

**LEE VALLEY REGIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**REGENERATION & PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES  
6 SEPTEMBER 2021**

|                     |                               |                  |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Members             | David Andrews (Chairman)      | Gordon Nicholson |
| in remote presence: | Chris Kennedy (Vice Chairman) | Paul Osborn      |
|                     | John Bevan                    | Mary Sartin      |
|                     | David Gardner                 | John Wyllie      |
|                     | Denise Jones                  |                  |

Apologies Received From: Calvin Horner, Graham McAndrew

|                     |                 |                              |
|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| Officers            | Claire Martin   | - Head of Planning           |
| in remote presence: | Beryl Foster    | - Deputy Chief Executive     |
|                     | Jon Carney      | - Corporate Director         |
|                     | Lindsey Johnson | - Committee Services Officer |

Part I

126 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

127 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

**THAT the Minutes of the Regeneration & Planning Committee meeting held on 5 August 2021 be approved and signed.**

128 PUBLIC SPEAKING

No requests from the public to speak or present petitions had been received for this meeting.

129 LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD DRAFT LOCAL PLAN  
– MAIN ISSUES PREFERRED OPTIONS (REGULATION 18)  
CONSULTATION

Paper RP/53/21

The report was introduced by the Head of Planning, stating that we have responded in 2019 to a previous consultation. Whilst largely in support of the Local Plan, we do have a few concerns which include the lack of a specific policy supporting the Park, its remit and the Park Development Framework which was in the previous plan; the need to revise site allocation SA 56 for Picketts Lock along with support for major leisure investment in the wider site and recognising its potential as a strategic site; and the need for further work on the proformas for the industrial site allocations at Rammey Marsh West and land to the south adjacent to Innova Park which is currently designated as Green Belt.

The Chairman asked if Canal & River Trust had been involved in this consultation. The Head of Planning responded stating that she was sure that they would have been and that they were very involved in the Meridian Water proposals. She stated that we could look at

having discussions with them before the next consultation to see if any of our objectives match.

Members expressed concern over the lack of specific policies that mentioned the Park, especially when a policy was included in the previous plan. The Chairman advised that many planning officers have retired in recent years, and we shouldn't assume it is just an omission. A Member suggested that perhaps political conversations might be helpful. Another Member suggested that it could be raised at the next Six Authorities Liaison Group meeting on Thursday. The Head of Planning stated that she can emphasise the importance of a Lee Valley Regional Park specific policy with London Borough of Enfield's Strategic Planning Officer. The Deputy Chief Executive added that officers would be meeting London Borough of Enfield officers in a Property meeting this week, which would be an ideal opportunity to mention this.

The Chairman asked about the Blue Green Policy. The Head of Planning responded stating that as the Park is a key component of the Borough's green and blue infrastructure, a policy referencing the Park could sit within this section. London Borough of Enfield have asked for us to make suggestions on wording for the Park and where in the plan it should sit. We have given them two suggestions.

A Member expressed concern over Rammey Marsh West's designation changing from Green Belt to industrial as it would be big loss of land in the northern green corridor. Other Members expressed concern of setting a precedent when Green Belt designated land is undesignated. The Chairman of the Authority responded stating that following a Land & Property Strategy Working Group meeting, it was decided that Rammey Marsh West was no longer necessary for Park purposes due to it being cut off, not easily accessible to the public, very close to the M25 and its surrounding boundaries are all industrial. Further the land does not contribute to the Green Belt. Rammey Marsh East, however, is an important site for wildlife and as such it needs to be protected with sympathetic boundary treatments.

A Member suggested that Rammey Marsh West could be made more bicycle friendly if it is developed, with links made to the towpath and blue ribbon routes in order to encourage sustainable transport for the future workforce.

A Member said that the redline around Picketts Lock should include the whole site.

A Member noted that the Local Plan had been in the news last week and had not been reported favourably and asked if London Borough of Enfield are in talks with neighbouring authorities. The Head of Planning responded stating that criticism had been focused on the London Borough of Enfield proposing the release of Green Belt land for housing and industrial purposes. She is expecting Green Belt boundary revisions to be brought forward in the next reiteration of the plan but does not know what they will do with Rammey Marsh West. There are currently Duty to Cooperate meetings taking place with cross borough meetings.

- (1) the comments as set out in Appendix A to Paper RP/53/21 as the Authority's formal response to this consultation by the London Borough of Enfield on the draft Local Plan 2019 - 2039 Main Issues Preferred Options were approved.**

---

Chairman

---

Date

The meeting started at 1.02pm and ended at 1.45pm