can help to meet and benefit from visitor needs. For example the villages of Stanstead Abbots and Roydon include pubs and cafes. A large proportion of visitors to Stanstead Innings visit for a couple of hours either as part of a local trip or as a stop on a series of visits to other sites ie cycle ride, circular walk.	No change
SR26.8	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8			Consultation process	6. The consultation process is flawed. There has been no publicity in the village by the LVRPA. No posters have been put up and the streets directly affected by the proposals have not been leafleted. Many people will not have seen the proposals and therefore not had an opportunity to respond. We do not know if the police or other stakeholders, such as the RSPB, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust and the Hertford County Yacht Club in Marsh Lane have been actively engaged in the consultation process. For example, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust bird hides, which are open access, have regularly been targeted by vandals at night. More publicity could result in increased vandalism at night.	Comments noted. Consultation covered a large area of the Park from the M25 north to Ware. Notices were placed in local newspapers and on the local council and LVRPA websites. The Local authorities, town and Parish Councils were notified together with other stakeholders; this included the RSPB, HMWT.	No change

SR26.9	1st Stanstead Abbots & St Margaret's Scout Group	8				7. When added to the proposals at Stanstead Marina, Netherfield Lane, Great Amwell, we are very concerned that the level of development is disproportionate in scale to the infrastructure in Stanstead Abbots, particularly the road network. Like Marsh Lane, access points at Netherfield Lane, Stanstead Marina and Great Amwell are via narrow roads. The timings of the level crossings at both Roydon and St Margaret's can at times cause very long queues of traffic on both sides of the barrier at St Margaret's. There is no capacity for additional traffic. For the reasons outlined above, the Scout Group strongly opposes the proposed LVRPA's development plans in Marsh Lane, Stanstead Abbots.	Objection and concerns regarding the capacity of local roads and access points into the Park are noted. The draft proposals seek to balance a need to provide attractive and safe access into the Park whilst also protecting and enhancing the Park's environment so that people can enjoy the open spaces, wildlife sites and leisure facilities.	No change
SR29.0	Towpath Fishery & Ware Angling Club	6 to 8			Fishing	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.	Comments noted	No change
SR29.1	Towpath Fishery & Ware Angling Club	6 to 8			Access to the river	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.	Comments noted and passed to Fisheries Team.	No change

SR30.52	ESSA Water Activities Centre	8		8.A.2 Sport & Rec	Angling	Area 8 Proposals state that LVRPA are intending to support the development of angling facilities and work with the private fisheries in the area to provide opportunities for disabled anglers, for example at the Amwell Pits 1 and 2 which lie close to a public car park off the High Street in Stanstead Abbots (Area 8 Proposal 8A2 : Page 12) and St Margarets Railway Station. This would be a more realistic and cost effective option of a Centre for Angling Excellence for the Authority, especially taking into consideration the recommendation to 'retain the two rail crossings off from Amwell Lane and from Lower Road that form part of the public footpath network and enable visitor access'(Area 8 Proposals 8A2 Page 15).	Comments noted. Amwell Pits 1 & 2 are now in private ownership. It is not feasible to create a centre for angling at this location. Given the change in ownership the existing text will be amended and deleted.	Amend text under 8.A.2 Sport & Rec - delete the following text Support the development of angling facilities and work with the private fisheries in the area to provide opportunities for disabled anglers for example at the Amwell Pits 1 and 2 which lie close to a public car park off the High Street in Stanstead Abbots.
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 8 to provide segregated routes. The Authority has reviewed its approach via work on its cycling strategy which has recently been adopted. This identifies measures to reduce conflict.	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. The Authority's recently adopted Cycling Strategy includes measures to reduce conflict.	No change
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	Noted	No change
SR32.0	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 8 a good proportion of established paths and routes are suitable for those pushing buggies or in wheelchairs and are accessible from car parks, e.g Stanstead Innings, Rye House Karting, RSPB Rye House and the C&RT towpath/Lea Valley Walk. Proposals for Amwell Nature Reserve identify the need for feasibility work to improve visitor facilities within this ecologically sensitive location and this would consider options for improved parking and access for all visitors. 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	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	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	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	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	Comment noted and agreed a glossary will be provided.	Include Glossary
SR32.5	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	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	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.	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. 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.	No change
SR32.8	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 8.	No change.
SR32.9	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8		Bio-diversity	<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: • 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. The Authority manages reedbeds appropriately. 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	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			<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.	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

SR 32.111	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Visitors		Par 2 Micro-brewery and brewpub, as final sentence on Page 2 says plenty of pubs around, do we need another one? Would this establishment be owned and run by LVRPA or run by a commercial company? Par 3 From experience of one of our other waters also being a Scheduled Ancient Monument, have you spoken to English Heritage about this, in case of objections about this developments impact on setting of Ancient monument?	Comments noted. Amendments are proposed which remove refernece to a micro-brewery	Amend visitor proposal 8.A.1 as follows: delete the whole of paragraph commencing "Undertake a feasibility study with stakeholders to assess potential for a new visitor hub...." through to "Associated boat hire/water bus facilities and visitor moorings could be located at Rye House Quay". Amend second paragraph as follows: "High quality sustainable design will be sought for any development proposals put forward for the ex Turnford Surfacing site which lies adjacent to the River Lee Navigation and forms part of an important entrance point into the Regional Park. Development proposals will need to new-visitor development proposals in this area that respond to the site's waterside location, adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument and related heritage assets, its ecological potential and especially its proximity to protected sites of national and international sites of ecological significance. Pedestrian accessibility should be improved with a widening of the towpath and enhanced links through to Rye House Station and the relationship with the RSPB Rye Meads reserve enhanced with new interpretation and signage along the Toll Road. The Authority will be seeking benefits, financial or otherwise, to be negotiated as planning obligations in order to secure a development that complements and enhances the Regional Park. "
SR 32.112	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Visitors		Par 4 Is this a suitable location for moorings, i.e. is area impacted by overhead cables if not is there somewhere nearby that is which could be used instead?	New visitor moorings have recently been installed adjacent to the Rye House Kart Raceway.	Amend Visitor Proposal 8.A.1 and delete as follows: Provide opportunities for recreational/visitor moorings alongside Lee-Navigation by the Rye House Kart Raceway.
SR 32.113	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Visitors		Par 7 As it is adjacent to Mill Stream, would toilet blocks and tank emptying facilities be provided and their use enforced in order to prevent sewage pollution of said Mill stream?	Any proposals for camping and caravanning would need to include appropriate services and obtain permissions from relevant authorities.	No change
SR 32.114	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Sport & Rec	Angling facilities	Par 2 Could this be expanded to cover towpath as well?	Enhancement of existing angling facilities at Marsh Lane Pits cannot be expanded to cover the towpath as this is not in the Authority's ownership.	Note minor changes to proposal text under 8.A.1 Sport & Recreation to clarify position regarding angling facilities. "Enhance and maintain angling facilities at the Marsh Lane Lakes of Banjo and Stock Pit managed by the Authority and support improvements at private fisheries on Pretty Pit and at Seniors Lake -west of the Navigation."
SR 32.115	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Sport & Rec		Par 4 If boat repair and maintenance is taking place, what precautions are in place or will be emplaced in case of pollution incidents? Believe water taxi service is non-viable.	Comments noted. Proposal is about maintaining and enhancing existing established boat repair, visitor and recreational moorings. Existing controls will remain in place and are an operational matter. The viability of a water taxi service will be considered as part of the option feasibility process.	No change

SR 32.116	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Bio-diversity	Flora & Fauna	<p>Bullet 1 & 2 It is needs to be investigated why reed areas restoration needed, surmise need for bullet 2 is due to low water level, so before creating new ones look into problems with existing i.e. is bank and lake bed unsuitable. Improving fish stock for Bittern will this consist of previous approach of dumping large quantities of fish in the lake, which is both economically and ecologically unsound, as a) Buying fish regularly from a fish farm of Bittern bite sized species is expensive and b) Will create an un-balanced aquatic ecology. It would be better if measures to control cormorant predation were taken, then after an initial stocking to replace losses caused by this predation, there would be a natural increase in fish stock levels to provide sufficient food source for Bittern within the lake and surrounding waterways. Bullet 4 As these trees could be providing refuges for fish from predation, it needs to be done carefully or will negate Bullet 1 activity re fish stock.</p> <p>Bullet 5 Suggest leave otter holts to the experts i.e. the otters, also as they eat fish is contraindicated for Bullet 1 activity re fish stock.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This work is focused mainly on the refuge area to the east of the site. it is anticipated that the creation will be carried out by fencing areas of reedbed to prevent grazing by geese to allow natural expansion. Prioir to any restocking fish surveys would continue to be undertaken. Whilst continual restocking is not viable a boost to an existing population may be required. This would be carried out in discussion with EA. The trees on the bund are above the water line and therefore do not provide refuge for fish, the importance of trees in the water are noted and considered when undertaking works. The provision of artificial holts provides greater opportunity for Otter to have safe lying up sites, they will of course also use natural features. A viable breeding fish population would provide a food source for a range of species, the key is to provide refuge areas for the fish so the population is self-sustaining</p>	No change
SR 32.117	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Bio-diversity	Access to nature	<p>Top of page 8 We have found in practice that ease of navigation supersedes this, i.e. if trees and shrubs overhang waterways or form a possible threat to bank stability, the C&RT chainsaws come out, much to disgust of anglers as these form prime fish holding features.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	No change
SR 32.118	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Land-scape & Heritage		<p>Par 1 & 2 Suggest leave glasshouses in Area 7 alone as this would become a site for them to displace to!</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	No change
SR 32.119	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Environment		<p>Par 1 (Water quality) Agree this would affect fish stock in area and downstream too. Par 2 Agree this would affect fish stock in area and downstream too.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	No change
SR 32.120	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.1 Environment	Water transport	<p>Undecided on this, as boats would colour up water when moving especially in winter when frosts kill off algae but worried as to what increased pollution risks it would bring, depending on what cargoes are transported. Have no worries about mostly inert materials being carried, but would be extremely concerned if toxic substances are transported this way, I can remember when a bargee "accidentally" kicked a 50 gallon drum of potassium cyanide in a Ponders End with resultant massive fish kill, also as water is extracted downstream for drinking purposes that needs to be taken care of.</p>	<p>Comments noted, feasibility work and C&RT input would be required before any conclusions could be reached on using the River Lee Navigation for water based transport. The Authority is working with the C7RT on a mooring strategy.</p>	No change
SR 32.121	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 Visitors	Primary Gateway Ware	<p>Why do you seek to put a primary gateway, at a place where car parking is limited, with a poor weekend train service. It will also be a long walk from there to Amwell Nature Reserve.</p>	<p>A key if somewhat understated entrance point into the Regional Park is provided at Ware from which a network of paths and cyclways then connect into the wider Park. Establishing this as a primary gateway enables joint working with the stakeholders such as East Herts District Council and Greater Anglia to promote the Park, improve signage and information from the station, bus stops and town centre and enhance routes into the Park</p>	No change

SR 32.122	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 Visitors		As well as a car park at Amwell, you need to build ones at Rye House and Ware access points, for various reasons e.g. cost and convenience most visitors will come by car not by train.	There are no proposals to build additional car parks at Ware and Rye House. Parking facilities are available within Ware town centre and in Stanstead Abbots and also at Rye House. Proposals for improved access into the Park at stations and town centres, including enhanced signage and public realm' seek to encourage visitors to use a combination of public transport, walking and cycling.	No change
SR 32.123	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 Visitors		Par 6 If boating focal points are to be developed, I oppose any boat repair facilities due to enhanced risk of pollution from them. Residential moorings are to be avoided full stop as if going by the mess from illegal long term moorings lower down, the towpath area will be blighted by ash heaps, log piles and rubbish, unless you are going to cover the cost of rubbish removal, also is there sufficient provision of pump out stations to cope with the increased amount of human waste.	Comments noted. Boat repair facilities already exist at Stanstead Marina. Proposal states that the development of linear residential moorings are to be avoided.	No change
SR 32.124	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 Sport & Rec		Par 2 Development of angling, will this also include provision of anglers car parks as well?	No this proposal related to the existing private angling facilities and is no longer considered relevant	Amend text under 8.A.2 Sport & Rec - delete the following text Support the development of angling facilities and work with the private fisheries in the area to provide opportunities for disabled anglers for example at the Amwell Pits 1 and 2 which lie close to a public car park off the High Street in Stanstead Abbots.
SR 32.125	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 Bio-diversity	Flora & Fauna	Par 2 If as stated in previous you will focused on maintaining favourable status, will you be able to afford the resources to do this?	The HMWT manage the Amwell Nature Reserve and SSSI. Maintaining its 'favourable' status is considered a key priority for both HMWT and the Authority. The work of dedicated volunteers, assists greatly in achieving this aim.	No change
SR 32.126	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 Bio-diversity	Access to nature	Is there adequate room for other vessels to pass at this point when barge in place? Why not make disused railway line a feature and run preserved steam trains on it?	Comments noted. Feasibility work for the Amwell Nature Reserve visitor facilities will consider these issues.	No change
SR 32.127	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 Community	Proposed visitors centre	This sounds very intrusive and would seem to contradict final statement in immediate section above.	Comments noted. As stated in proposals a full feasibility study would be undertaken in collaboration with the HMWT and other stakeholders into the potential for a visitor facility at Amwell nature reserve. This would address the scale and location of facilities such as classroom space and outdoor shelters and take full account of the sensitivities of this site and its ecological value.	No change
SR 32.128	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 landscape & heritage		Par 3 & 4 These imply that the authority wishes to control if not dictate how people maintain their own property. I question a) The legality of this i.e. believe it would be unenforceable and b) there would be a cost implication to the authority as owners quite rightly would say you want this done, you pay for it then.	Comments noted. Proposals have been amended to take account of new draft Landscape Character Area Assessment and Strategy.	Amend Proposal 8.A.2 Landscape & Heritage as follows: delete para 3 and 4 and add new text "Protect enhance and manage the landscape as set out in the Landscape Guidelines for Character Area A1 Amwell Floodplain."

SR 32.129	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 landscape & heritage		Par 5 &6 With the current planning issues in the county, regarding new housing being built, is this achievable or can it be overruled under current legislation?	Comments noted, the East Herts Local Plan process will identify sites for new housing within the District. The Authority's Landscape proposals have been informed by the Landscape Sensitivity Study Jan 2014 and more recently by a new landscape assessment and strategy 2018. These highlight the the intricate pattern and relatively coherent and intact nature of the landscape character in this area of the Park and which the Authority considers it is important to protect.	No change
SR 32.130	Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	8		8.A.2 Environment	Land	Par 1 Is this to be on top of existing ecological farming practices?	Comments noted. This would be bothpart of the ecological farming practices and to ensure new measures can be considered as needed to benefit wider ecology of the valley and the designated sites within the area.	No change
SR 32.132	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. Proposals identify key 'visitor hubs' within the Park where a wider suite of facilities will be provided or already exist, including refreshments, cycle and car parking, indoor space for meeting, education etc. Within Area 8 visitor facilities are limited although the town /village centres offer a range of facilities and services. Proposals have identified the need for visitor facilities at Amwell Nature Reserve and feasibility work would consider the provision of toilets as part of this.	No change
SR 32.133							email re not being consulted 12 Jan when in fact their email address not working?	
GI34.0	Ware Town Council	8			General support	Ware Town Council welcomes the proposals, particularly those to attract more visitors to the town	Support noted and welcomed	No change
GI34.1	Ware Town Council	8		8.A.2 Visitors	Ware Station	if improvements are to be made to Ware Station in order to attract more visitors, then pressure should be put on Abellio Greater Anglia to reopen the station toilets to passengers.	Comments noted	No change
GI34.2	Ware Town Council	8			Kings Meads	Consideration should be given to extending the park to Hertford Lock and including Kings Meads as there was a delightful riverside walk between Ware and Hertford.	Comments noted. There are no proposals to extend the Park to the north.	No change

GI38.0	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8		General support	Stantead Abbots Parish Council (SAPC) supports the work that the LVRPA has done in the area to conserve an important area of nature and wildlife that is accessible for the public to enjoy. The Council welcomes a forward plan for the Lee Valley Regional Park that enables this work to continue.	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
GI38.1	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8	8.A.1 & 8.A.2 Visitors	Visitor numbers	However, SAPC has concerns about the scale of what has been proposed across a number of sites in Stanstead Abbots and Great Amwell. The stated aim is to improve and promote visitor access, but there is no estimate of the number of additional visitors, nor the number of additional vehicles that will be drawn to the village as a result of this plan. Other parts of the Lee Valley further south attract a large volume of visitors arriving by car. When added together, the proposals at Marsh Lane, Stanstead Marina, Netherfield Lane and Great Amwell amount to a level of development is disproportionate in scale to the infrastructure in Stanstead Abbots, particularly the road and towpath networks. A considerable number of residents have voiced these concerns to councillors too. Specific concerns are as follows:	The Regional Park was created as a leisure, recreation and nature conservation resource for the enjoyment of people living in Essex, Hertfordshire and the Greater London region. The Authority has a duty to preserve, manage and develop the Park for these purposes whilst also protecting and enhancing the Park's ecological and landscape assets. Hence Proposals for Area 8 seek to improve the public realm around railway stations and entrances, enhance existing routes into the Park for example along Marsh Lane and Netherfield Road, improve signage and connectivity between sites to encourage people to access the Park by public transport and on foot/bicycle. Support is given for improvements to boating facilities at the Marina and for recreational moorings in appropriate locations.	No change
GI38.2	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8	8.A.1 Visitors & Sport & Rec	Stanstead Marina Cycle Hire & Accommodation	<i>Specific concerns continued:</i> <u>Cycle hire, camping & caravanning at the Stanstead Marina</u> SAPC supports a plan that will enhance the existing site, which includes redundant land that is not well looked after and unsightly. However, there are significant limitations to the site and SAPC is concerned at the scale of what is being proposed: 1. The access road, South Street, is too narrow to accommodate additional traffic: i) There is already a problem of vehicle overcrowding around the marina entrance. ii) There are already problems when boats are brought to and from the marina. The local police told us that they have to stop and direct the traffic on South St and the High St in order to help the trailers to manoeuvre in and out of the narrow and overcrowded street. iii) Overcrowding is exacerbated by the fact that the street is used by lorries delivering to the Co-op store's back entrance. iv) Access by emergency vehicles could be compromised by increased congestion. 2. The site of the marina is too small to accommodate cycle hire, camping and caravanning at a sustainable level. 3. Stanstead Abbots High St becomes very crowded with long queues of traffic due to the level crossings at Roydon and St Margarets stations. When the barriers are down, there are queues of traffic that fill the length of the High St, often backing a considerable way down Roydon Rd too. If the LVRPA's aim is to attract more visitors to the area, it could become gridlocked.	Comments noted. Proposals for camping and touring caravanning have been deleted. Cycle hire opportunities would require further investigation to ensure they were viable at this location and hence proposal refers to exploring options for cycle hire.	Delete proposals under Visitors 8.A.1: for camping etc at Stanstead Marina as follows - Explore opportunities for introduction of camping and touring caravanning at Lee Valley Marina, Stanstead Abbots, adjacent to the Stanstead Mill Stream in the eastern section of the marina site.

GI38.3	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8		8.A.1 Sport & Rec	Cycling	<p><u>Cycle hire at Stanstead Marina and St Margarets station</u></p> <p>There is already a conflict between walkers and cyclists using the towpaths on the River Lee around Stanstead Abbots. At weekends and holidays, there are many cyclists already using the towpaths; because they are very narrow, they conflict with pedestrians. The towpaths cannot accommodate more cyclists safely. We do not think that it is appropriate to encourage more use of the towpaths by cyclists, by offering cycle hire facilities.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns about cycle safety noted. The Authority's recently completed Cycling Strategy addressed this matter. It has identified the following measures amongst others, to encourage safe cycling within the Park including cycle hire facilities:</p> <p>"7. Encourage considerate sharing of paths. To continue efforts to minimise conflict, we will work closely with C&RT to implement awareness-raising campaigns.</p> <p>8. Develop cycle parking and hubs. We will increase the provision of cycle parking at key visitors attractions and gateways, as well as supporting the development of cycle hubs by neighbouring boroughs.</p> <p>9. Explore options for cycle hire. We shall explore options for further cycle hire locations in the Park."</p> <p>It also considers new routes and alternatives to the towpath.</p>	No change
GI38.4	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p><u>Improve and promote visitor access at Marsh Lane, Stanstead Abbots, with improved car park facilities at Stanstead Innings</u></p> <p>1. Marsh Lane is not able to accommodate an increased number of vehicles safely for the following reasons:</p> <p>i) With no other access road to or from the car park, all vehicles coming and going would be trying to pass each other on Marsh Lane, which is too narrow to accommodate this.</p> <p>ii) The car park is very small. Active promotion of the site as an access point to the Lee Valley Regional Park could quickly result in more cars than parking places. As noted in (i), Marsh Lane is narrow and cannot accommodate parked cars. Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent this because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced.</p> <p>iii) There is already a significant volume of cars using Marsh Lane to pick up and drop off children at the scout hut. The scout hut is in use every day of the week because there are two Beavers groups, two Cubs groups, a Scout group, weekend activities and private hires for parties and other groups.</p>	<p>Concerns about vehicle movements, volume of traffic and use of Marsh Lane noted. This is an important access into the Park for all visitors and local people whether by foot, bicycle or in a vehicle and is already identified as such in existing public information about the Park. There would need to be a joint approach with the District and County Councils, local community and businesses to address improvements & potential traffic calming. The car park is of a poor standard and requires enhancement. Indeed enhancement would help to prevent parking of vehicles each side of Marsh Lane inner track from the Height Barrier to the existing Car Park.</p>	<p>Amend text under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. and e Enhance the existing public car park at Stansted Innings. (Refer also to LA2.2 & SR26.0 Scout Group response).</p>

GI38.5	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p><i>continued from above:</i></p> <p>In addition, there is an industrial unit opposite the scout hut and an abattoir at the end of Marsh Lane, with cars and other commercial vehicles coming and going all day. There is also a boat club at Stanstead Innings, and boats are transported down the lane on trailers. There is already significant congestion on the lane outside the scout hut as cars attempt to park and turn. If additional traffic through to the LVRP entrance is added, there will be chaos. It will be unsafe.</p> <p>iv) There are no pavements on all but a small stretch of Marsh Lane. Most of the pavements that do exist are not in use for pedestrians because residents and visitors to the scout hut have to park on them as the lane is so narrow. Consequently, pedestrians walk in the road. Additional cars will make it unsafe for: Residents, half of whom have young families. The groups using the scout hut. There are large numbers of children on the road at these times – not just those being dropped off/picked up by car, but also those arriving and leaving on foot. The many walkers and cyclists, particularly families at weekends and holidays, who currently use Marsh Lane to access the Lee Valley. Upgrading the car park would, if anything, deter walking and cycling down the Lane as people would no longer consider it safe.</p> <p>v) Access by emergency vehicles could be compromised by increased congestion.</p>	Comments and concerns about the volume of traffic noted. This suggests that action to resolve capacity, parking and general safety issues would be beneficial. Revisions to the draft Proposals seek to ensure a partnership approach to resolve these outstanding matters.	As above
GI38.6	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p><i>continued</i> : 2. Marsh Lane is a private, unadopted lane. This results in the following issues:</p> <p>i) The road is not publically maintained. The lane is already in a state of significant disrepair with very large potholes and it is not suitable to promote as a visitor access point by car.</p> <p>ii) No speed limits can be set because it is unadopted by the council.</p> <p>iii) The Council will not provide street lights.</p> <p>iv) Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent unsafe parking because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced.</p>	Comments and concerns noted. As ownership and status of Marsh Lane is complicated any efforts to improve the condition and safety of the route to the car park for all users/visitors will require a partnership approach with the Local and County Councils and local community. An amendment to the proposal clarifies this position.	As above
GI38.7	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>3. We question whether LVPRA has the funds available to maintain any increased use of the site, as it will not generate any revenue:</p> <p>i) Over time, warden resources have been reduced and they now have to cover a wider area; consequently they patrol Stanstead Innings less frequently.</p> <p>ii) More visitors will generate increased litter and dog fouling. The site is already often badly littered, with dog waste bins overflowing, dog fouling problems and rubbish dumped by fishermen at the lakes.</p> <p>4. There are no toilets, or other facilities, at Stanstead Innings. There are no public toilets in Stanstead Abbots or at St Margarets station. It is therefore not appropriate for attracting more visitors.</p>	In response to point 3. The maintenance of parkland and open spaces owned by the Authority is undertaken by a grounds maintenance team. Fisheries Bailiff also carries out regular litter collection. Comments will be passed to both the above for attention. In response to point 4. The Authority is seeking to develop a network of facilities that offer a core level of service such as toilets, shelter, staff presence and Park information located close to sites of interest within the Park . Where this level of provision is not possible or appropriate, facilities nearby the Park can help to meet and benefit from visitor needs. For example the villages of Stanstead Abbots and Roydon include pubs and cafes. A large proportion of visitors to Stanstead Innings visit for a couple of hours either as part of a local trip or as a stop on a series of visits to other sites ie cycle ride.	No change

GI38.8	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8		8.A.2 Visitors	St Margarets Station	<u>Promoting use of St Margarets station to access the Lee Valley Parks</u> Whilst Stanstead Abbots appears to have good access by public transport, the buses are infrequent and do not run on Sundays or public holidays. The trains serve limited destinations only. It is unrealistic to think that the majority of people can be encouraged to come to Stanstead Abbots by public transport.	Comments noted. It is important to make the most of existing public transport facilities through promotion and by improving the physical connections between stations and the adjacent Park. Although limited in this area the public transport provision is linked to the local area and via the train into London Liverpool Street station (2 trains an hour).	No change
GI38.9	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8		8.A.1 Visitors & Land-scape & Heritage	Riverside Green	<u>Promoting the Riverside Green (by the Jolly Fisherman)</u> SAPC has in the past worked closely with the LVRPA to hold its very successful Riverside Festival at the Riverside Green and there is local appetite for more events to be held there. SAPC would be pleased to see more events at the site and would be happy to work with the LVRPA to facilitate this. However, there is very limited parking on site and promotion of activities there would have to be carefully managed.	Comments noted and welcomed. Agreed that promotion of events must be carefully managed.	No change
GI38.10	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council	8			Consultation	<u>Consultation process</u> The consultation process is flawed. There has been no publicity in the village by the LVRPA. No posters have been put up and the streets directly affected by the proposals have not been leafleted. Many people will not have seen the proposals and therefore not had an opportunity to respond. We do not know if the police or other stakeholders, such as the RSPB, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust and the boat club on Marsh Lane have been actively engaged in the consultation process. For example, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust bird hides, which are open access, have regularly been targeted by vandals at night. More publicity could result in increased vandalism at night.	Comments noted. Consultation covered a large area of the Park from the M25 north to Ware. Notices were placed in local newspapers and on the local council and LVRPA websites. The Local authorities, town and Parish Councils were notified together with other stakeholders; this included the RSPB and HMWT	No change
GI40.0	Individual 2 A. Hunt	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	As a resident of Marsh Lane, I have a particular concern about the potential impact of proposals to improve and promote visitor access at Marsh Lane, Stanstead Abbots, with improved car park facilities at Stanstead Innings (page 4).	Comments and concern noted	No change

GI40.1	Individual 2 A. Hunt	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>1. There is no estimate of the number of additional vehicles that would result from this plan. Other parts of the Lee Valley further south attract a large volume of visitors arriving by car. Marsh Lane is not able to accommodate an increased number of vehicles safely for the following reasons: i) With no other access road to or from the car park, all vehicles coming and going would be trying to pass each other on Marsh Lane, which is too narrow to accommodate this. ii) The car park is very small. Active promotion of the site as an access point to the Lee Valley Regional Park could quickly result in more cars than parking places. As noted in (i), Marsh Lane is narrow and cannot accommodate parked cars. Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent this because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced. iii) We already have significant volumes of cars using Marsh Lane to pick up and drop off children at the scout hut. The scout hut is in use every day of the week because there are two Beavers groups, two Cubs groups, a Scout group, weekend activities and private hires for parties and other groups.</p> <p>In addition, there is an industrial unit opposite the scout hut and an abattoir at the end of Marsh Lane, with cars and other commercial vehicles coming and going all day. There is also a boat club at Stanstead Innings, and boats are transported down the lane on trailers. There is already significant congestion on the lane outside the scout hut as cars attempt to park and turn. If additional traffic through to the LVRP entrance is added, there will be chaos. It will be unsafe.</p>	<p>Concerns about vehicle movements, volume of traffic and use of Marsh Lane noted. This is an important access into the Park for all visitors and local people whether by foot, bicycle or in a vehicle and is already identified as such in existing public information about the Park. There would need to be a joint approach with the District and County Councils, local community and businesses to address improvements & potential traffic calming. The car park is of a poor standard and requires enhancement. Indeed enhancement would help to prevent parking of vehicles each side of Marsh Lane inner track from the Height Barrier to the existing Car Park.</p>	<p>Amend text as follows under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. and Enhance the existing public car park at Stanstead Innings. (Refer also to LA2.2 & SR26.0 Scout Group response).</p>
GI40.2	Individual 2 A. Hunt	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p><i>continued:</i> iv) There are no pavements on all but a small stretch of Marsh Lane. Most of the pavements that do exist are not in use for pedestrians because residents and visitors to the scout hut have to park on them as the lane is so narrow. Consequently, pedestrians walk in the road. Additional cars will make it unsafe for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents, half of whom have young families. • The groups using the scout hut. There are large numbers of children on the road at these times – not just those being dropped off/picked up by car, but also those arriving and leaving on foot. • The many walkers and cyclists, particularly families at weekends and holidays, who currently use Marsh Lane to access the Lee Valley. Upgrading the car park would, if anything, deter walking and cycling down the Lane as people would no longer consider it safe. <p>v) Access by emergency vehicles could be compromised by increased congestion.</p> <p>vi) There are already problems at the bottom of Marsh Lane with drivers confused about which way to go. This results in cars driving into the abattoir and then having to reverse along the single track and turn back at the bend. This will result in accidents if there are more vehicles on the road.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns about the volume of traffic noted. This suggests that action to resolve capacity, parking and general safety issues would be beneficial. Revisions to the draft Proposals seek to ensure a partnership approach to resolve these outstanding matters</p>	<p>See above</p>

GI40.3	Individual 2 A. Hunt	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>2. Marsh Lane is a private, un-adopted lane. This results in the following issues:</p> <p>i) The road is not publically maintained. The lane is already in a state of significant disrepair with very large potholes and it is not suitable to promote as a visitor access point by car. Residents such as us are not able or willing to fund the impact of more damage to the road caused by LVRP traffic.</p> <p>ii) We are already concerned about cars speeding along the lane. No speed limits can be set because it is un-adopted by the council.</p> <p>iii) There is no public lighting on the road or in the Stanstead Innings car park. As it is an un-adopted road, the Council will not provide street lights.</p> <p>iv) Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent unsafe parking because it is un-adopted by the Council and they could not be enforced. 3. Whilst Stanstead Abbots appears to have good access by public transport, the buses are infrequent and do not run on Sundays or public holidays. The trains serve limited destinations only. It is unrealistic to think that the majority of people can be encouraged to come to Stanstead Abbots by public transport.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. In response to point 2. Ownership and status of Marsh Lane is complicated any efforts to improve the condition and safety of the route to the car park for all users/visitors will require a partnership approach with the Local and County Councils and local community. An amendment to the proposal clarifies this position.</p> <p>In response to point 3. It is important to make the most of existing public transport facilities through promotion and by improving the physical connections between stations and the adjacent Park. Although limited in this area the public transport provision is linked to the local area and via the train into London Liverpool Street station (2 trains an hour).</p>	See above
GI40.4	Individual 2 A. Hunt	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>4. We question whether LVPRA has the funds available to maintain any increased use of the site, as it will not generate any revenue:</p> <p>i) Over time, warden resources have been reduced and they now have to cover a wider area; consequently they patrol Stanstead Innings less frequently.</p> <p>ii) More visitors will generate increased litter and dog fouling. The site is already often badly littered, with dog waste bins overflowing, dog fouling problems and rubbish dumped by fishermen at the lakes.</p> <p>iii) The LVRP sign at the height restrictor is faded and has not been maintained.</p>	<p>The maintenance of parkland and open spaces owned by the Authority is undertaken by a grounds maintenance team. Fisheries Bailiff also carries out regular litter collection. Comments will be passed to both the above for attention.</p>	No change
GI40.5	Individual 2 A. Hunt	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>5. There are no toilets, or other facilities, at Stanstead Innings. There are no public toilets in Stanstead Abbots or at St Margarets station. It is therefore not appropriate for attracting more visitors.</p>	<p>The Authority is seeking to develop a network of facilities that offer a core level of service such as toilets, shelter, staff presence and Park information located close to sites of interest within the Park . Where this level of provision is not possible or appropriate facilities nearby the Park can help to meet and benefit from visitor needs. For example the villages of Stanstead Abbots and Roydon include pubs and cafes. A large proportion of visitors to Stanstead Innings visit for a couple of hours either as part of a local trip or as a stop on a series of visits to other sites ie cycle ride.</p>	No change

GI40.6	Individual 2 A. Hunt	8			Consultation	<p>6. The consultation process is flawed. There has been no publicity in the village by the LVRPA. No posters have been put up and the streets directly affected by the proposals have not been leafleted. Many people will not have seen the proposals and therefore not had an opportunity to respond.</p> <p>We do not know if the police or other stakeholders, such as the RSPB, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust and the boat club on Marsh Lane have been actively engaged in the consultation process. For example, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust bird hides, which are open access, have regularly been targeted by vandals at night. More publicity could result in increased vandalism at night.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Consultation covered a large area of the Park from the M25 north to Ware. Notices were placed in local newspapers and on the local council and LVRPA websites. The Local authorities, town and Parish Councils were notified together with other stakeholders; this included the RSPB and HMWT</p>	No change
GI40.7	Individual 2 A. Hunt	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>7. When added to the proposals at Stanstead Marina, Netherfield Lane and Great Amwell, we are very concerned that the level of development is disproportionate in scale to the infrastructure in Stanstead Abbots, particularly the road network. Like Marsh Lane, access points at Netherfield Lane, Stanstead Marina and Great Amwell are via narrow roads. The timings of the level crossings at both Roydon and St Margarets can at times cause long very queues of traffic on both sides of the barrier at St Margarets. There is no capacity for additional traffic.</p>	<p>Objection and concerns regarding the capacity of local roads and access points into the Park are noted. The draft proposals seek to balance a need to provide attractive and safe access into the Park whilst also protecting and enhancing the Park's environment so that people can enjoy the open spaces, wildlife sites and leisure facilities.</p>	No change
GI42.0	Individual 4.A Goldthorpe	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>As a Stanstead Abbots resident, Chairman of the local Scout Group and regular user of the Lea Valley Park, I have particular concerns about the potential impact of proposals to improve and promote visitor access at Marsh Lane, Stanstead Abbots, with improved car park facilities at Stanstead Innings (page 4). There is no estimate of the number of additional vehicles that would result from this plan. Other parts of the Lee Valley further south attract a large volume of visitors arriving by car. Marsh Lane is not able to accommodate an increased number of vehicles safely for the following reasons: - With no other access road to or from the car park, opposing traffic would have to pass on Marsh Lane, which is too narrow. - The car park is very small. Active promotion of the site as an access point to the Lee Valley Regional Park could quickly exceed parking place availability. As noted in (i), Marsh Lane is narrow and cannot accommodate parked cars. Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent this because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced. We already have significant volumes of cars using Marsh Lane to pick up and drop off children at the Scout Group Headquarters. This building is in use every day of the week; there are two Beavers groups, two Cubs groups, a Scout group, weekend activities and private hires for parties and other groups. In addition, there is an industrial unit opposite the Scout Group Headquarters and an abattoir at the end of Marsh Lane, with cars and other commercial vehicles coming and going all day. There is also a boat club at Stanstead Innings, with boats regularly transported down the lane on trailers.</p>	<p>Concerns about vehicle movements, volume of traffic and use of Marsh Lane noted. This is an important access into the Park for all visitors and local people whether by foot, bicycle or in a vehicle and is already identified as such in existing public information about the Park. There would need to be a joint approach with the District and County Councils, local community and businesses to address improvements & potential traffic calming. The car park is of a poor standard and requires enhancement. Indeed enhancement would help to prevent parking of vehicles each side of Marsh Lane inner track from the Height Barrier to the existing Car Park.</p>	<p>Amend text as follows under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. and e Enhance the existing public car park at Stanstead Innings. (Refer also to LA2.2 & SR26.0 Scout Group response).</p>

GI42.1	Individual 4. A Goldthorpe	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>There is already significant congestion on the lane outside the Scout Group Headquarters as cars attempt to park and turn. Additional traffic through to the LVRP entrance will result in gridlock. (This already occurs on busy evenings at the Scout Group headquarters. It will also become unsafe.</p> <p>There are no pavements on all but a small stretch of Marsh Lane. Most of the pavements that do exist are not in use for pedestrians because residents and visitors to the Scout Group Headquarters have to park on them as the lane is so narrow. Consequently, pedestrians walk in the road. Additional cars will make it unsafe for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents, half of whom have young families. • The groups using the Scout Group Headquarters. There are large numbers of children on the road at these times – not just those being dropped off/picked up by car, but also those arriving and leaving on foot. • The many walkers and cyclists, particularly families at weekends and holidays, who currently use Marsh Lane to access the Lee Valley. Upgrading the car park would, if anything, deter walking and cycling down the Lane as people would no longer consider it safe. • Access by emergency vehicles could be compromised by increased congestion. <p>There are already problems at the bottom of Marsh Lane with drivers confused about which way to go. This results in cars driving into the abattoir and then having to reverse along the single track and turn back at the bend. The risk of accidents will increase if there are more vehicles on the road.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns about the volume of traffic noted. This suggests that action to resolve capacity, parking and general safety issues would be beneficial. Revisions to the draft Proposals seek to ensure a partnership approach to resolve these outstanding matters</p>	See above
GI42.2	Individual 4. A Goldthorpe	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>As already stated, Marsh Lane is a private, un-adopted lane. This results in the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road is not publically maintained. The lane is already in a state of significant disrepair with very large potholes and it is not suitable to promote as a visitor access point by car. Residents such as us are not able or willing to fund the impact of more damage to the road caused by LVRP traffic. • We are already concerned about cars speeding along the lane. No speed limits can be set. • There is no public lighting on the road or in the Stanstead Innings car park. The Council will not provide street lights. • Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent unsafe parking and they could not be enforced 	<p>Comments noted. Ownership and status of Marsh Lane is complicated and any efforts to improve the condition and safety of the route to the car park for all users/visitors will require a partnership approach with the Local and County Councils and local community. An amendment to the proposal clarifies this position.</p>	See above
GI42.3	Individual 4.A Goldthorpe	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane & Stanstead Abbots	<p>Whilst Stanstead Abbots appears to have good access by public transport, the buses are infrequent and do not run on Sundays or public holidays. The trains serve limited destinations only. It is unrealistic to think that the majority of people can be encouraged to come to Stanstead Abbots by public transport.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is important to make the most of existing public transport facilities through promotion and by improving the physical connections between stations and the adjacent Park. Although limited in this area the public transport provision is linked to the local area and via the train into London Liverpool Street station (2 trains an hour).</p>	See above

GI42.4	Individual 4. A Goldthorpe	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane & Stanstead Innings	I question whether LVRPA has the funds available to maintain any increased use of the site, as it will not generate any revenue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over time, warden resources have been reduced and they now have to cover a wider area; consequently they patrol Stanstead Innings less frequently. • More visitors will generate increased litter and dog fouling. The site is already often badly littered, with dog waste bins overflowing, dog fouling problems and rubbish dumped by fishermen at the lakes. • The LVRP sign at the height restrictor is faded and has not been maintained. 	The delivery of these proposals will require consideration against the Authority's other priorities. The maintenance of parkland and open spaces owned by the Authority is undertaken by a grounds maintenance team. Fisheries Bailiff also carries out regular litter collection. Comments will be passed to both the above for attention.	No change.
GI42.5	Individual 4. A Goldthorpe	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	There are no toilets, or other facilities, at Stanstead Innings. There are no public toilets in Stanstead Abbots or at St Margarets station. It is therefore not appropriate for attracting more visitors.	The Authority is seeking to develop a network of facilities that offer a core level of service such as toilets, shelter, staff presence and Park information located close to sites of interest within the Park . Where this level of provision is not possible or appropriate facilities nearby the Park can help to meet and benefit from visitor needs. For example the villages of Stanstead Abbots and Roydon include pubs and cafes. A large proportion of visitors to Stanstead Innings visit for a couple of hours either as part of a local trip or as a stop on a series of visits to other sites ie cycle ride.	No change
GI42.6	Individual 4. A Goldthorpe	8			Consulation	The consultation process is flawed. There has been no publicity in the village by the LVRPA. No posters have been put up and the streets directly affected by the proposals have not been leafleted. Many people will not have seen the proposals and therefore not had an opportunity to respond. We do not know if the police or other stakeholders, such as the RSPB, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust and the boat club on Marsh Lane have been actively engaged in the consultation process. For example, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust bird hides, which are open access, have regularly been targeted by vandals at night. More publicity could result in increased vandalism at night.	Comments noted. Consultation covered a large area of the Park from the M25 north to Ware. Notices were placed in local newspapers and on the local council and LVRPA websites. The Local authorities, town and Parish Councils were notified together with other stakeholders; this included the RSPB and HMWT	No change
GI42.7	Individual 4.A Goldthorpe	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	When added to the proposals at Stanstead Marina, Netherfield Lane and Great Amwell, I am concerned that the level of development is disproportionate in scale to the infrastructure in Stanstead Abbots, particularly the road network. Like Marsh Lane, access points at Netherfield Lane, Stanstead Marina and Great Amwell are via narrow roads. The timings of the level crossings at both Roydon and St Margarets can at times cause long very queues of traffic on both sides of the barrier at St Margarets. There is no capacity for additional traffic. For these reasons outlined above I oppose the LVRPA's development plans in Stanstead Abbots.	Objection and concerns regarding the capacity of local roads and access points into the Park are noted. The draft proposals seek to balance a need to provide attractive and safe access into the Park whilst also protecting and enhancing the Park's environment so that people can enjoy the open spaces, wildlife sites and leisure facilities	No change

GI45.0	Individual 7. C&A Day	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>As residents of Marsh Lane we wish to endorse the comments already forwarded by Julia Witting of 4 Marsh Lane on behalf of all residents. We should like in particular to stress the fact that Marsh Lane, which is the only route to this section of the Park, is an unadopted road. It is narrow, without pavements, and unlit. There is already a heavy use of the Lane by industrial vehicles (to the building company, and to the abattoir), and vehicles needing access to the Sailing Club, and the fishing lakes.</p> <p>The current state of the Lane is precarious in places where deep potholes have formed, and although some residents take it upon themselves to remedy this on a temporary basis, the road surface soon deteriorates again. Increased traffic to the Park area will only exacerbate this situation.</p>	<p>Concerns about vehicle movements, the condition and use of Marsh Lane noted. This is however an important access into the Park. As ownership and status of Marsh Lane is complicated any efforts to improve the condition and safety of the route to the car park for all users/visitors will require a partnership approach with the Local and County Councils and local community.</p>	<p>Amend text as follows under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. and e Enhance the existing public car park at Stansted Innings. (Refer also to LA2.2 & SR26.0 Scout Group response).</p>
GI45.1	Individual 7. C&A Day	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>We feel that if the LVRPA wishes to extend the facilities within the Park, it should take some responsibility for the maintenance of the only access road to the area, and make some budgetary provision for repair work to the road surface.</p>	<p>Proposals seek to improve existing facilities but it is agreed that a multi-party approach is needed to resolve access issues at Marsh Lane.</p>	<p>As above</p>
GI45.2	Individual 7. C&A Day	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>Better signage would be needed, particularly approaching the entrance gates, where Marsh Lane proper turns left towards Holts' Yard (a dead end). The lack of proper information at this point regularly causes confusion. Advisory speed limit signs would also be desirable.</p> <p>In addition, there is an ongoing litter problem, and we would hope that any new plans would include the provision, and regular emptying, of litter bins in the Park area.</p>	<p>Agreed this is a matter (speed limits and signage for commercial operations) that needs to be resolved, ideally as part of joint working with the District and County Councils.</p>	<p>As above</p>
GI45.3	Individual 7. C&A Day	8			Consultation	<p>Finally, we were most alarmed to learn of these proposals by word of mouth. We do not take the Hertfordshire Mercury on any regular basis, and would have had no other way of learning of these plans. We did not receive any written communication from the LVRPA, (surely a statutory requirement?), neither were there any public posters or leafletting campaign. All other statutory bodies – East Herts D.C., Herts. County Council/Highways Agency, Energy and Water agencies – all inform and consult to those individual properties directly affected.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. Consultation covered a large area of the Park from the M25 north to Ware. Notices were placed in local newspapers and on the local council and LVRPA websites. The Local authorities, town and Parish Councils were notified together with other stakeholders;</p>	<p>No change</p>

GI47.0	Individual 9 E. Poulton	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Accommodation at Stanstead Marina	Having read your proposals to introduce caravanning at the marina in Stanstead Abbots, I would like to know please where the access to the marina would be for these caravans? I live just off of South Street and am seriously hoping that the plan is not to allow access to the site via this road. It is a very narrow road already, with residents' cars parked all along one side, and often with people parked on the double yellow lines to go to the local shops, being too lazy to walk from the car park. Adding another dimension of traffic, with large vehicles, would make using our own road even more difficult. I feel it would also make it even more dangerous during busy times like school drop-off and pick-up when the road is busy with people parking on the double yellows and children are also trying to cross the road. There are frequently cars parked on the corner of South Street and the High Street and caravans would find it extremely difficult to come either in or out of the road, once again making the road dangerous for pedestrians and other road users. Should an emergency vehicle need to use South Street, it may therefore be unable to access the road, which is obviously totally unacceptable. Please consider the residents and their safety when making your plans to "improve" the area.	Comments noted. Proposals for camping and touring caravanning have been deleted.	Delete proposals under Visitors 8.A.1: for camping etc at Stanstead Marina as follows - Explore opportunities for introduction of camping and touring caravanning at Lee Valley Marina, Stanstead Abbots, adjacent to the Stanstead Mill Stream in the eastern section of the marina site.
GI53.0	Individual 15 J&T Combellack	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	As residents of Marsh Lane, we have a particular concern about the potential impact of proposals to improve and promote visitor access at Marsh Lane, Stanstead Abbots, with improved car park facilities at Stanstead Innings (page 4). 1. There is no estimate of the number of additional vehicles that would result from this plan. Other parts of the Lee Valley further south attract a large volume of visitors arriving by car. Marsh Lane is not able to accommodate an increased number of vehicles safely for the following reasons: i) With no other access road to or from the car park, all vehicles coming and going would be trying to pass each other on Marsh Lane, which is too narrow to accommodate this. ii) The car park is very small. Active promotion of the site as an access point to the Lee Valley Regional Park could quickly result in more cars than parking places. As noted in (i), Marsh Lane is narrow and cannot accommodate parked cars. Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent this because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced.	Concerns about vehicle movements, volume of traffic and use of Marsh Lane noted. This is an important access into the Park for all visitors and local people whether by foot, bicycle or in a vehicle and is already identified as such in existing public information about the Park. There would need to be a joint approach with the District and County Councils, local community and businesses to address improvements & potential traffic calming. The car park is of a poor standard and requires enhancement. Indeed enhancement would help to prevent parking of vehicles each side of Marsh Lane inner track from the Height Barrier to the existing Car Park.	Amend text as follows under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. and e Enhance the existing public car park at Stansted Innings. (Refer also to LA2.2 & SR26.0 Scout Group response).
GI53.1	Individual 15 J&T Combellack	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<i>continued</i> iii) We already have significant volumes of cars using Marsh Lane to pick up and drop off children at the scout hut. The scout hut is in use every day of the week because there are two Beavers groups, two Cubs groups, a Scout group, weekend activities and private hires for parties and other groups. In addition, there is an industrial unit opposite the scout hut and an abattoir at the end of Marsh Lane, with cars and other commercial vehicles coming and going all day. There is also a boat club at Stanstead Innings, and boats are transported down the lane on trailers. There is already significant congestion on the lane outside the scout hut as cars attempt to park and turn. If additional traffic through to the LVRP entrance is added, there will be chaos. It will be unsafe.	As above	As above

GI53.2	Individual 15 J&T Combellaack	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>v) There are no pavements on all but a small stretch of Marsh Lane. Most of the pavements that do exist are not in use for pedestrians because residents and visitors to the scout hut have to park on them as the lane is so narrow. Consequently, pedestrians walk in the road. Additional cars will make it unsafe for: Residents, half of whom have young families. The groups using the scout hut. There are large numbers of children on the road at these times – not just those being dropped off/picked up by car, but also those arriving and leaving on foot. The many walkers and cyclists, particularly families at weekends and holidays, who currently use Marsh Lane to access the Lee Valley. Upgrading the car park would, if anything, deter walking and cycling down the Lane as people would no longer consider it safe.</p> <p>v) Access by emergency vehicles could be compromised by increased congestion.</p> <p>vi) There are already problems at the bottom of Marsh Lane with drivers confused about which way to go. This results in cars driving into the abattoir and then having to reverse along the single track and turn back at the bend. This will result in accidents if there are more vehicles on the road.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns about the volume of traffic noted. This suggests that action to resolve capacity, parking and general safety issues would be beneficial. Revisions to the draft Proposals seek to ensure a partnership approach to resolve these outstanding matters</p>	As above
GI53.3	Individual 15 J&T Combellaack	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>2. Marsh Lane is a private, unadopted lane. This results in the following issues:</p> <p>i) The road is not publically maintained. The lane is already in a state of significant disrepair with very large potholes and it is not suitable to promote as a visitor access point by car. Residents such as us are not able or willing to fund the impact of more damage to the road caused by LVRP traffic.</p> <p>ii) We are already concerned about cars speeding along the lane. No speed limits can be set because it is unadopted by the council.</p> <p>iii) There is no public lighting on the road or in the Stanstead Innings car park. As it is an unadopted road, the Council will not provide street lights.</p> <p>iv) Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent unsafe parking because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. As ownership and status of Marsh Lane is complicated any efforts to improve the condition and safety of the route to the car park for all users/visitors will require a partnership approach with the Local and County Councils and local community. An amendment to the proposal clarifies this position.</p>	As above
GI53.4	Individual 15 J&T Combellaack	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Access Stanstead Abbotts	<p>3. Whilst Stanstead Abbots appears to have good access by public transport, the buses are infrequent and do not run on Sundays or public holidays. The trains serve limited destinations only. It is unrealistic to think that the majority of people can be encouraged to come to Stanstead Abbots by public transport.</p>	<p>It is important to make the most of existing public transport facilities through promotion and by improving the physical connections between stations and the adjacent Park. Although limited in this area the public transport provision is linked to the local area and via the train into London Liverpool Street station (2 trains an hour).</p>	

GI53.5	Individual 15 J&T Combellack	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Funding Marsh Lane	<p>4. We question whether LVPRA has the funds available to maintain any increased use of the site, as it will not generate any revenue:</p> <p>i) Over time, warden resources have been reduced and they now have to cover a wider area; consequently they patrol Stanstead Innings less frequently.</p> <p>ii) More visitors will generate increased litter and dog fouling. The site is already often badly littered, with dog waste bins overflowing, dog fouling problems and rubbish dumped by fishermen at the lakes.</p> <p>iii) The LVRP sign at the height restrictor is faded and has not been maintained.</p>	<p>The maintenance of parkland and open spaces owned by the Authority is undertaken by a grounds maintenance team. Fisheries Bailiff also carries out regular litter collection. Comments will be passed to both the above for attention.</p>	No change
GI53.6	Individual 15 J&T Combellack	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Stanstead Innings	<p>5. There are no toilets, or other facilities, at Stanstead Innings. There are no public toilets in Stanstead Abbots or at St Margarets station. It is therefore not appropriate for attracting more visitors.</p>	<p>The Authority is seeking to develop a network of facilities that offer a core level of service such as toilets, shelter, staff presence and Park information located close to sites of interest within the Park . Where this level of provision is not possible or appropriate facilities nearby the Park can help to meet and benefit from visitor needs. For example the villages of Stanstead Abbots and Roydon include pubs and cafes. A large proportion of visitors to Stanstead Innings visit for a couple of hours either as part of a local trip or as a stop on a series of visits to other sites ie cycle ride.</p>	No change
GI53.7	Individual 15 J&T Combellack	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Consultation	<p>6. The consultation process is flawed. There has been no publicity in the village by the LVRPA. No posters have been put up and the streets directly affected by the proposals have not been leafleted. Many people will not have seen the proposals and therefore not had an opportunity to respond. We do not know if the police or other stakeholders, such as the RSPB, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust and the boat club on Marsh Lane have been actively engaged in the consultation process. For example, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust bird hides, which are open access, have regularly been targeted by vandals at night. More publicity could result in increased vandalism at night.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Consultation covered a large area of the Park from the M25 north to Ware. Notices were placed in local newspapers and on the local council and LVRPA websites. The Local authorities, town and Parish Councils were notified together with other stakeholders; this included the RSPB and HMWT</p>	No change
GI53.8	Individual 15 J&T Combellack	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>7. When added to the proposals at Stanstead Marina, Netherfield Lane and Great Amwell, we are very concerned that the level of development is disproportionate in scale to the infrastructure in Stanstead Abbots, particularly the road network. Like Marsh Lane, access points at Netherfield Lane, Stanstead Marina and Great Amwell are via narrow roads. The timings of the level crossings at both Roydon and St Margarets can at times cause long very queues of traffic on both sides of the barrier at St Margarets. There is no capacity for additional traffic.</p>	<p>Objection and concerns regarding the capacity of local roads and access points into the Park are noted. The draft proposals seek to balance a need to provide attractive and safe access into the Park whilst also protecting and enhancing the Park's environment so that people can enjoy the open spaces, wildlife sites and leisure facilities</p>	No change

GI55.0	Individual 17 M Hills	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>As residents of Marsh Lane, we have a particular concern about the potential impact of proposals to improve and promote visitor access at Marsh Lane, Stanstead Abbots, with improved car park facilities at Stanstead Innings (page 4).</p> <p>1. There is no estimate of the number of additional vehicles that would result from this plan. Other parts of the Lee Valley further south attract a large volume of visitors arriving by car. Marsh Lane is not able to accommodate an increased number of vehicles safely for the following reasons:</p> <p>i) With no other access road to or from the car park, all vehicles coming and going would be trying to pass each other on Marsh Lane, which is too narrow to accommodate this.</p> <p>ii) The car park is very small. Active promotion of the site as an access point to the Lee Valley Regional Park could quickly result in more cars than parking places. As noted in (i), Marsh Lane is narrow and cannot accommodate parked cars. Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent this because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced.</p>	<p>Concerns about vehicle movements, volume of traffic and use of Marsh Lane noted. This is an important access into the Park for all visitors and local people whether by foot, bicycle or in a vehicle and is already identified as such in existing public information about the Park. There would need to be a joint approach with the District and County Councils, local community and businesses to address improvements & potential traffic calming. The car park is of a poor standard and requires enhancement. Indeed enhancement would help to prevent parking of vehicles each side of Marsh Lane inner track from the Height Barrier to the existing Car Park.</p>	<p>Amend text as follows under 8.A.1 Visitors as follows: Work in partnership with the District and County Councils and the local community to improve and promote safe visitor access into the Park from Stanstead Abbots via Marsh Lane; prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. and Enhance the existing public car park at Stanstead Innings. (Refer also to LA2.2 & SR26.0 Scout Group response).</p>
GI55.1	Individual 17 M Hills	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>iii) We already have significant volumes of cars using Marsh Lane to pick up and drop off children at the scout hut. The scout hut is in use every day of the week because there are two Beavers groups, two Cubs groups, a Scout group, weekend activities and private hires for parties and other groups.</p> <p>In addition, there is an industrial unit opposite the scout hut and an abattoir at the end of Marsh Lane, with cars and other commercial vehicles coming and going all day.</p> <p>There is also a boat club at Stanstead Innings, and boats are transported down the lane on trailers.</p> <p>There is already significant congestion on the lane outside the scout hut as cars attempt to park and turn. If additional traffic through to the LVRP entrance is added, there will be chaos. It will be unsafe.</p>	As above	As above

GI55.2	Individual 17 M Hills	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>iv) There are no pavements on all but a small stretch of Marsh Lane. Most of the pavements that do exist are not in use for pedestrians because residents and visitors to the scout hut have to park on them as the lane is so narrow. Consequently, pedestrians walk in the road. Additional cars will make it unsafe for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents, half of whom have young families. • The groups using the scout hut. There are large numbers of children on the road at these times – not just those being dropped off/picked up by car, but also those arriving and leaving on foot. • The many walkers and cyclists, particularly families at weekends and holidays, who currently use Marsh Lane to access the Lee Valley. Upgrading the car park would, if anything, deter walking and cycling down the Lane as people would no longer consider it safe. <p>v) Access by emergency vehicles could be compromised by increased congestion.</p> <p>vi) There are already problems at the bottom of Marsh Lane with drivers confused about which way to go. This results in cars driving into the abattoir and then having to reverse along the single track and turn back at the bend. This will result in accidents if there are more vehicles on the road.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns about the volume of traffic noted. This suggests that action to resolve capacity, parking and general safety issues would be beneficial. Revisions to the draft Proposals seek to ensure a partnership approach to resolve these outstanding matters</p>	<p>Please refer to change proposed under GI55.0</p>
GI55.3	Individual 17 M Hills	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>2. Marsh Lane is a private, unadopted lane. This results in the following issues:</p> <p>i) The road is not publically maintained. The lane is already in a state of significant disrepair with very large potholes and it is not suitable to promote as a visitor access point by car. Residents such as us are not able or willing to fund the impact of more damage to the road caused by LVRP traffic.</p> <p>ii) We are already concerned about cars speeding along the lane. No speed limits can be set because it is unadopted by the council.</p> <p>iii) There is no public lighting on the road or in the Stanstead Innings car park. As it is an unadopted road, the Council will not provide street lights.</p> <p>iv) Yellow lines cannot be placed on the lane to prevent unsafe parking because it is unadopted by the Council and they could not be enforced.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. As ownership and status of Marsh Lane is complicated any efforts to improve the condition and safety of the route to the car park for all users/visitors will require a partnership approach with the Local and County Councils and local community. An amendment to the proposal clarifies this position.</p>	<p>As above</p>
GI55.4	Individual 17 M Hills	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>3. Whilst Stanstead Abbots appears to have good access by public transport, the buses are infrequent and do not run on Sundays or public holidays. The trains serve limited destinations only. It is unrealistic to think that the majority of people can be encouraged to come to Stanstead Abbots by public transport.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is important to make the most of existing public transport facilities through promotion and by improving the physical connections between stations and the adjacent Park. Although limited in this area the public transport provision is linked to the local area and via the train into London Liverpool Street station (2 trains an hour).</p>	<p>As above</p>

GI55.5	Individual 17 M Hills			8.A.1 Visitors	Funding Stanstead Innings	<p>4. We question whether LVPRA has the funds available to maintain any increased use of the site, as it will not generate any revenue:</p> <p>i) Over time, warden resources have been reduced and they now have to cover a wider area; consequently they patrol Stanstead Innings less frequently.</p> <p>ii) More visitors will generate increased litter and dog fouling. The site is already often badly littered, with dog waste bins overflowing, dog fouling problems and rubbish dumped by fishermen at the lakes.</p> <p>iii) The LVRP sign at the height restrictor is faded and has not been maintained.</p>	<p>The delivery of these proposals require consideration against the Authority's other priorities. The maintenance of parkland and open spaces owned by the Authority is undertaken by a grounds maintenance team. Fisheries Bailiff also carries out regular litter collection. Comments will be passed to both the above for attention.</p>	No change
GI55.6	Individual 17 M Hills	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Facilities	<p>5. There are no toilets, or other facilities, at Stanstead Innings. There are no public toilets in Stanstead Abbots or at St Margarets station. It is therefore not appropriate for attracting more visitors.</p>	<p>The Authority is seeking to develop a network of facilities that offer a core level of service such as toilets, shelter, staff presence and Park information located close to sites of interest within the Park . Where this level of provision is not possible or appropriate facilities nearby the Park can help to meet and benefit from visitor needs. For example the villages of Stanstead Abbots and Roydon include pubs and cafes. A large proportion of visitors to Stanstead Innings visit for a couple of hours either as part of a local trip or as a stop on a series of visits to other sites ie cycle ride.</p>	No change
GI55.7	Individual 17 M Hills	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Consultation	<p>6. The consultation process is flawed. There has been no publicity in the village by the LVRPA. No posters have been put up and the streets directly affected by the proposals have not been leafleted. Many people will not have seen the proposals and therefore not had an opportunity to respond.</p> <p>We do not know if the police or other stakeholders, such as the RSPB, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust and the boat club on Marsh Lane have been actively engaged in the consultation process. For example, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust bird hides, which are open access, have regularly been targeted by vandals at night. More publicity could result in increased vandalism at night.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Consultation covered a large area of the Park from the M25 north to Ware. Notices were placed in local newspapers and on the local council and LVRPA websites. The Local authorities, town and Parish Councils were notified together with other stakeholders; this included the RSPB, HMWT</p>	No change
GI55.8	Individual 17 M Hills	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Marsh Lane	<p>7. When added to the proposals at Stanstead Marina, Netherfield Lane and Great Amwell, we are very concerned that the level of development is disproportionate in scale to the infrastructure in Stanstead Abbots, particularly the road network. Like Marsh Lane, access points at Netherfield Lane, Stanstead Marina and Great Amwell are via narrow roads. The timings of the level crossings at both Roydon and St Margarets can at times cause long very queues of traffic on both sides of the barrier at St Margarets. There is no capacity for additional traffic.</p>	<p>Objection and concerns regarding the capacity of local roads and access points into the Park are noted. The draft proposals seek to balance a need to provide attractive and safe access into the Park whilst also protecting and enhancing the Park's environment so that people can enjoy the open spaces, wildlife sites and leisure facilities</p>	No change
GI57.0	Individual 19 S Strutt	8		8.A.1 Visitors		<p>I am a resident within area 8 (Stanstead Abbots). I welcome proposals to enhance pedestrian and cycle access routes and the potential for a new visitor hub closer to Rye Meads, including potential for a microbrewery, picnic area, cycle hire. I particularly support the provision of boat hire facilities which will make the waterways more accessible for families.</p>	<p>Comments noted and support welcomed</p>	No change

GI57.1	Individual 19 S Strutt	8		8.A.1 Landscape	Riverside Green	Riverside Green is a much valued community asset and has hosted annual community festivals in previous years. It is a real hub for Stanstead Abbots, providing the opportunity to feel part of the waterside. I am unclear on the precise meaning of "promote and enhance the waterside entrance" but would want any changes to be in close consultation with the local community.	Comments noted. The intention is to protect this important waterside open space. Landscape proposal text has now been amended to take account of the new draft Landscape Character Assessment and Strategy and detail under 8.A.1 is now covered by the Landscape Guidelines for Area A2 Rye Meads	Amend Landscape & Heritage Proposal 8.A.1 to include reference to the Landscape Strategy Guidelines for Character Area A2 Rye Meads. The following to be deleted: Promote and enhance the waterside entrance into the Park at Stanstead Abbots-Riverside Green.
GI57.2	Individual 19 S Strutt	6 to 8		8.A.2 Sport & Rec	Orienteer-ing	I am particularly keen to see an affordable and accessible range of activities for children and young people. As a member of Girlguiding, I would like to see more orienteering routes opened up north of Cheshunt and Broxbourne that would benefit youth groups including scouting and guiding. I believe there is plenty of scope for this around the Amwell nature reserve and would be pleased if you could give this further consideration, alongside the development of other visitor facilities. We like to promote the natural environment to our Brownie and Guide groups so improving opportunities to develop partnerships between the LVRP and voluntary youth groups would be very welcome.	Agreed that another orienteering course would be good, but this is currently not a high priority due to the need to maintain other course in the Park. The existing course at Fishers Green is a large course (from Waltham Abbey north to Slupe Lane) and requires a lot of maintenance, the Tottenham Marshes course requires further investment and there are also plans for Walthamstow Marshes. Amwell may not be suitable as there needs to be a large area with lots of intersecting paths away from roads. There may be scope for shorter course or quiz trail.	Add text under Community Proposal 8.A.2 as follows: Work with stakeholders including volunteers to develop health walks, and short quiz trail/orienteering courses using existing network of routes and local rail stations.
GI58.0	Individual 20 J&E Thorne	8				If you remember we came in to see the ' Lee valley project' this afternoon and you said you would let me know who is responsible for maintaining the 3 raised beds along the river by the bridge in Ware	Response sent directly to consultees.	No comment
GI59.0	Individual H & R Arthurs					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 evidence. It should point right to the traffic light at Nazeing New Road, but points straight across to a footpath.	These comments were acknowledged and issue of incorrect sign is being rectified.	No change
OA60.0	HMWT				NIA	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.	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

OA60.1	HMWT	8		8.A.2 Visitors & Bio-diversity	Amwell	2. Amwell is owned and managed by the Trust and is of regional significance for the wildlife watching opportunities it provides. However, car parking and visitor facilities are still limited and in light of this have aspirations for the development of visitor facilities and safe car parking for the reserve and welcome the proposal of a feasibility study to look at options which would work for our reserve and this important gateway to the northern part of the regional park.	Comments and support for feasibility study welcomed	No change
OA60.2	HMWT	8		8.A.2 Visitors & Bio-diversity	Amwell	3. Rail crossing from Amwell Lane to Amwell Nature Reserve. The crossing is one used by most car-borne visitors to Amwell Nature Reserve. In its current state it provides a poor entrance to the reserve and regional park and the entrance would benefit from being upgraded.	Agreed - this would be addressed by any future feasibility work	No change
OA60.3	HMWT	8		8.A.2 Visitors	Tumbling Bay	4. Entrance to the regional park from Ware at Tumbling Bay – here - http://streetmap.co.uk/map.srf?X=536361&Y=214152&A=Y&Z=115 . This entrance from Star Street through a small industrial area is a key access for residents from the east side of Ware. However, it isn't a public right of way. The regional park could perhaps investigate if this access could be formalised, with appropriate signage. In addition, there is a small unoccupied building at the north end of Tumbling Bay gravel pit, on the east side of the canal which could provide some form of visitor facility located, as it is, at the entrance to the regional park	Comments and suggestions for visitor access and facilities noted. These will be included within feasibility work.	No change
OA60.4	HMWT	8		8.A.2 Bio-diversity	Tumbling Bat	5. Tumbling Bay gravel pit. This narrow lake links Amwell nature reserve to Ware ecologically. The Trust owns the southern part of the pit. The remainder of the lake provides complimentary habitats to Amwell nature reserve and ideally it should be managed accordingly. There is pedestrian access along the west side of the pit and this is a popular walk for residents from Ware. In view of the narrowness of the pit, public access should be discouraged from being made available on the east side as this will result in disturbance to wintering and breeding birds. Access only to the east allows birds to move to the west side if disturbed.	Agreed - incorporating Tumbling Bay into the wider Amwell Nature Reserve will need to consider how existing habitats and wildlife can be protected whilst allowing and encouraging public access. This will require further discussions with a range of stakeholders and should form part of feasibility work.	No change
OA60.5	HMWT	8		8.A.1 Visitors	Rye Road	6. Rye Road. Please note that the invertebrate <i>Micronecta minnutissima</i> lives in the small reedbed here - http://streetmap.co.uk/map.srf?X=538506&Y=209840&A=Y&Z=115 . This is cited on the Ramsar designation for the Lee Valley - http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/RIS/UK11034.pdf - and its habitat and needs should be considered if any developments are planned for this area.	Comments noted	No change

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

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

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 mental 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 mental 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.	Noted - within Area 8 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 collaborative 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
OA62.10	Canal & River Trust					The Trust supports the proposal to explore the feasibility of using the Lee Navigation for water transport, including freight. This should include potential opportunities for additional wharf facilities along the network, as a lack of wharves is affecting the potential to move freight by barge.	Comments noted - this applies with in Area 8.A.1 Environment.	No change

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 - the Authority approved a Cycling Strategy for the Regional Park. This took into consideration the C&RT's document Better Towpaths for Everyone and seeks to provide alternative routes to the towpath.	No change
OA61.12	Canal & River Trust	8		8.A.1 Visitors		The proposal, at part 8.1.A, for a new visitor hub near to Rye House station on the Lee Navigation is in line with the Trust's aspirations to provide "Welcome Stations" along our network in key locations. Welcome Stations can be used by volunteers for shelter and other basic facilities and for the storage of essential materials and equipment. The Trust would like to work with LVRPA in establishing suitable locations for Welcome Stations within the Park, which we would be happy to share with the LVRPA and its volunteers	Comments noted	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
PE63.0	Individual G Hayer	8				Residents from Netherhall Lane – concern about adopting road and increased traffic and any future plans to turn to residential site	Comment noted. Please note changes to proposals that may impact upon Netherhall Road.	Amend proposal under Visitors 8.A.1 as follows: Explore development potential of Ryegate Farm and its curtilage. Prepare feasibility study for the development of a sustainable camping and outdoor activity base at Ryegate Farm suitable for cub/scout groups, and similar organisations. Farm buildings to provide office and indoor space as well as bunk-house type accommodation. To include access improvements along Netherhall Lane (and possible adoption of the road) for operational purposes to service the facility —
PE64.0	Individual R Ottery					keen to see dedicated separate cycle lane, for access	Comment made at Ware exhibition. 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 8 to provide segregated routes. Later this year the Authority will review its approach via work on its cycling strategy.	
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 Abbots. 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.	Comments noted	No change
