

ID. No.	Organisation name or individual	Area 6, 7, 8.	Map Ref	Schedule ref	Site name or issue	Consultee Comments	LVRPA Response	Proposed Amendment
LA1.0	Broxbourne Borough Council	6		6.A.1	Hazlemere Marina	Broxbourne Council has prepared a development brief for the Hazlemere Marina site, which borders the LVRP in Waltham Cross. The development brief sets out the Council's ambitions for residential, leisure and community facilities on the site. The Council has been working with the prospective developer of the site and a planning application is in the process of being submitted on which the LVRPA will be consulted. Housing will be the majority land use within this application. The LVRP Framework is supportive of the Council's brief and the Council is therefore supportive of this element of the Framework.	The Hazlemere Marina site has been redeveloped for residential use with a café. Facilities for the Park visitor have been delivered and the Proposal under Visitors is no longer relevant.	Delete proposal under 6.A.1 Visitors as follows: Support provision of new hotel, café or restaurant facilities adjacent to the River Lee Navigation as part of the redevelopment of the Hazlemere Marina site and work with Broxbourne Council and the Canal & River Trust to ensure these are available to the general Park visitor and S&R state Work with stakeholders to secure provision for the flat water canoe trail, as part of the route linking through to Old Ford in Tower Hamlets. Redevelopment of Hazlemere Marina to consider potential for a portage with car parking and shared use of associated amenities provided for boaters at the new marina
LA1.1	Broxbourne Borough Council	6		6.A.3	LVWWC	Broxbourne Council welcomes the Framework's proposals for making the LVWWC an 'adrenaline sports hub, building on its success as a white water canoe centre and improving its leisure and sporting offer. It is anticipated that the Council's Local Plan will accordingly allocate the site for leisure and sporting facilities though the site will be retained within the Green Belt. Please could you therefore send us a map clearly defining the boundary of the proposed facility. We are particularly keen to open up the White Water Centre to the community and look forward to co-operative working to make sure this happens.	Comments noted and map sent. Current Regulation 18 Consultation draft of Broxbourne Local Plan includes the boundary of the Lee Valley White Water Centre.	No change .

LA1.2	Broxbourne Borough Council	6		6.A.4	Britannia Nurseries	<p>Following the quashing of the planning permission, the Council is currently considering its position on what is now a live planning application. I do anticipate that the Council will continue to support the redevelopment of this site for housing as it has always been of the view that the proposals are entirely beneficial to the future of the Park in this location. In particular, the proposals incorporate a new entry to the park together with a visitor reception area and that is something that we would wish to continue to discuss with you. Regardless of the Council's stance on the residential scheme, I would question the deliverability of the Framework's proposals for bringing this site into Park use. It has been long derelict, it is in private ownership and a substantial capital sum would therefore be required for purchase and remediation. The means for achieving this are not set out within the Framework and the Council must therefore formally object to this aspect of the proposals.</p>	<p>Broxbourne Borough Council granted planning permission for residential development of the Britannia Nursery site. The layout of the granted scheme includes a play area and visitor parking, with an access point into the Park. However this scheme has yet to be implemented and it is understood the site has now been sold on. Proposals will be amended to take account of the sites planning status and the need to protect and enhance its boundary with the River Lee Country Park and opportunities to improve access.</p>	<p>Amend proposals under 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park as follows: Visitors - "Options to create a A new secondary vehicular and pedestrian and operational access into the River Lee Country Park off from Eleanor Cross Road via the Britannia Nursery site to be provided assessed as part of the redevelopment of this site together with a small visitors car park bringing this area back into a Park related use." Sport & Rec - "Consider options at Britannia Nurseries for natural play and informal recreation. These elements to occupy current derelict site. Provision to be made for access into the Park from Britannia road with small visitors car park." Biodiversity - "Establish northern part of Britannia Nursery site, Britannia Meadows and Lake as an ecological buffer to complement the adjoining SSSI, Lee Valley SPA and Ramsar areas..." Proposal Maps - Sport & Rec, remove notation for informal recreation and natural play. Biodiversity, amend the area covered by notation "Manage Meadow and Lake" to exclude northern part of Britannia.</p>
LA1.3	Broxbourne Borough Council	6		6.A.4	Rail crossings	<p><u>Access into the Park from existing rail crossings.</u> The LVRP is situated along the eastern side of the Borough and in most cases on the eastern side of the West Anglia Mainline. As a result, visitors and users often access the Park by foot or vehicle via a level crossing. This includes access to a number of important leisure and community facilities; in particular the Herts Young Mariners Base and the LV Youth Hostel, as well as allotments, fishing lakes and parking areas. The Framework intends to safeguard these links and enhance them as access routes into the LVRP. Although the Council would also wish to see these connections retained, I am concerned that the Framework does not make reference to Network Rail's plans to close level crossings along the West Anglia Mainline and possibly in the longer term to four track this line. These proposals have major implications for access into the Park at these points which need to be addressed. Indeed, we may have to start planning now for alternative vehicular access points. The Framework should highlight this issue and the fact that alternative access arrangements may need to be put in place. It should refer to the need to work with Network Rail and Broxbourne Council on finding viable solutions for accessing the Park and its facilities. The Council will continue to support the LVRPA and work with Network Rail on this issue</p>	<p>Proposal 6.A.4 Environment - Four Tracking and Crossrail2 supports ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure but seeks the retention of rail crossings to ensure access into the Park for all visitors to the Regional Park. 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. The Authority would not wish to see new roads created within the Park to mitigate for closed crossings. Proposals will be amended to reflect the current position.</p>	<p>Amend proposal 6.A.4 Environment as follows: Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 Support ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and work with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 team, the local and county authorities to develop a strategy for retaining crossing points and access into the Park for all visitors and to enable operational management, without large areas of parkland being lost to new bridge landings, new roads or related infrastructure. and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park.</p> <p>The Authority will seek mitigation for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2 proposals; for example improved rail access at Cheshunt station and supporting infrastructure. These proposals may not be resolved within the timescale of these Area proposals.</p>

LA1.4	Broxbourne Borough Council	6		6.A.4.1	Wharf Road	Wharf Road in Wormley currently contains a number of unlawful gypsy and traveller plots and a number of plots which, given the length of time of their occupation, have become lawful. As you are aware the Council is undertaking enforcement action on particular unlawful plots, some of which are subject to a public inquiry which reconvenes in March. The Council is keen to find a long term solution for those residents of Wharf Road who have a genuine local connection to the area. This solution will be set out in the draft Local Plan, but it is likely, given Wharf Roads flood risk and access issues, that a new site will be allocated. The Council is supportive of the Framework's proposals to bring the Wharf Road area back into leisure/Park uses once/if the gypsy and traveller community are relocated. We would support early joint working with the Park Authority to formulate and deliver a strategy for the area.	Comments noted. The Authority has objected to Policy GT1 Gypsy and Traveller Sites, bullet point 4) and the policy map designation GT1 in the Broxbourne draft Local Plan (July 2016) which seeks to establish an authorised Gypsy Traveller site at Wharf Road in the Park. This is considered inappropriate in terms of Green Belt policy and PDF Proposals and undeliverable as much of the site lies in the flood zone 3 and the Authority owns the majority of the site. The Authority remains committed to working with the Council to secure a sustainable solution to this site.	No change
LA1.5	Broxbourne Borough Council	6		6.A.4	Leisure Pool Site	<u>Broxbourne Gateway and Leisure Pool Site.</u> Broxbourne Council prepared a development brief for the former Leisure Pool site in Broxbourne in 2008. The brief, which is available on our website, supported short-term accommodation, office uses (potentially), an enhancement of existing leisure facilities e.g. boat moorings/cycle hire/marina, the creation of additional leisure facilities such as climbing walls, adventure playgrounds, cricket/tennis facilities, entertainment facilities such as amphitheatres as well as facilities which support the wetland habitat and wildlife in that area. The Council continues to support these types of uses at this site and therefore supports the Framework's proposals for establishing this area as a major visitor hub, improving existing facilities, developing the area as a waterside park and implementation of 'pod' style accommodation. The Council is keen to improve access to this part of the Park from Broxbourne Station and work with the Authority on bringing forward leisure and water related activities at this site. Like the LVWWC, we would envisage defining this area on the Local Plan proposals map for these types of uses. A plan defining the boundary of the site, from your perspective, would be useful	Comments noted. The position regarding this site has been updated through the current draft Local Plan (July 2016) which includes a boundary defining the area and a commitment to update the adopted development brief to identify the potential for housing "to enable the wider development and improvement of the site". Area Proposals will need to be amended to allow for the potential of residential development on the site of the former Leisure Pool previously identified as 'major development site' in the Green Belt	Amend Proposal 6.A.4 Visitors <u>5. Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North</u> Establish a major visitor hub at Broxbourne as a primary gateway into the River Lee Country Park incorporating existing visitor facilities at Broxbourne Riverside, Old Mill and Meadows and the site of the former Leisure Pool. This will be achieved by: • joint working with Broxbourne Council to update the Leisure Pool Development Brief to include the potential for residential development to enable the wider development and improvement of the site development of the former Leisure Pool site for a leisure use appropriate to the Regional Park; options to be explored with potential development partners —
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
LA1.12	Broxbourne Borough Council	6		6.A.4	Visitors	The Council is supportive of a number of other projects and schemes outlined within the thematic proposals; - Providing additional facilities at Herts Young Mariners Base, subject to resolution of the access issues referred to above; - Enhancing, maintaining and refurbishing Broxbourne Mill;	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	No change

LA1.15	Broxbourne Borough Council				Local Plan	The Council will be publishing the Local Plan within the next few months. In accordance with statute, it will include the Lee Valley Park Plan within its overall provisions through an appropriate policy. For the most part, the Local Plan will also directly reflect the proposals of the Park Framework within its allocations. There are, however, two exceptions where we have not secured common ground – Britannia Nurseries and Turnford Surfacing. It may be possible to reach a common position on the latter but as things stand, there is likely to be an allocation for Britannia Nurseries that sits directly counter to the Park's own proposals for the site	The position on Britannia Nurseries has been concluded; the site has permission for housing with a play area and visitor parking. As stated above proposals for Britannia Nurseries will be amended. Comment regarding Turnford Surfacing site are made under Area 8.	See amendments made above in response to LA1.2
LA1.16	Broxbourne Borough Council				Four Tracking	The other point of potential difficulty is the four tracking of the West Anglia main line along which a safeguarding direction may be issued within the course of both plans. We will both have to address and respond to the implications of such a direction in due course. However, as things stand, the Broxbourne Local Plan is likely to support the extension of Crossrail to Broxbourne with direct implications for the level crossings along the route.	Comments noted. The Authority recognises the importance of maintaining a network of crossings which can satisfy its operational requirements and the need to ensure safe and convenient access for visitors. As stated above since these proposals were issued Network Rail has continued to reduce surface level crossings on an incremental basis without responding to officers' concerns for the need for an access strategy designed to address operational and visitor needs. The Authority's existing draft proposals state that mitigation will be sought for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2	Please note the amendments made above under LA1.3
LA1.17	Broxbourne Borough Council				Joint working	The Council welcomes the publication of the Park Authority's proposals for the Park area within the Borough and looks forward to working with the Authority to bring forward many of the proposals and schemes set out in the thematic proposals for areas 6, 7 and 8. I would welcome further meetings to secure pragmatic and deliverable solutions and to align our respective plans.	Comments noted - it is intended to continue with regular meetings (Duty to Co-operate) between officers from both authorities.	No change
LA3.0	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7			Planning process	The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at its meeting on 10th February 2015, considered a report on the Lee Valley Regional park Authority's Park Development Framework consultation. Members discussed the statutory duties and role of the Park Authority, the potential impact of some of the proposals on the Green Belt, particularly in Area 6, and the possible implications for some glasshouse businesses and other long-standing commercial uses. The chairman of the Lea Valley Food Task Force described the on-going work of the group which included involvement by the Regional Park Authority officers. Members were also made aware that the Park Authority intended to run a second round of consultation in summer this year.	Comments noted	No change
LA3.1	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7			General support	The Committee agreed the following as the formal response of the Council to the consultation: That the Council supports the overall approach of the proposals in the context of the statutory functions of the Park Authority, ie in relation to (i) sport and recreation, (ii) leisure, (iii) education and (iv) landscape, heritage and nature conservation.	Support noted and welcomed	No change
LA3.2	Epping Forest District Council	6			Green Belt	That the Council expresses concern about the possible extent of new building being proposed in the Green Belt, especially in Area 6;	Concerns noted	No change

LA3.3	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7		Environment	CPO powers	That the Council objects to proposals, as currently worded, concerning the use of compulsory purchase powers in relation to a number of glasshouse sites and other long-standing commercial uses within the Park;	Objection noted.	Please refer to comments and amendments below.
LA3.4	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7			Glass-houses	That the Council encourages the Park Authority to work more closely with the Lea Valley Growers Association and individual growers to advance schemes for land swaps to benefit both the Park and the glasshouse industry;	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly.	Please refer to amendment below
LA3.5	Epping Forest District Council	6 & 7			Glass-houses	That the Council encourages the Park Authority to reconsider its attitude towards the glasshouse industry in the light of the National Planning Policy Framework, the on-going work of the Lea Valley Food Task force, the Authority's stated support for continued agricultural use of land, and the potential educational and heritage resource which the industry could represent within the Park.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly. Under Environment 6.A.4 existing references to Paynes Lane, Stubbins Hall Lane Langly and Mile Nurseries have been deleted. Amended proposal is shown opposite.	Glasshouses The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the River Lee Country Park Area 6.A.4 will be considered in relation to how the development impacts upon the openness of the Regional Park, the quality of its landscape character and visitor enjoyment. Cumulative impacts will also be a factor where large scale expansion has already taken place. The following issues will need to be addressed: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and preserve existing positive features such as wildlife areas, trees and woodland belts, attractive water edges; • Maintain the existing level and quality of pedestrian and cycle access within the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. Where development is proposed on land outside the ownership of the Authority it will seek planning obligations in line with the above proposal to mitigate adverse impacts.
LA4.0	Essex County Council	6 & 7			Funding	<u>ECC Interest in the Lee Valley Park Authority - Park Framework.</u> ECC has an interest in shaping future growth and development throughout Essex, and this includes spatial development proposals at the county border and those outside that may impact our community. The County Council responds to and shapes future spatial policy for the Lee Valley and commenting on this Consultation. ECC offers substantial annual funding to the Lee Valley Park Authority, and therefore aims to ensure that the spatial, environmental, social and economic priorities are consistent.	Comments noted.	No Change
LA4.1	Essex County Council	6 & 7			General	<u>Strategic Context</u> A range of strategies produced solely or in collaboration with the Essex borough, city and district councils as well as the Greater Essex unitary authorities of Thurrock and Southend-on-Sea provide the strategic context for the response to this Consultation. The relevant strategies are set out below	Comments noted	No change

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

LA4.5	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Essex Economic plan	<u>Essex Economic Plan</u> The Economic Plan for Essex is based on the collective ambitions of all local authorities in Essex. It identifies the steps that local partners will take together, alongside the private sector and HM Government to accelerate local growth over the next seven years (2014-2021). Furthermore it lays the foundation for long-term sustainable growth in the years to follow. Following analysis of the challenges and opportunities facing the Essex economy, and discussions with partners and local businesses, key issues that need to be addressed to facilitate sustainable economic growth were agreed and identified. The key issues that have some relevance to this consultation include - - Issue 1: Enhancing the Essex workforce – To ensure Essex can compete, the workforce should be developed to ensure there are the right skills to support existing and future employers as well as the needs of businesses in Essex’s key growth sectors. - Issue 2: unlocking growth in Essex’s strategic growth corridors - Investment to enable growth and development in established corridors offers a greater return on investment. - Issue 3: Enhancing the productivity within the Essex economy - Essex has the assets to exploit a competitive advantage in key sectors and to bring about a step change in local innovation and Research and Development investment. - Issue 4: The reputation of Essex - If Essex is to attract businesses into the county, and attract investment from the UK and overseas, it needs to develop and maintain the right reputation.	Comments noted	No change
LA4.6	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Essex Transport Strategy	<u>Essex Transport Strategy – the Local Transport Plan for Essex, June 2011</u> ECC produces a Transport Strategy for the County. The strategy highlights the role high quality transportation plays in delivering strong and sustainable communities coupled with providing a prosperous economy. The Strategy sets out the transport vision for Essex, the transport outcomes to achieve over a 15 year period, policies and implementation. The Strategy includes specific priorities for West Essex.	Comments Noted. Integration of the County Councils proposals for cycling are addressed in the Authority’s adopted Cycling Strategy.	No change
LA4.7	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Joint Working	<u>ECC’s Detailed Response</u> ECC’s response sets out issues and questions that ECC has with the Park Framework from a thematic basis. Further joint working is welcomed to ensure consistency with local and national planning and spatial policy.	Comments noted and further joint working supported	No Change

LA4.8	Essex County Council	6 & 7		General support	<p><u>Overarching Principles and Objectives for the Lee Valley Park Authority.</u> ECC acknowledges and supports the broad and dynamic remit of the Park Authority to develop and preserve leisure, recreation, sport and nature throughout the Regional Park. ECC welcomes working in partnership with the Park Authority in seeking to deliver its broad remit, and ensure that the Park Authority delivers a sustainable legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. ECC supports the Park Authority in seeking to deliver proposals that deliver Park's ambitions through maintaining and delivering - sport and recreation, leisure, education and valuing existing and future landscape, heritage and nature conservation. ECC is therefore supportive of the strategic approach that the Park Authority is seeking to deliver. Comments from ECC also highlight where it is important that the ambitions of the Park Authority are consistent with the strategic objectives of the wider locality.</p>	<p>Support noted and future partnership welcomed. The Park has an important 'offer' in terms of preventative health and mental health and fostering general well-being.</p>	No change
LA4.9	Essex County Council	6 & 7		CPO powers	<p><u>Compliance with Local & national Policy & Guidance</u> ECC's Economic Plan for Essex highlights the importance of west Essex, and recognises the role performed by the Lee Valley and in particular its contribution to supporting innovation in food production and technology. It is considered important that emerging policy secures the future for the food industry increasing the market share of specialist food supply to the capital. ECC considers it is essential that emerging spatial policy and development proposals within west Essex and adjoining authorities are consistent. The Park Authority consultation refers to a long term strategy of removing non-conforming and non-park compatible uses. It highlights that the Park Authority will use Compulsory Land Purchase Powers to support this aim. ECC is particularly concerned about the following proposals, where the Park Authority may use Compulsory Purchase Powers on land currently used for food production. ECC regards this approach as inconsistent with the broader strategic spatial and economic objectives within west Essex. The specific proposals that ECC are particularly concerned about within the Park Framework's consultation for Areas 6 - 8 include –</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan</p>	See amendments proposed below.

LA4.10	Essex County Council	6 & 7		6.A.4 Environment & 7.A.2 Landscape & Heritage	Glass-houses	Area 6 – River Lee Country Park - The Park Development Proposals refers to "Langley and Mile Nurseries stating that in the "short to medium term until the land can be brought into recreational and leisure use, through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary. It is likely that major redevelopment or expansion for new large scale glasshouse use will be resisted" (Area 6 Park Development Framework Proposals, 2014, page 26). Area 7 – Nazeing Meads and Carthagena – The Park Development Proposals states that "the open character of the valley floor to be protected from development ... at Sedge Green Nurseries. Over the long term, non-park compatible intrusive uses to be removed or their adverse impact mitigated including through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary" (Area 7 Park Development Framework Proposals, 2014, page 14). ECC considers that the proposals set out within the consultation document have undermined consumer confidence, highlighted by customers contacting local businesses to question whether the nurseries will be operational in the medium to longer term. ECC accepts that businesses are concerned about the impact the consultation document may have upon their future growth potential, especially given the concerns that customers have raised with the growers.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out opposite for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	<u>Glasshouses</u> The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the River Lee Country Park Area 6.A.4 will be considered in relation to how the development impacts upon the openness of the Regional Park, the quality of its landscape character and visitor enjoyment. Cumulative impacts will also be a factor where large scale expansion has already taken place. The following issues will need to be addressed: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and preserve existing positive features such as wildlife areas, trees and woodland belts, attractive water edges; • Maintain the existing level and quality of pedestrian and cycle access within the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. Where development is proposed on land outside the ownership of the Authority it will seek planning obligations in line with the above proposal to mitigate adverse impacts.
LA4.11	Essex County Council	6 & 7			CPO powers	ECC questions the use of compulsory purchase powers on these sites, and considers that the park proposals should ensure they are consistent with wider strategic economic and spatial aims and objectives. Furthermore it is important that the Park Authority proposals are viable. ECC questions whether the Park Authority has fully understood the financial implications involved in the acquisition of the glasshouses, and therefore queries the viability of the Park Framework. It is acknowledged that the Park Framework is non statutory and therefore requires adoption by individual Local Planning Authorities. Proposals set out by the Lee Valley Park Authority should therefore be consistent with national and local planning policy and guidance. ECC welcomes greater joint working to ensure that the Lee Valley Park Authority produces a plan that is consistent with the local, County and national planning policy and guidance.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. References to CPO powers have been deleted and a new proposal added for glasshouse areas within 6.A.4.	Please see amendments above.
LA4.12	Essex County Council	6 & 7			Access	<u>Surface Access</u> ECC as highway authority welcomes discussions with the Lee Valley Park Authority to discuss any potential impacts that changes or alteration to land use may have on the highway network. ECC aims to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place, and future spatial plans contain policies to ensure any issues impacting on the highway network are minimised.	Comments noted	No change

LA4.13	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Heritage	ECC welcomes that Landscape and Heritage have been identified as being of significance within the Lee Valley Regional Park. It is noted that reference to landscape and heritage has largely concentrated on the designated assets, primarily the Scheduled Areas of the Waltham Abbey Gunpower Factory and Waltham Abbey itself. The consultation documentation does not identify the extensive undesignated assets relating to below-ground archaeology, unlisted structures or the Paleolithic and paleo-environmental deposits known to exist within the Lee Valley.	Comments noted. The Authority has little information or expertise regarding undesignated heritage assets but would welcome guidance from Essex County Council on this matter as proposals are delivered.	No change
LA4.14	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Heritage	Considering the wide range of assets spread over a large area it would be worth considering the development of a historic environment conservation management plan for the Lee Valley Regional Park. This would identify all of the heritage assets; both designated and undesignated, and would provide recommendations for both their management and promotion. Once completed there would be a strong understanding of the heritage within the Park and how it can be used and managed for the benefit of the local population and visitors to the area.	Comments noted. Agreed that the development of a historic environmental conservation management plan would be beneficial to the understanding of the Park's heritage and how best to interpret and manage it for visitors. However this would need to be a project that is supported by a range of stakeholders	No change
LA4.15	Essex County Council	6 & 7		Heritage	It should be noted that groundworks relating to habitat management (such as scrapes or regarding of water features) or other activities such as the improvement of visitor facilities may have an impact on the historic environment. As part of any development proposal discussion will be required with appropriate historic environment specialists to establish whether mitigation measures are required.	Comments noted. Areas with statutory designations will have a consent mechanism that will be adhered to. Larger scale works on areas with no known historic designations may require planning permission and there would be scope for comment and mitigation as required.	No change
LA4.16	Essex County Council	6 & 7		SUDs	Flood Water Management ECC recommends that consideration be given to ensuring delivery of sustainable drainage systems as part of any new development. It is recommended that the Park Authority ensures that development integrates water management, biodiversity and amenity.	Agreed. The open spaces and green infrastructure of the Regional Park has an important role in flood management. The Authority does seek to ensure new development incorporates sustainable drainage systems, and that water management benefits biodiversity and amenity.	Amend Proposals as follows: 6.A.2, 6.A.3 and 6.A.4 Environment: add Work with the Environment Agency, and other stakeholders to support development projects which integrate measures, including sustainable drainage systems 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.
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. Further amendments have now been made to landscape proposals to take account of the new draft Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Strategy	No change
LA5.2	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8			Landscape Baseline documents	The Park Development Framework acknowledges the 'Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) and Landscape Strategy Vision for the Regional Park,' produced in 1996, and states that it remains the basis for landscape conservation and enhancement within the Park - however it is not listed in the baseline documents. The Landscape Sensitivity Study 2014 (LUC) was based on, and should be used alongside, the 1996 LCA. However there is concern that the 1996 document significantly pre-dates the best practice guidance for landscape character assessment published in 2002 (The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage), plus a high level of landscape change has occurred over the past 20 years. The Landscape Objective (5.1) published July 2010, refers to undertaking a Landscape Assessment. It is recommended that the local level landscape character assessments for Southern Hertfordshire and Broxbourne, that were produced in 2001 and 2008 respectively and are based on current best practice, could help inform the baseline of any new landscape strategies and design guidelines.	Comments noted the Authority has commissioned a new landscape assessment and strategy which have informed revised proposals throughout the northern 'half' of the Park.	Changes made to landscape proposals under each sub section to take account of the new draft Landscape Character Assessment and strategy guidelines.
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.	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. Area 6 proposals seek to encourage access to the Park by public transport, cycle and by foot, but recognise that some facilities and attractions are poorly served by public transport and safe cycle routes.	No change

LA5.11	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Visitor Hubs & Transport	The proposals seek to establish a number of visitor hubs which will provide gateways into key areas of interest within the Park, as follows: • Cheshunt Station and Pindar Visitor Gateway • Fishers Green Visitor Hub • Lee Valley Park Farms Visitor Hub • Broxbourne Gateway and Visitor Hub - River Lee Country Park North • Ware Station • Rye House Station • St Margaret's Station • Broxbourne Station • Roydon Station • Lee Valley White Water Centre. The focus of the document on promoting sustainable transport by designating stations throughout the Lee Valley Park hinterland as key access points into the Park is welcomed. In certain locations such as Broxbourne and at the Lee Valley White Water Centre (WWC) more significant improvements and new facilities are planned in order to act as key gateways into the Park.	Noted	No change
LA5.12	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Visitor Hubs & Transport	As noted within the document, the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority should seek to work with relevant stakeholders, including the County Council as highway authority and the district and borough councils, in order to develop gateways and visitor hubs. In particular, further technical work to seek to establish routes for pedestrians and cyclists from public transport nodes into the Park is welcomed. This may include enhanced signage, new crossing points and dedicated pedestrian and cyclist routes. Once the proposals become more detailed, reference should usefully be made to Urban Transport Plans (UTPs) that have been prepared by the County Council with partners, which in many instances set out proposals and aspirations to enhance such provision. The relevant documents are: • Cheshunt and Waltham Cross UTP • Hoddesdon and Broxbourne UTP • Hertford and Ware UTP	Noted, partnership working with all stakeholders will be essential in respect of improving sustainable transport/access opportunities. Issues relating to cycle routes are addressed in the Authority's adopted Cycling Strategy.	No change
LA5.13	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Visitor Hubs & Transport	In some cases, such as to establish visitor hubs or increase parking provision at selected locations, further technical work may be necessary, including the production of Transport Assessments or Design and Access Statements. In these cases, the Park should engage with the County Council in order to determine the scope of any necessary technical work.	Noted and agreed	No change
LA5.14	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Rights of Way	The proposals may affect the public Rights of Way Network (ROWN). At this point in time, it is difficult to comment accurately on how the proposals may affect and connect with the Network, though initial analysis suggests further investigation is required. It is proposed that the LVRPA establishes a working group with the County Council's ROW team in order to examine these issues and connectivity within and outside the Park's network, with discussion to include: • some of the footpaths indicated on the maps do not match with definitive routes and it is not clear whether the intention is to dedicate those non-definitive routes to the public.	Comments noted. The Authority liaises with the County on issues relating to ROWN and would welcome support for improving access into the Park. Routes provided by the Authority are designated as permissive routes.	No change
LA5.15	Hertfordshire County Council	6 to 8		Cycling	• there are a lot of cycle tracks shown over definitive public footpaths - it would be beneficial to the public to have them upgraded legally to cater for the cycling formally.	The Authority will obtain all necessary permissions for any new cycle routes and ensure they meet required standards.	No change

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>There are no proposals for bridleways in Area 6. The Area 8 Visitor proposals map includes Bridleway H25 and seeks to develop a network of routes linking together existing bridle paths. The Authority would welcome further information from the Council on this matter.</p>	No change
LA5.17	Hertfordshire County Council	6			Transport	<p>• diversion orders are required to legalise some obstructions at the WWC. These routes should be improved to allow and encourage cycling, increase useable width and create a multi-user greenway through the Park as part of a more holistic development and 'improvement' plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted all diversions at the WWC have been formalised.</p>	No change
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.</p>	No change
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. Proposals designed to address these issues are included under Community.</p>	No change
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. Proposals designed to address these issues are included under Community.</p>	No change

LA6.2	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Community Health	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Thematic Proposals 2011 covered health and well being under the Community Theme with a section set out under "Objective 4.1 Health - Facilitate people pursuing healthy lifestyles". However the role of the Authority's Youth and Schools team covers Sport and Orienteering, outdoor learning and programmes which instill a sense of ownership amongst young people for the outdoors - important for the future of open spaces, the countryside and wildlife etc. Again this is about the role of the Park in social and mental health and general well-being, the therapeutic benefits it can achieve. Proposals designed to address these issues are included under Community.</p>	No change
LA6.3	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Community Health	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Amend introductory text to Area 6. Add under Opportunities for Visitors at end of first paragraph the following: All these activities and environments provide opportunities for people to improve their physical and mental health and wellbeing.</p>
LA6.4	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Community Health	<p>There are some fundamental key messages to support this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactivity in Hertfordshire costs the health economy £16m+/year (Sport England, 2014) • One in four adults do less than 30 minutes physical activity in a week (DPH Annual Report, 2014) • The minimum recommendation for adults to keep healthy and prevent illness such as heart disease, cancer and diabetes is 150 minutes of activity a week (see Physical Activity Guidelines https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-physical-activity-guidelines). <p>The Lee Valley Park includes within its geographical coverage parts of Hertfordshire where health inequalities are recognised as an issue; where obesity and inactivity are well noted challenges. The park offers a fantastic natural resource at the doorstep of these communities and we'd want to ensure that this potential is utilised and linked in with local work on further health promotion.</p>	<p>Agreed in relation to 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</p>	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 "Health - Facilitate people pursuing healthy lifestyles" provides specific reference to this but all proposals will assist in delivering this objective.	No change
LA6.6	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Visitors	Specific comments in relation to the key themes in the proposals: Fully support the proposals around cycle hire. - Within the development of new catering facilities, we would encourage further investigation of the opportunities for local food procurement / production. Furthermore, as part of this new provision, can the Park Authority ensure – through the tendering process and subsequent contract management – that healthy food options are available as standard across the park.	Comments noted.	No change
LA6.7	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Visitors	Will the proposals for new visitor provision offer opportunities in relation to employment, skills and training (including those for vulnerable groups)? One of the wider determinants of health is access and opportunities around education, skills and employment.	Comments noted. Through our Youth and Schools programme Teacher Training is offered. Vulnerable Groups are also taught life skills and learning relating to the outdoors - for example how to navigate. Other operators within the Park will offer employment and learning opportunities. The Lee Valley Leisure Trust Vibrant Partnerships operates a system of casuals and apprenticeship positions which offer training and skills opportunities.	No change
LA6.8	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Visitors	Note there is a stated need for improved car parking and accessibility and recognise the park will attract visitors from further afield. However, priority should be placed on accessibility by pedestrians, bikes or sustainable modes of transport wherever possible. This should be supported by ensure appropriate facilities are available within the park for visitors such as free water top up points, secure bike racks around visitor centres etc.	Agreed - support facilities and infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists at existing and new centres or hubs (railway stations for example) is important. Feasibility studies for new provision will cover these points and it is the Authority's intention to ensure all visitor facilities include cycle parking and water points. These issues are covered in the Authority's adopted Cycling Strategy	No change
LA6.9	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Visitors	To ensure accessibility for all users, will visitor hubs and key park attractions be accessible for wheelchairs and pushchairs?	Yes this is the case for Authority operated facilities and sites which are DDA/Equality act compliant where reasonable and practicable	No change
LA6.10	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8		Sport & Rec	Fully support establishment of recreational routes for pedestrians and cyclists. Would encourage that wherever possible these are linked to wider networks outside of the park to enable active travel i.e. park users accessing the park by foot or bike as a first choice, rather than car	Agreed. It is very important that the Regional Park is connected to the network of paths and cycle routes beyond its boundaries and that these routes are well promoted and signed. This requires joint working amongst a number of stakeholders. This challenge is addressed in the adopted Cycling Strategy Area 6 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

LA6.12	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6		6.A.3	Sport & Rec	Fully support further development of the Lee Valley White Water Centre as a sporting facility – would comment on how this can be made accessible to its local community to avoid inequality of opportunity where possible.	Support for Lee Valley White Water Centre welcomed. The Authority is developing the Centre as the major family leisure destination in the south east. Amendments to proposals and proposal maps will highlight this new focus. The Centre provides a range of events and activities, as well as paddle sports and hosts school activities and sessions.	Amend Proposal 6.A.3 Sport & recreation Lee Valley White Water Centre as follows: Develop the Lee Valley White Water Centre as a World Class venue for canoeing, kayaking and rafting and as the major family leisure destination within the south east. Its offer will be diversified into 'extreme' sports. Major paddle sporting events to continue to be held at this venue
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.	Significant opportunities continue to arise from the Trust operations at the White Water Centre.	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 6 are identified under Community Proposals for Town Mead, at Gunpowder Mills, Lee Valley White Water Centre and 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. There is a full programme of volunteer activity throughout the Park.	No change
LA6.17	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6 to 8			Environment	Fully support the proposals for improving water quality and ecological conditions, recognising the benefits for wider outdoor activity.	Comments and support welcomed	No change
LA6.18	Hertfordshire Public Health Service	6		6.A.4	Environment	Can Lee Valley Park Farms' commercial arable and dairy element be linked into the provision of improved visitor facilities through local food production?	Comments noted. This would require considerable investment (ice cream, cheese etc) as the products are sold nationally. Also our grain is grown as feed (animal quality). However a small percentage of the milk produced on the Farm will now be offered for sale via a milk vending machine	No change
LA7.0	Hertfordshire Property Development Services	6			Herts Young Mariners Base	I can confirm that our ownership interests in this area of consultation is limited to a small building leased to the Young Mariners Charity located off Windmill Lane, Cheshunt. I note that there are no significant proposals within the consultation framework to see the redevelopment of the site, reference is made to the Herts Young Marines Base with the intention to support this existing activity and foster greater synergies between existing water based facilities within the Park.	Comments noted	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 Environment Proposals under 6.A.2, 6.A.2 and 6.A.4 as follows Work with the Environment Agency, and other stakeholders to support development projects which integrate measures, including sustainable drainage systems 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 Proposal 6.A.2 text will be added to ensure re-wetting works benefit fish. Proposals relating to the renovation of swims for disabled anglers is no longer relevant so will be deleted.	Amend text under 6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills Biodiversity as follows: " Work with the Environment Agency and Royal Gunpowder Mills to improve the habitats and ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals and fish , of the Waltham Abbey SSSI, with Cornmill Meadows and Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSIs, through complementary habitat management e.g. rewetting of ditches within Gunpowder Mills" Following text to be deleted from 6.A.4 Sport & Rec, Angling, as no longer relevant " Renovate swims for disabled anglers, on the Cadnore Lane bank of North Met Pit, on Boot Pit at Slipe Lane Pits and Hooks Marsh. "
OA9.5	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Bio-diversity	We welcome references to managing non-native invasive species (NNIS) in the Area 6 and 7 consultations, i.e. Area 6 - to Himalyan Balsam in the corner of Wharf Road. However, there are no references to NNIS in the Area 8 consultation. Recommendation: Review the documents for consistency in terms of managing non-native species. We also recommend the creation of a NNIS strategy for the Park, which would support the Park Authority's biodiversity and environment proposals. Our comments on the Water Framework Directive below are also applicable here.	Comments noted. NNIS are an issue across the whole Park and need to be tackled on a landscape scale to see the benefits. References to managing NNIS have been added to Area 8 Biodiversity proposals.	No change within Area 6

OA9.6	Environment Agency	6 to 8		Access to Nature	Balancing access and recreation with wildlife requirements needs careful consideration. Access to nature areas that are more sensitive, for example Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's), needs to be managed to minimise damage and disturbance and to improve the status of these areas. This may mean restricting access to particular areas, and / or to particular times of year (e.g. not during nesting season or near the constructed otter holts or kingfisher banks). For example, the proposed new canoe route needs to balance the needs of river users against protection of fish habitats. Consideration needs to be given along the old river Lea particularly the Fisher's Green section, of potential damage to fish spawning habitat. This could be managed by closing the route during more sensitive times of the year i.e. the closed season for angling/ spawning season for fish. Recommendation: Insert text in all proposals schedules 'Biodiversity' sections text similar to the following: 'Work with stakeholders including Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Wildlife Trusts to ensure that access to nature areas that are more sensitive, for example Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's), are managed to minimise damage and disturbance, and to improve the status of these areas.'	Comments noted. All routes and access to nature areas would need to be carefully considered before they are opened up. There is always the potential to build-in seasonality into the terms of use and restrict access during certain times of year. The proposed new canoe route is incorrectly shown on the Proposals Map and will be amended. The route does not impinge upon fish spawning habitat.	Add text under 6.A.4 Access to Nature " Work with relevant agencies 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 " Amend route of new canoe trail on Sport & Rec Proposals Map.
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 6.	Add text under 6.A.3 Environment for the White Water Centre as follows: Ensure development and operational proposals are consistent with the Water Framework Directive objectives and support implementation of the Thames River Basin Management Plan and the actions it identifies to secure improved water quality and ecological quality. Amend text under 6.A.4 Environment as follows: " Work with Thames Water, the Environment Agency and relevant stakeholders 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. " Work with the Environment Agency and the Canal & River Trust to improve and maintain water quality and to encourage greater use of the waterways for recreational boating.

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 6 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 Regional Park noted	No change
OA9.11	Environment Agency	6		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 6 - 6.A.1 Town Mead and waterways - redevelopment of Hazlemere Marina, 6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills – development of visitor facilities, 6.A.3 Development of the Lee Valley Whitewater Centre, 6.A.4 Development of Broxbourne Gateway visitor hub	Comments noted. Hazlemere Marina has already been developed	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. Environment Proposal text for Area 6 will be amended.	See amendments made under OA9.8 above.
OA10.0	Natural England	6 to 8		General	Having taken a look at the documentation provided with this consultation and having liaised with colleagues who are responsible for a number of the designated sites involved in these areas Natural England has the following comments to make. Overall Natural England is broadly supportive of the development framework and welcomes the proposals set out within the document. Our intention is to provide input in order to assist in continuing the excellent work that is currently being done across the Lee Valley Regional Park. A number of the comments made, relating to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in particular, ensure that the document would be in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 118 in particular.	Comments noted	No change

OA10.1	Natural England	6			Bio-diversity, SSSI & SPA	Nazeing Marsh to Waltham Abbey (This area includes Turnford & Cheshunt Pits SSSI; Cornmill Steam & Old River Lea SSSI and Waltham Abbey SSSI – the former is part of Lee Valley Special Protection Area (SPA)): Natural England is broadly very supportive of the proposals put forward here, notably the reference made to conservation and enhancement works to the SSSI and the adjoining buffer areas. This helps align the framework with the requirements to ensure SSSIs achieve and maintain favourable condition status and the Lee Valley SPA achieves and maintains favourable conservation status, consistent with statutory Section 28G duties and targets set out in the Defra strategic document Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services (see https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/biodiversity-2020-a-strategy-for-england-s-wildlife-andecosystem-services)	Support noted and welcomed	No change
OA10.2	Natural England	6	6.A.2 Sport & Rec	<u>Sailing</u> , <u>Boating and</u> <u>Rowing</u>	With reference to the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority's (LVRPA) publication 'An Assessment of the Wetland Resource of the Lee Valley Park' 1993 it seems that the Nazeing area has been significantly affected by sailing for some time ' <i>Prior to the mid-1970s Nazeing gravel pit held huge numbers of diving duck such as Tufted and Pochard, Numbers have since declined to minimal levels. This may be due to a reduction in food availability, the introduction of sailing), the construction of the Flood Relief Channel or a combination of all three. The sailing is now likely to be the major factor suppressing numbers.</i> ' Whereas Holyfield Marsh has provided an important bird refuge for some time ' <i>The southern end has considerable low intensity leisure use and is very popular with birdwatchers due to the range of birds it attracts..... A major winter feeding site, hard-weather refuge and breeding area for waterbirds and waders. A winter cormorant roost of national importance. This is the most important gravel pit for scarcer wintering duck such as goosander, goldeneye and smew. It is the size of the lake and the presence of numerous islands that is thought to attract these species. It is particularly important in severe weathers when the flow of the Flood Relief Channel through the site usually maintains some open water and affords a hard-weather refuge for waterbirds. The winter roost of cormorant on the wooded islands at a level of national significance is a major feature of the site</i> '.	Comments noted - Proposal 6.A.4 Sport & Recreation proposes to explore options with stakeholders to relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake. This is linked to Proposal 7.A.2 Sport & Recreation which seeks to establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon. The option analysis will require feasibility work which would include full consideration and assessment of the impact of such proposals on the SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England. The Authority would not knowingly undertake an action that would have a negative impact on the SSSI/SPA sites. Proposal text will be amended to clarify this, both under 6.A.4 and 7.A.2	Amend text for River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation as follows: Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake - Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities to be supported. Undertake feasibility work Explore options with stakeholders to explore options for the relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake i.e. move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake. Feasibility work will need to consider and assess a range of environmental and access issues including: - the ecological impact of proposals on Holyfield Lake, and the adjacent SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England; an Habitat Regulation Assessment may be required, and options and requirements for new and shared facilities and water space between different water based clubs and groups.	

OA10.3	Natural England	6			<i>continued</i>	<i>continued</i> While my colleague responsible for these sites does not have recent WeBS counts available for these areas he is however of the opinion that the plans have the capacity to significantly impact on an important bird refuge (including SSSI, SPA bird features) that is proximal to the Turnford & Cheshunt Marsh SSSI, Lee Valley SPA. We would question how well the Nazeing Gravel Pit could be enhanced and over what timescales to adequately offset the proposal. Any proposals would need a detailed appraisal accounting for background bird survey information and adequate period & coverage of up-to-date surveys and an assessment of significance of likely impacts. The nearby SPA bird features may be affected and it is anticipated that the LVRPA and/or the applicant would be required to undertake a Habitat Regulations Assessment of the project to support any submissions to regulators. In addition to this, the SSSI bird interest features may be affected and we would request that LVRPA seek to deliver their S28G duties (Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 with amendments) to conserve and enhance the SSSI interest through their activities and operations enabled.	Comments noted - As above proposal 6.A.4 Sport & Recreation proposes to explore options with stakeholders to relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake. This is linked to Proposal 7.A.2 Sport & Recreation which seeks to establish a Centre for Angling on the Nazeing Central Lagoon. The option analysis will require feasibility work which would include full consideration and assessment of the impact of such proposals on the SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England. The Authority would not knowingly undertake an action that would have a negative impact on the SSSI/SPA sites. Proposal text will be amended to clarify this, both under 6.A.4 and 7.A.2	See amendments proposed above.
OA10.4	Natural England	6 to 8			Joint working	Natural England acknowledges the need to engage stakeholders to explore options and advise that we are keen to be kept informed of any proposals and suggest that additional consultees should include Graham White (RSPB), accounting for his long association in birdwatching/surveying these areas and role as author of the LVRPA report 1993.	Comments noted and joint working supported. Graham White is listed as a consultee and was consulted on the proposals.	No change
OA10.5	Natural England	6		6.A.4 Biodiversity	Waltham Abbey SSSI	In terms of works elsewhere in the area potentially affecting Waltham Abbey SSSI this would need to be taken into account so that consideration could be made of the possible impacts and these could be avoided. Natural England's main concern relates to water level works elsewhere resulting in water levels changing adversely on site and this in turn potentially affecting its suitability for nesting Herons.	Comments noted. Discussions with relevant organisations would be undertaken prior to any works. The Environment Agency is leading on the project relating to Waltham Abbey SSSI and water levels.	No change
OA10.6	Natural England	6		6.A.2 Biodiversity Fauna & Fkora	6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills (RGM)	There are a few suggested changes to make in relation to wording within the proposals schedule, as follows in red highlights: "Support management of the Waltham Abbey SSSI contained within the Royal Gunpowder Mills site, to improve the site status from 'Unfavourable no change' to 'Unfavourable recovering' as required by Natural England. Support the investigation into and delivery of the project to re-wet the many dry watercourses on the site. This would improve the potential of the site to sustain increased numbers of key species such as Otter, Kingfisher, Water Vole and dragonflies/damselflies. "	Note red highlights are shown in bold underlined. Agree text will be amended as suggested.	Amend proposal text under 6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills - Biodiversity as follows: "Support the investigation into and delivery of the project to re-wet the many dry watercourses on the site. This would improve the potential of the site to sustain increased numbers of key species such as Otter, Kingfisher, Water Vole and dragonflies/damselflies. "
OA10.7	Natural England	6		6.A.4 Biodiversity. Fauna & Flora	6.A.4 River Lee Country Park	<i>continued</i> .."Work with EA and Royal Gunpowder Mills to improve the ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals and dragonflies/damselflies , of the Waltham Abbey SSSI, with Cornmill Meadows and Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSIs, through complementary habitat management e.g. re-wetting of ditches with Gunpowder Mills and re-wetting of land at the northern end of Cornmill Meadows"	Note red highlights are shown in bold underlined. Agree text will be amended as suggested.	Amend proposal text under 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park - Biodiversity as follows: "Work with EA and Royal Gunpowder Mills to improve the ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals and dragonflies/damselflies , of the Waltham Abbey SSSI, with Cornmill Meadows and Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSIs, through complementary habitat management e.g. re-wetting of ditches with Gunpowder Mills and re-wetting of land at the northern end of Cornmill Meadows"

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 6.A.4.	Amend proposal text under 6.A.4 River Lee Country park - Biodiversity Fauna and Flora as follows: "Protect Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSI (part of the Lee Valley Special Protection Area 2000) as an internationally important wetland with priority given to key habitats, open water, reedbed and wetland scrape. Management to maintain 'favourable' status of the site as required by Natural England and with reference to the Lee Valley SPA Site Improvement Plan ".
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.'	Please refer to the response to OA9.6 above. Additional text added to proposal 6.A.2 and 6.A.4 to cover this point.	Additional text to be added as follows: Under 6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills - Biodiversity "Work with relevant agencies to maintain the current system of controlled access to the SSSI to protect the area as a quiet haven for wildlife." Under 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park - Biodiversity Access to Nature add "Work with relevant agencies 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"
OA10.14	Natural England	6		6.A.2	Ref to EA Comments	We would also suggest that their recommendation: Recommendation: Amend the Area proposals schedules 'Biodiversity' sections by cross-referencing the most recent BAP version where applicable. We also recommend referencing the Lea Fisheries Action Plan in the Biodiversity sections, e.g: • <i>6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills Rewetting the dry watercourses on the site- designs should also benefit fish.</i> needs to adequately take into account the requirements of the SSSI interest features and target species referenced in suggested changes above in Area 6.	The current BAP dates from 2000 and it is now under review. It does however form part of the base line. In relation to Proposal 6.A.2 text will be added to ensure re-wetting works benefit fish.	Amend text under 6.A.2 Royal Gunpowder Mills Biodiversity as follows: " Work with the Environment Agency and Royal Gunpowder Mills to improve the habitats and ecological connectivity, particularly for wetland mammals and fish , of the Waltham Abbey SSSI, with Cornmill Meadows and Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSIs, through complementary habitat management e.g. rewetting of ditches within Gunpowder Mills"

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
OA11.1	Sport England	6			Sport & Rec proposals	In particular, the proposals for the following projects offer potential to grow and sustain opportunities for participation: - Development and enhancement of sport and leisure facilities at Town Mead Leisure Park; - Flat water canoe trail between Herts Young Mariners Base and lower parts of the Lea Valley; - Developing the Lee Valley White Water Centre to provide enhanced support facilities for canoeing, kayaking and rafting; - Exploring options for an adrenaline sports park at Lee Valley White Water Centre; - Developing a cycle track for triathlon events at Lee Valley White Water Centre; Development of the former Broxbourne Leisure Pool site for leisure uses; Potentially increasing use of Herts Young Mariners Canoe trail; - Promoting and supporting management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing; - Establishing buffer zones to create seclusion around angling swims on the Old River Lea to the west and south of Holyfield Lake and renovating swims for disabled anglers on the Cadmore Lane bank of North Met Pit, on Boot Pit at Slipe Lane Pits, and Hooks Marsh;	Comments noted and welcomed. It should be noted that the proposal to renovate swims for disabled anglers on the Cadmore Lane bank of North Met Pit, on Boot Pit at Slipe Lane Pits, and Hooks Marsh has been deleted	No change in response to comments.
OA11.4	Sport England	6 to 8			Consultation	It is advocated that consultation takes place with the relevant sports governing bodies (such as Canoe England, the Royal Yachting Association, the Angling Trust and British Cycling) to discuss these proposals in more detail as they progress as they can provide support and advice on how the projects can help grow and sustain participation in their sports and co-ordinate input from local clubs.	Agreed, consultation is and will be undertaken with relevant bodies as proposals area are amended and/or developed.	No change

OA11.5	Sport England	6 to 8			Angling Trust comments I have consulted the Angling Trust (the recognised governing body for angling) for their comments which can be summarised as: Access is a major issue as the vast majority of anglers carry a large volume of kit that they use to cover a range of situations. Therefore parking close to fishing points is a necessity and a key reason why there has been a major change in fishing favouring private lakes that have better access.	Comments noted, access for anglers is an issue but the provision of on site parking in every instance is not practicable or appropriate. The Authority has a policy of shared car parks i.e. with the general Park visitor. It should be noted that a large proportion of our angling venues are very old post-aggregate gravel pits often in the centre of the Park several hundred metres from any car parks, or vehicular tracks and are only served by footpaths.	No change
OA11.6	Sport England	6 to 8			Angling Trust comments Protection of fisheries from predators is a key issue as fish populations are under ever increasing threat from changes in ecology and predation) caused by Cormorants and Goosander, Signal Crayfish, Zebra mussels etc). Any proposals in the LVRPA area that would place pressure on fish species could lead to a significant reduction in mature individuals, removing the ability of watercourses to repopulate and the consequent loss of their angling value.	Comments noted. The Authority aims to provide a balanced ecosystem, key agencies will be consulted to ensure no negative impacts arising from works	No change
OA11.8	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 and welcomed. 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

OA12.0	Transport for London	6 7		6.A.4 Environment	Four Tracking	The area is outside the Greater London boundary, although TfL does have a limited interest in this area. Reference to Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 is made for Areas 6 and 7 made in 6.A.4 Environment. We would suggest slightly re-wording the initial sentence of this section: subject to ongoing work there may be amendments to level crossings and footbridges and we would suggest to word this more positively in terms of maintaining access without specifically referencing "all rail crossings" as such. Our suggested wording would be: "Support ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park maintain good levels of access to the Regional Park and seek to address issues of poor east-west connectivity, particularly for people with reduced mobility, pedestrians and cyclists. "	Proposal 6.A.4 Environment - Four Tracking and Crossrail2 supports ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure but seeks the retention of rail crossings to ensure access into the Park for all visitors to the Regional Park. 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. The Authority would not wish to see new roads created within the Park to mitigate for closed crossings. Proposals will be amended to reflect the current position.	Amend proposal 6.A.4 Environment as follows: Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 Support ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and work with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 team, the local and county authorities to develop a strategy for retaining crossing points and access into the Park for all visitors and to enable operational management, without large areas of parkland being lost to new bridge landings, new roads or related infrastructure. and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park. The Authority will seek mitigation for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2 proposals; for example improved rail access at Cheshunt station and supporting infrastructure. These proposals may not be resolved within the timescale of these Area proposals.
OA12.1	Transport for London	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Rail Crossings	Reference is also made in Area 6 Visitors to specific rail crossing sites "to be protected, retained and enhanced": again, given ongoing work we would suggest to re-word this slightly to read: "Existing rail crossings at Trinity Lane, Windmill Lane Cheshunt, Cadmore Lane, Slipe Lane, Wharf Road and Winford Drive to be protected, retained and enhanced maintained and enhanced to ensure good levels of access to the Regional Park and safe crossing of the railway. Work with stakeholders to investigate options for crossings and rationalise existing signage and where necessary install new signs promoting the Park from residential areas and main roads together with awareness of safety at rail crossings."	Proposal 6.A.4 Environment - Four Tracking and Crossrail2 supports ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure but seeks the retention of rail crossings to ensure access into the Park for all visitors to the Regional Park. 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. The Authority would not wish to see new roads created within the Park to mitigate for closed crossings. Proposals will be amended to reflect the current position.	Amend proposal 6.A.4 Environment as follows: Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 Support ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and work with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 team, the local and county authorities to develop a strategy for retaining crossing points and access into the Park for all visitors and to enable operational management, without large areas of parkland being lost to new bridge landings, new roads or related infrastructure. and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park. The Authority will seek mitigation for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2 proposals; for example improved rail access at Cheshunt station and supporting infrastructure. These proposals may not be resolved within the timescale of these Area proposals.
OA12.2	Transport for London	6			Bus services	There are some cross-boundary TfL bus services which serve Waltham Cross, but which do not run into the Lee Valley Park Area 6.	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	<p><u>Lee Valley Special Protection Area</u>. The Lee Valley was designated as an SPA for the wintering assemblage of gadwall, shoveler and bittern. Spa boundaries were tightly drawn at the time of designation to represent the areas where significant populations occurred. Functionally linked land within the LVRP which gadwall and shoveler would also use, was not included. Naturally it is fundamental to the success of the SPA populations that they have access to adequate functionally linked land from which they will not be disturbed. <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.</p>	Comments noted and agree that non designated water bodies are important to overall success of the SPA populations.	Amend proposal text under 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park Biodiversity Fauna and Flora by adding the following text under 'Outside Designated Areas': Management of non designated waterbodies to take account of their role in supporting the wider SPA
OA13.2	RSPB	6		6.A.4 Bio-diversity	<p>Suggested Amendments. In the draft Area Proposal for Section 6, item 6.A.4 (page 20), please amend paragraph 2 to read ..."with priority given to key habitats, species (bittern, shoveler and gadwall), open water, reedbed and wetland scrape."</p>	Agree, additional text will be added as suggested.	Amend Proposal text under 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park - Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora as follows: "Protect Turnford and Cheshunt Pits SSSI (part of the Lee Valley Special Protection Area 2000) as an internationally important wetland with priority given to key habitats, species (bittern, shoveler and gadwell) , open water, reedbed and wetland scrape."
OA13.3	RSPB	6 to 8		6.A.4, 7.A.1, 7.A.2, 7.A.3, 8.A.1	<p>To help maintain condition of the SPA designated species, we would like to see this bullet point adopted in the following sections: - maintain and manage areas of shallow flood for the benefit of designated SPA species (wintering shoveler). Section 6 - 6.A.4, bottom of page 20; Section 7 - 7.A.1 page 7; 7.A.2 page 12; 7.A.3 - page 18; and Section 8 - 8.A.1 page 6. We would gladly provide more specific habitat management advice if required.</p>	Additional text to be added as proposed.	Amend Proposal text under 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park - Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora, under as follows: Maintain the mosaic of wetland habitats targeting protection of key species. Explore opportunities to increase the extent of wetland habitat into the northern section of the site in partnership with Environment Agency and Natural England. "Maintain and manage areas of shallow flood for the benefit of designated SPA species (wintering Shoveler) " .

OA14.0	Thames Water	6 to 8		General	Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) Property Services function is now being delivered by Savills (UK) Limited as Thames Water's appointed supplier. Savills are therefore pleased to respond to the above consultation on behalf of Thames Water in relation to their statutory undertakings. Thames Water is the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for the majority of the Lee Valley Regional Park (LVRP) and are hence a "specific consultation body" in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. As a statutory undertaker in London and adjoin areas, Thames Water operate, manage and invest in significant water and wastewater infrastructure in the LVRP. This includes Rye Meads Sewage Works located in area 8 [Note – the main part of the sewage works is not located in the Park]. In operating, managing and investing in their assets Thames Water have to consider what is in the best interest of their customers. This includes considering opportunities for recreation and education, alongside maximising the value of our redundant land, which helps ultimately to keep customers bills lower. In this context we have the following comments on the draft area proposals:	Comments noted	No change
OA15.0	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8		Lea Valley Food Taskforce	Firstly, can I introduce the Lea Valley Food Taskforce. The Taskforce was established under the umbrella of One Epping Forest, to look into the future of the glasshouse industry, suggest new approaches and identify new opportunities to meet local communities' aspirations and government policy. What first emerged was the apparent lack of national direction, support or guidance for this important area to meet the challenges of the nation's food deficit. There is not one single government department or agency whose sole responsibility it is to champion this sector, and this is reflected in lost opportunities, and the loss of a once major UK strength in growing under glass.	Comments noted	No change
OA15.1	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8		Glass-house Industry	The Taskforce has brought together the commercial growers, their umbrella bodies, the Lea Valley Growers Association, the National Farmers Union and a range of statutory bodies including the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority and a number of local councils. As the work has continued, the original councils (London Borough of Enfield, Epping Forest District Council and Broxbourne Borough Council) have been joined by representatives from Essex County Council, LB Waltham Forest, Uttlesford Futures, and East Herts and Harlow DCs. This gives representation across three Local Enterprise Partnerships, increasing the opportunity and ambition of the group. We also are now linking with the London Stansted Cambridge Consortium and the West Essex Alliance whose members we hope will see the benefit of what we are doing and support us in our efforts. With regards to Lee Valley Regional Park we have Del Goddard, Chairman of the LVRP Trust as one of the members (he is also chair of the Task Force Planning Subgroup) and Stephen Wilkinson also attends as an officer of the Authority.	Comments noted This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly.	No change

OA15.2	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8			CPO powers & the Glass-house Industry	At our meeting on the 7th January 2015 there were major issues raised with the current Park Development Framework Areas 6, 7 and 8 consultation. The membership was very concerned over what was being proposed and also felt that the timing of the proposals was very ill advised with the judicial reviews still in progress for the Valley Grown Nursery site (Epping Forest District Council) and also the issues with the Borough of Broxbourne housing site. One of the main issues was the proposal to use the Authority's land purchasing powers to acquire and demolish existing growers' businesses in the Lea Valley. We believe these proposals are not in the interest of the public or the British rural economy and have wide reaching reputational damage implications for growers and the rural economy. Several of the companies that the growers supply have already questioned long term viability of the businesses should the proposals be accepted. This amounts to planning blight for the affected businesses.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly. Please note that Proposal 6.A.4 has been amended and all reference to named sites or areas removed along with reference to CPO powers. Amended proposal text for Environment 6.a.4 is shown opposite.	Glasshouses The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the River Lee Country Park Area 6.A.4 will be considered in relation to how the development impacts upon the openness of the Regional Park, the quality of its landscape character and visitor enjoyment. Cumulative impacts will also be a factor where large scale expansion has already taken place. The following issues will need to be addressed: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and preserve existing positive features such as wildlife areas, trees and woodland belts, attractive water edges; • Maintain the existing level and quality of pedestrian and cycle access within the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. Where development is proposed on land outside the ownership of the Authority it will seek planning obligations in line with the above proposal to mitigate adverse impacts.
OA15.3	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8			Glass-house Industry	We have worked very hard over the last few years to build relationships between the growers and the Authority so we can find compromises which are to the benefit of all parties yet the lack of discussions prior to the proposals being published seems to have destroyed that confidence within the industry.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly	Please note amendments above
OA15.4	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8			Glass-house Industry	I also have been informed by the growers and National Farmers Union that, in order to action this acquisition of glasshouses and for them to move their businesses, the costs could be in the region of £100m. I am sure that in these tough times the Authority just could not afford this sort of money, and the Plan would therefore be unviable and unsound. I also would have thought the contrary, that the Authority might want to dispose of unused or disconnected pieces of land which might be of use to the Glasshouse industry which is showing real signs of growth, partly with the coordinated efforts of the Taskforce.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly	Please note amendments above
OA15.5	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8			Glass-house Industry	What these proposals have served to do is to undermine customer confidence in the Lea Valley rural economy, potentially compromising thousands of jobs, and resulting in large monetary losses to the industry. As such we believe the Authority is failing to recognise glasshouse grower landowners and the thriving rural economy of the Lea Valley. We believe that the only practical way forward is by recognising that the proposals for this part of the Park can only be delivered through the collective efforts of a range of partners, stakeholders and landowners.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan	Please note amendments above

OA15.6	Lea Valley Food Task Force	6 to 8			Glass-house Industry	With the issues of the timing of the Judicial Reviews and also the very strong views of members of the Task Force can I therefore formally suggest that the consultation is withdrawn immediately. This should allow time for further work and discussions with concerned parties to prevent further escalation of the issues above and to produce proposals which are more acceptable to relevant groups and businesses.	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly	Please note amendments above
LB16.0	Capita on behalf Britannia Nurseries	6			Britannia Nurseries	Britannia Nurseries is the freehold owner of the Britannia Nurseries site comprising a roughly rectangular parcel of land totalling approximately 4.4 hectares. The Britannia Nurseries site falls within a corner of the Lee Valley Regional Park adjacent the settlement of Waltham Cross. Britannia Nurseries is located approximately 500m to the east of Waltham Cross shopping centre and approximately 300m west of the Lee Valley White Water Olympic Centre within the district boundary of Broxbourne Borough Council. The site is accessed via Bryanstone Road which is in turn accessed via Eleanor Cross Road (A121), which connects Waltham Cross to Waltham Abbey and the Great Cambridge Road which in turn provides access to the M25.	Details of site noted, please refer to comments made below.	Please refer to comments and proposed amendments set out below.
LB16.1	Capita on behalf Britannia Nurseries	6			Britannia Nurseries	The Britannia Nurseries site comprises a number of buildings, areas of hardstanding and unkempt grassland. A line of small brick buildings are located within the centre of the site and are in poor condition as a result of a fire. These buildings cover an area 20 metres x 70 metres and rise to 8 metres at the western end. There are also 3 long glasshouse buildings to the southeast of the brick buildings, and to the west of these the remains of 5 identical former metal glasshouses that have been re-clad with steel sheeting and converted to salerooms and warehouses. There is also an area filled with demolition waste from former structures on site is located to the west of the glasshouses. A large area of hardstanding is situated to the west of the former nursery buildings and wraps around the redundant structures and buildings. The total building area with permission for wholesaling covered over 4,700sq.m. This does not include the three glasshouses used until 2008 for the growing of shrubs and ferns.	Comments and site description noted. Please refer to comments made below.	Please refer to the proposed amendments set out below.

LB16.2	Capita on behalf Britannia Nurseries	6			<p>Britannia Nurseries</p> <p>The Britannia Nurseries site is bounded by a variety of land uses, with allotments to the north; Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) to the east; and to the south Bryanstone Road and Latimer Court. The western boundary is constrained by the railway line, planting and a small commercial business yard. Land immediately east of the site, formerly in the ownership of Britannia Nurseries, now belongs to the LVRP. The Britannia Nurseries site has been disused since a fire in September 2010. Prior to this the site was in use solely for a florist wholesale and distribution use, with a plant nursery having ceased in 2008. Britannia Nurseries submitted an outline planning application to Broxbourne Council (ref. 07/13/0158/O) in February 2013 for the demolition of existing former nursery buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site for residential development comprising 90 dwellings, internal access road, public open space, 30 public car parking spaces (for visitors to the LVRP) and ancillary development. Broxbourne Council granted outline planning permission for appl ref 07/13/0158/O on 22nd April 2014. The LVRPA challenged the decision of Broxbourne Council resulting in a judgement made by Mr Justice Ousley (Case No. CO/2496/2014) in January 2015 that planning permission 07/13/0158/O be quashed. At the time of this submission, outline planning application ref. 07/13/0158/O remains to be re-determined by Broxbourne Council.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Situation has now changed and after consideration of the second planning application Broxbourne Borough Council granted planning permission for residential development of the Britannia Nursery site. The layout of the granted scheme includes a play area and visitor parking, with an access point into the Park. However this scheme has yet to be implemented and it is understood the site has now been sold on. Proposals will be amended to take account of the sites planning status and the need to protect and enhance its boundary with the River Lee Country Park and opportunities to improve access.</p>	<p>Amend proposals under 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park as follows: Visitors - "Options to create a A new secondary vehicular and pedestrian and operational access into the River Lee Country Park off from Eleanor Cross Road via the Britannia Nursery site to be provided assessed as part of the redevelopment of this site together with a small visitor car park. bringing this area back into a Park-related use." Sport & Rec - "Consider options at Britannia Nurseries for natural play and informal recreation. These elements to occupy current derelict site. Provision to be made for access into the Park from Britannia road with small visitors car park." Biodiversity - "Establish northern part of Britannia Nursery site, Britannia Meadows and Lake as an ecological buffer to complement the adjoining SSSI, Lee Valley SPA and Ramsar areas..." Proposal Maps - Sport & Rec, remove notation for informal recreation and natural play. Biodiversity, amend the area covered by notation "Manage Meadow and Lake" to exclude northern part of Britannia.</p>
LB16.3	Capita on behalf Britannia Nurseries	6	Sport & Rec Thematic Proposals		<p>Britannia Nurseries</p> <p>The LVRPA 'Sport and Recreation' Thematic Proposal Plan identifies on the Britannia Nurseries site a symbol for 'informal recreation & natural play'. Britannia Nurseries objects to the Britannia Nurseries site being identified in the LVRPA Development Framework for informal recreation and natural play. The Britannia Nurseries represents a suitable site for development, including for residential, in accordance with outline planning application ref. 07/13/0158/O. Allocation of the Britannia Nurseries site in its entirety for informal recreation and natural play would conflict with proposed development of the Britannia Nurseries site. Notwithstanding our objection to the allocation of Britannia Nurseries for informal recreation and natural play, the Master Plan accompanying outline planning application ref. 07/13/0158/O does provide for significant formal equipped areas of play, informal play, open space and significant enhancements to the LVPRA from Waltham Cross, through the Britannia Nurseries site.</p>	<p>Broxbourne Borough Council granted planning permission for residential development of the Britannia Nursery site. The layout of the granted scheme includes a play area and visitor parking, with an access point into the Park. However this scheme has yet to be implemented and it is understood the site has now been sold on. Proposals will be amended to take account of the sites planning status and the need to protect and enhance its boundary with the River Lee Country Park and opportunities to improve access.</p>	<p>Amend proposals under 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park as follows: Visitors - "Options to create a A new secondary vehicular and pedestrian and operational access into the River Lee Country Park off from Eleanor Cross Road via the Britannia Nursery site to be provided assessed as part of the redevelopment of this site together with a small visitors car park. bringing this area back into a Park-related use." Sport & Rec - "Consider options at Britannia Nurseries for natural play and informal recreation. These elements to occupy current derelict site. Provision to be made for access into the Park from Britannia road with small visitors car park." Biodiversity - "Establish northern part of Britannia Nursery site, Britannia Meadows and Lake as an ecological buffer to complement the adjoining SSSI, Lee Valley SPA and Ramsar areas..." Proposal Maps - Sport & Rec, remove notation for informal recreation and natural play. Biodiversity, amend the area covered by notation "Manage Meadow and Lake" to exclude northern part of Britannia.</p>

LB16.4	Capita on behalf Britannia Nurseries	6	Bio-diversity Thematic Proposals		Britannia Nurseries	The LVRPA 'Thematic Proposals' Plan identifies the northern part of the Britannia Nurseries site as 'manage meadow & Lake – establish areas as buffer to complement adjoining SSSI'. Britannia Nurseries objects to part of the Britannia Nurseries site being identified in the LVRPA Development Framework as a managed meadow and lake established area. There are significant landscaped buffers running along the eastern boundary of the Britannia Nurseries site resulting in the Britannia Nurseries site being quite separate to and enclosed from the wider Lee Valley Regional Park further to the north and east. Furthermore, current outline planning application ref. 07/13/0158/O provides for an appropriate landscape and ecology buffer along the eastern site of the Britannia Nurseries site.	Broxbourne Borough Council granted planning permission for residential development of the Britannia Nursery site. The layout of the granted scheme includes a play area and visitor parking, with an access point into the Park. However this scheme has yet to be implemented and it is understood the site has now been sold on. Proposals will be amended to take account of the sites planning status and the need to protect and enhance its boundary with the River Lee Country Park and opportunities to improve access.	Please refer to the amendments proposed above
LB16.5	Capita on behalf Britannia Nurseries	6	Environment Thematic Proposals		Britannia Nurseries	The LVRPA 'Environment' Plan identifies existing buildings at Britannia Nurseries as glasshouses and the northern part of the site as agriculture. Britannia Nurseries objects to part of the Britannia Nurseries site being identified in the LVRPA Development Framework as glasshouses and the northern part as agriculture. The established use at Britannia Nurseries should not be regarded as agricultural. Furthermore, the Britannia Nurseries site represents previously developed and despoiled land that has not been fully remediated.	Broxbourne Borough Council granted planning permission for residential development of the Britannia Nursery site. The layout of the granted scheme includes a play area and visitor parking, with an access point into the Park. However this scheme has yet to be implemented and it is understood the site has now been sold on. Proposals will be amended to take account of the sites planning status and the need to protect and enhance its boundary with the River Lee Country Park and opportunities to improve access.	Please refer to the proposed amendments set out below.
LB16.6	Capita on behalf Britannia Nurseries	6			Britannia Nurseries	<u>Recommendations</u> - The emerging LVRPA Park Development Plan (AREA 6: Waltham Abbey to Broxbourne) should be amended to exclude the site specific annotations/ allocations for the Britannia Nurseries as considered above. The Britannia Nurseries site represents a previously developed and a partially remediated site that is highly suited to residential development. Current outline planning application ref. 07/13/0158/O remains to be determined by Broxbourne Council, with the application proposing 90 dwellings, internal access road, public open space, 30 public car parking spaces (for visitors to the LVRP) and ancillary development. It is submitted that the LVRPA Development Plan should be amended to reflect potential residential development at the Britannia Nurseries site, together with enhanced access to the LVRP from Waltham Cross. The LVRP Development Plan should also be amended to accord with the Broxbourne Borough Council Design Brief for Reserved Matters for residential development, November 2013, relating to the Britannia Nurseries site	Broxbourne Borough Council granted planning permission for residential development of the Britannia Nursery site. The layout of the granted scheme includes a play area and visitor parking, with an access point into the Park. However this scheme has yet to be implemented and it is understood the site has now been sold on. Proposals will be amended to take account of the sites planning status and the need to protect and enhance its boundary with the River Lee Country Park and opportunities to improve access.	Please refer to the proposed amendments set out below.

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. Matters relating to Turnford Surfacing have been addressed in the response to Area 8	No change
LB19.1	Nazeing Glass Works Ltd	6 & 7		6.A.4	Lido site	To this end we would like to ask the members of the Lee Valley Authority whether they would consider a 25-50 year lease on the old Broxbourne Lido site at a reasonable, but upward moving annual ground rent? As to time scale we would envisage 5-7 years i.e. 2022-2025, having completed the sale of the rest of the site around 2018. Among the advantages the deal offers to the park, are:- 1. An existing well known small manufacturer with an excellent environmental reputation, at present 250 yards away. 2. Over 80 years existence in the area-since 1928. 3. A Museum, Heritage site, with at present around 7,000 visitors a year. 4. A lecture conference facility that could be hired out to local companies. 5. An involvement in an artistic and creative industry. 6. A past history having left Vauxhall in 1928, where glass making can be traced in this area back to 1612, and the Hall family (Stephen and John Hall) which owned Whitefriars and Falcon Stairs Glass works in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. visit and written about by Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn in their diaries. 7. The oldest glassmaking company therefore in the UK. 8. The only hand glass manufacturer remaining - not small studio-(outside automatic production) in the South East of England -(the next nearest is Langham Glass Kings Lynn Norfolk. In sum, history and heritage writ large in the area. The new factory would be planned from scratch with low impact, and visitor attraction and attractiveness at its heart, consulting LVPRA at every step of the way.	Comments noted. The site of the former Leisure Pool/Broxbourne Lido has been allocated for housing in the Broxbourne Draft Local Plan which is supported by the Authority	No change but note amendments made under LA1.5 above
LB20.0	M O'Connor	6	Visitors Baseline & proposals	6.A.4	Langridge	Further to our conversation about the Park's Development Proposals at Waltham Abbey Library, I write to confirm the points I raised with you: 1 There is no existing or historical public footpath on the land privately owned at the southern boundaries of Langridge Barn and Woodside Barn adjacent to Langridge Scrape and clearly we would object to any planning proposal which would want to allow members of the public to walk across our garden.	Comments noted. There are errors on the mapping for the Visitors baseline and proposals map and these will be corrected to remove the purple notation for a public right of way south of Langridge Barn. The proposal to upgrade the path alongside the edge of Holyfield Lake shown on the Visitors Proposal Map is correct and will be retained.	Amend both Baseline and Proposal Visitors Map to correct route of public rights of way and remove purple notation south of Langridge Barn.

LB20.1	M O'Connor	6	Landscape & Heritage Map	6.A.4	Langridge	2 We also object to designating our land which surrounds Woodside Barn and includes the adjacent forty acre field as part of the conservation area with 'strong landscape character to be protected". This is residential land and agricultural land without any particular character features. (Pink striped area on the area 6 map of Landscape and heritage) We would like it removed from that designation.	Objection noted. Langridge Farm and land to the south and west form part of a wide area of strong landscape character encompassing Holyfield Lake, Holyfield Farm and Fishers Green. These contribute to the recreational experience of those using and visiting the River Lee Country Park. The designation can sit across small areas of residential development and farm buildings as is the case here. It can also include pockets of lower quality landscape which need to be improved. The intention is to protect and enhance the strong identity of openness, wetland and woodland in the area.	No change
LB20.2	M O'Connor	6	Landscape & Heritage Baseline Map	6.A.4		3 Although one of your maps depicted a monument close to the southern boundary of Langridge Barn it is not correct. The ground was excavated for gravel many years ago and subsequently became part of the deep lake, anything that had existed was lost	The monument is recorded on the baseline map as an historical record. It is not referenced as a proposal	No change
LB20.3	M O'Connor	6			general Support	Apart from the above, we support the Park's Plan and the Park's ethos of providing sport and leisure facilities. The existence and development of the Park is a wonderful gift to people of all ages to enjoy all the free activities such as walking, cycling and birdwatching but especially families, enabling them to have an active open-air day out together without having to spend money. It is important that Green Belt land within the Park remains respected by local planning authorities and protected from any large scale industrial development which would not be in keeping with the Park's plans.	Comments and support welcomed	No change
LB21.0	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6 & 7				These comments include reference to the general policy proposals of the Framework as well as the specific proposals in relation to Sub Areas 6 and 7, within which my client's properties are located. It is noted with interest that LVRPA's position in relation to the long standing growing industry and associated glasshouses within the Valley is made clear from the outset: <i>"To date there have been many questions received during the consultation concerning the impact of the Authority's draft proposals on the glasshouse industry. These proposals seek to integrate areas of <u>redundant</u> glasshouses into the landscape of the Regional Park through partnership work with landowners and the riparian planning authorities. They do not seek to close existing businesses."</i> Such a clear and seemingly unambiguous position is welcomed as it would appear to support the existing growing industry, which is a long standing and vital part of the Lea Valley.	Comments noted	No change

LB21.1	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries			6.A.4 Environment	Glass-houses The subsequent narrative in relation to Area 6 'River Lee Country Park' is somewhat surprising, therefore; in that it appears to contradict this clearly stated position: "6.A.4 River Lee Country Park (Environment) - Existing glasshouse sites within the RLCP at Paynes Lane, Stubbins Hall Lane, Langley and Mile Nurseries to continue in the short to medium term until the land can be brought into recreational or leisure use, through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary. It is likely that major redevelopment or expansion for new large scale glasshouse use will be resisted." The narrative goes on to say: "Landscape & Heritage - The positive and attractive landscape character of the River Lee Country Park south of Holyfield Lake and Langridge Farm to be protected and enhanced. <u>This strong identity of woodland, wetland, farmland and open parkland to be extended north to Nazeing Road. The green edge of the Regional Park boundary to be protected and enhanced and the open valley floor protected from intrusive development.</u> "	Comments noted	No change
LB21.4	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries				Glass-houses Of even greater concern is the fact that the seemingly flawed approach of LVRPA is entirely at odds with the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and its 'golden thread' of encouraging economic regeneration through sustainable development. Specifically and unequivocally, paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that for plan-making; "local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs in their area... [and] meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change..." The proposed policies do not achieve these aims in that they are clearly not positive for the established local industry, do not meet established demand, have not been objectively assessed against identified need and offer no real form of flexibility, even with the full knowledge of the rapidly changing nature of the growing industry. Furthermore, para 28 of the NPPF makes specific reference to supporting the rural economy and states that; "Planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development". The knock-on benefits this has for local services and community is also advocated and it is clear that the proposed LVRPA policies fail to account for such.	.Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out opposite for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Glasshouses The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the River Lee Country Park Area 6.A.4 will be considered in relation to how the development impacts upon the openness of the Regional Park, the quality of its landscape character and visitor enjoyment. Cumulative impacts will also be a factor where large scale expansion has already taken place. The following issues will need to be addressed: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and preserve existing positive features such as wildlife areas, trees and woodland belts, attractive water edges; • Maintain the existing level and quality of pedestrian and cycle access within the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. Where development is proposed on land outside the ownership of the Authority it will seek planning obligations in line with the above proposal to mitigate adverse impacts.

LB21.5	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries			Glass-houses	Presumably, LVRPA are content to encourage the expansion of recreational facilities within the Valley, at the expense of a long established and essential industry which has served the needs of the local community and the wider region for decades, both in terms of essential produce and employment. By seeking to stifle the continued existence of the growing industry LVRPA's proposals will only serve to favour the ever increasing pressures from overseas produce, whilst the home grown provider declines. There can be no question that such an approach is highly unsustainable and entirely irresponsible.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above
LB21.6	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6		6.A.4	With regards to other relevant policies within the PDF, the following are of note "6.A.4 <i>Work with stakeholders to improve access & the quality of the routes for pedestrians & cyclists into the Park; at entrance points to the RLCP in the north along Paynes Lane, Green Lane & Old Nazeing Road; & from adjoining communities to the south & west & off from key routes such as the Crooked Mile along the eastern boundary.</i> " " <i>Clayton Hill: Develop the site as an access point into RLCP. Work [with] stakeholders to improve visitor facilities especially where this would also benefit local events use, & recreational activities for example provision of toilets. Improve the quality of access routes into the Park from the north along Paynes Lane, Green Lane and Old Nazeing Rd. Work with stakeholders to conserve, promote & celebrate heritage features, artefacts and buildings within the RLCP. Explore opportunities for heritage themed trails based on industrial, wartime, the glasshouse and gravel industries.</i> " My clients are entirely in favour of such proposals, as evident in the wealth of environmental, educational & visitor access enhancement initiatives that can be achieved through new planning consents for the expansion of existing glasshouse facilities. Indeed, through appropriate planning control, it is clear that local businesses & the LVRPA could work together to help secure new public facilities, which may otherwise lack the funding or cooperation of landowners. It is very disappointing that to the contrary, LVRPA seemingly prefer to work in opposition to local landowners & key stakeholders, even to the extent of legally challenging their local authority peers.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above

LB21.7	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6 to 8			Guiding Principles	The clear reference that LVRPA make to their adopted 'guiding principles' within the consultation document is, on the face of it, commendable: "The Authority's draft proposals... are based on the Authority's adopted (July 2010) guiding principles for the future development and management of the Regional Park. These are: - Partnership work – recognising that many of the proposals can only be delivered through the collective efforts of a range of partners, stakeholders and landowners. - Regional Value – assessing the range of benefits that any particular facility or activity within the Park delivers to the people of Essex, Hertfordshire and London. - Multi-function and synergy – developing proposals which can be used to harness competing demands. - Flexibility – the design and management of facilities and open spaces of the park in a way which responds to changing needs and demands. - Sustainability – ensuring that new development does not prejudice the lives of future generations."	Comments noted	No change
LB21.8	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6 to 8			Glasshouses	Unfortunately, such words are evidently hollow when compared to the very real and purposeful direction of the proposed policies, which effectively seek to facilitate the long term decline of the growing industry in favour of one large attractive Regional Park, where 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 and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above
LB21.9	RPS on behalf of Valley Grown Salads/Valley Grown Nurseries	6 to 8			Glasshouses	The inappropriately narrow approach of LVRPA is best exemplified in the distinct lack of reference to the growing industry and glasshouses throughout the consultation document. When this absolutely intrinsic topic is mentioned, it is only in a negative context. This clear absence of crucial reference must bring the validity of the entire exercise into question; because a so called consultation document which at best ignores a fundamental part of the Valley's make-up and which at worst seeks to undermine it, cannot possibly be considered fully inclusive or adequately engaging.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above

LB22.0	Lea Valley Growers Assc. Letter 11 Feb 2015	6 to 8			Glass-houses	<p><u>Summary of Response</u> - The Lea Valley Growers Association (the 'Association') represents over 100 Glasshouse growers in the Lea Valley who grow healthy fresh produce for the UK with a retail value of £1bn to the British economy. These grower businesses also provide employment for 2,500 people. - We wish to object to the Draft Proposals for the Regional Park, as detailed above, in the strongest terms and formally request a complete review of Park policy for this area as a matter of urgency. - The 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.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out opposite for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.</p>	<p><u>Glasshouses</u> The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the River Lee Country Park Area 6.A.4 will be considered in relation to how the development impacts upon the openness of the Regional Park, the quality of its landscape character and visitor enjoyment. Cumulative impacts will also be a factor where large scale expansion has already taken place. The following issues will need to be addressed: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and preserve existing positive features such as wildlife areas, trees and woodland belts, attractive water edges; • Maintain the existing level and quality of pedestrian and cycle access within the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. <p>Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. Where development is proposed on land outside the ownership of the Authority it will seek planning obligations in line with the above proposal to mitigate adverse impacts.</p>
LB22.1	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8				<p><i>continued</i> - The Association believes that the Park Authority should seek to redraft its policies to future-proof the sustainable development of the glasshouse industry in the Park, to reflect the value of retaining and enhancing glasshouse grown food production. - The Association believe Park Authority should seek to work with local partners, including local planning authorities to ensure that positive Park policies for glasshouse retention and development are included in the Park proposal and that food production is included as a key part of their plan. Thus ensuring the value of local food production in the Park, to serve local and wider communities as well as Greater London, is properly acknowledged.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.</p>	<p>Please refer to 22.0</p>
LB22.2	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses	<p><i>continued.</i> - The Association request that the historic legacy of the glasshouse industry, and its current and future importance, be acknowledged within the proposals. - The Association suggests that other potential benefits of retaining a vibrant glasshouse horticulture industry, in areas like education, leisure and tourism, should be promoted within the park.</p>	<p>Please refer to comment above</p>	<p>Please refer to 22.0</p>

LB22.3	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	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 the comment above	Please refer to 22.0
LB22.4	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8		Back-ground to Growers Assoc.	Formed in 1911, the Association became a branch of the National Farmers Union of England & Wales in 1926. Lea Valley glasshouse growers pre date the Lee Valley Regional Park by over a century. Lea Valley glasshouses are long established as part of the distinctive landscape character of the Lea Valley, with a history spanning three centuries. Our growers helped feed Britain with cucumbers and tomatoes during two world wars and led the world with the largest concentration of glasshouses in the Lea Valley (1,100) during the 1950's. The Lea Valley is known as the 'Cucumber Capital of England' and remains of national and regional importance for our nations local food supplies. We grow up to three quarters of Britain's cucumbers and half of Britain's sweet peppers, along with various other edible and ornamental produce that supply London and the UK with essential healthy fresh produce. The countryside has always been primarily a place for food production both inside and outside of the Lee Valley Regional Park and the Lea Valley remains the UK's most important glasshouse area for food production. Our role is important both nationally and for the sustainable growth of our capital city. Britain is a nation that cannot feed itself and food production in the UK is more important now than ever, as self-sufficiency levels for healthy fresh salad produce have fallen below 30%. This is against a backdrop of a growing population in the UK as a whole, and a population in London that is growing at double the rate of the rest of the UK.	Comments and background to the Growers Association noted	No change

LB22.5	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Back-ground to this consultation	<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.</p> <p>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>	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly..	Please see amended proposal above
LB22.6	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Back-ground to this consultation	<p>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.</p>	Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly..	Please see amended proposal above
LB22.7	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8		Back-ground to this consultation	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above

LB22.8	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses & CPO	<p><u>Recommendation for a new approach.</u> The Association requests that the Park Authority commence a new consultation on how glasshouse development can be positively planned for and for this to be carried out in a positive, open and transparent manner. We ask for the Park Authority as a whole to move away from a policy of challenging local planning authority decision making, and a policy of proposing to acquire land that would be better retained for glasshouse use. We ask for a halt to any proposals for the compulsory purchase of land within the Park that is currently or was last used for horticulture or agriculture, until the overall Park Authority policy has been independently reviewed. We ask that all glasshouse sites, for which proposals have been written to take them out of long term horticultural use and put into low income generating use, to be designated for positive horticultural re-use in the first instance. We believe there is sufficient land within the park for recreational enhancement without the need for the compulsory purchase of glasshouse sites.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This matter has been dealt with in correspondence with the growers directly. Please note that Proposal 6.A.4 has been amended and all reference to named sites or areas removed along with reference to CPO powers. Amended proposal text for Environment 6.a.4 is shown opposite</p>	<p><u>Glasshouses</u> The expansion of existing or development of new glasshouse sites within & adjacent to the River Lee Country Park Area 6.A.4 will be considered in relation to how the development impacts upon the openness of the Regional Park, the quality of its landscape character and visitor enjoyment. Cumulative impacts will also be a factor where large scale expansion has already taken place. The following issues will need to be addressed: The scale, height, and bulk of new glasshouse development including lighting and associated infrastructure should be appropriately located & designed so as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to protect the openness of the Park and views into and across the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid adverse impact upon the visual amenity of visitors or users of the Park; • Enhance landscape character and preserve existing positive features such as wildlife areas, trees and woodland belts, attractive water edges; • Maintain the existing level and quality of pedestrian and cycle access within the River Lee Country Park; • Avoid harm to or disturbance of wildlife either through loss or fragmentation of habitat or through noise, lighting or pollution; • Protect and maintain water quantity and quality. <p>Applications for new or replacement glasshouses within the curtilage of existing sites will be considered subject to conditions to mitigate the impact of development on visual amenity, landscape character, biodiversity and recreational use, including pedestrian and cycle access. Where development is proposed on land outside the ownership of the Authority it will seek planning obligations in line with the above proposal to mitigate adverse impacts.</p>
LB22.9	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses	<p>We ask for the Park Authority's decision making to properly take into account the economic, social and environmental impacts of its proposals. We have not seen a sustainability appraisal or any economic appraisal of the impact of the proposals on existing businesses within the Park. We ask for both to be produced.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>Please see above</p>
LB22.10	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6 to 8		Glass-houses	<p>We have suggested in our summary a clear, positive policy approach for including glasshouses in a compatible way in the Park. The Association is happy to present our detailed findings of the implications of the proposed policy and plan, but is concerned that the views of our members and their 2,500 employees are not being addressed in an open and transparent way. We therefore believe the Park Authority's Plan policy within the park should be independently assessed.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>Please see above</p>

LB22.11	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Area 5 Glass-houses	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>	Comments noted. Area 5 proposals will be amended in line with Areas 6 and 7 in due course.	No change
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.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	Please see above
LB22.13	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses	<u>Detailed Response to this consultation.</u> The Association believes the premise to oppose any substantial further development of the horticulture sector in or adjacent to the Park is fundamentally flawed and outdated. The proposed Plan's use of green belt policy also goes against recent developments of that policy in the last few years. The Association responded to the London Assembly 2009 consultation into the promotion of Commercial Food Growing in London. The planning and housing committee conducted a review of the role of the planning system in supporting horticulture in London, with a particular focus on commercial food growing. The aim was to assess how effectively the planning system supports and encourages food growing in London and calls for changes to the planning system to exploit the capital's potential to become more self-sufficient.	Please see comments above	Please see above

LB22.14	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			London Plan 7 food growing	<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 see comments above	Please see above
LB22.15	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	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 see comments above	Please see above
LB22.16	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	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 see comments above	Please see above
LB22.17	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	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>	Comments noted	No change

LB22.18	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6 to 8			Glass-houses	<u>Specific Area Responses</u> The Association recommends that all the proposals should be rethought in accordance with the summary recommendations at the start of this letter, as the proposed policies seek the long term removal of horticultural nurseries from within the Park, rather than re-using existing open space and heritage assets. We have not seen a sustainable appraisal of these policy choices.	Please see comments above	Please see changes made above
LB22.19	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6		6.A.4	Britannia Nurseries	<u>Area 6 River Lee Country Park. RLCP South & Waltham Abbey Gardens</u> "Consider options at Britannia Nurseries for natural play and informal recreation. These elements to occupy current derelict site. Provision to be made for access into the Park from Britannia road with small visitor's car park". "Establish northern part of Britannia Nursery site, Britannia Meadows and Lake as an ecological buffer to complement the adjoining SSSI, Lee Valley SPA and Ramsar areas". This current nursery site should be encouraged to remain in horticultural use, with incentives provided to provide additional landscaping if required to buffer to the north.	Broxbourne Borough Council granted planning permission for residential development on former nursery site at Britannia part of which had been used for many years for commercial purposes. . The layout of the granted scheme includes a play area and visitor parking, with an access point into the Park. Proposals will be amended to take account of the sites planning status and the need to protect and enhance its boundary with the River Lee Country Park and opportunities to improve access.	Amend proposals under 6.A.4 River Lee Country Park as follows: Visitors - "Options to create a A new secondary vehicular and pedestrian and operational access into the River Lee Country Park off from Eleanor Cross Road via the Britannia Nursery site to be provided assessed as part of the redevelopment of this site together with a small visitor car park. bringing this area back into a Park related use. " Sport & Rec - "Consider options at Britannia Nurseries for natural play and informal recreation. These elements to occupy current derelict site. Provision to be made for access into the Park from Britannia road with small visitors car park. Biodiversity - "Establish northern part of Britannia Nursery site , Britannia Meadows and Lake as an ecological buffer to complement the adjoining SSSI, Lee Valley SPA and Ramsar areas..." Proposal Maps - Sport & Rec, remove notation for informal recreation and natural play. Biodiversity, amend the area covered by notation "Manage Meadow and Lake" to exclude northern part of Britannia.
LB22.20	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6		6.A.4.1	Wharf Road Inset Environment	Environment - <i>"Work with Broxbourne Council and other stakeholders to develop a long term strategy of removing illegal, non-conforming and non park compatible uses within the area, including through the use of planning enforcement action, and compulsory purchase if necessary"</i> . We are concerned that the Park' policies have been instrumental in the growth of non-confirming and non-park compatible uses, for example by land-locking businesses and reducing the value of their land or potential for investment. This has resulted in the increase and escalation of non-conforming and non-compatible Park uses in many parts of the Park, such as Wharf Road and Nazeing. These sites should be considered for uses compatible with horticulture.	Comments noted. Proposals are based on the Wharf Road Environmental Strategy and the Authority's long term and consistent policy to bring this area into recreational use.	No change
LB22.21	Lea Valley Growers Assc.	6		6.A.4	Chimes Nursery	<u>Nazeing Marsh, the Old Chimes Nursery Site</u> <i>"Work with EFDC, landowners and other stakeholders to bring this area of the Park into a recreational or leisure use in accordance with the Park's remit. This may require use of the Authority's land purchasing powers to consolidate existing land ownership, improve access and widen options for future use"</i> . The Old Chimes Nursery Site is another example of a thriving horticultural business that has fallen into decline due to the Park Authority's land purchasing policy. The Park Authority now proposes to use its land purchasing powers and public funding to purchase the non-conforming site that it has created. The ability of this site to accommodate uses compatible with supporting the horticultural industry should be considered.	Comments noted. Part of the site has planning permission for 26 houses.	No change

LB22.22	Lea Valley Growers Assoc.	6		6.A.4 Environment	Glass-houses	<u>Environment - Paynes Lane, Stubbins Hall Lane, Langley & Mile Nurseries</u> "Existing Glasshouse sites within the RLCP at Paynes Lane, Stubbins Hall Lane, Langley & Mile Nurseries to continue in the short to medium term until the land can be brought into recreational use, through the use of the Authority's land purchasing powers if necessary. It is likely that major redevelopment or expansion for new large scale glasshouse use will be resisted". The Association formally objects to the publication of proposals, by a statutory body with planning authority powers, during an on-going judicial review process involving this site. We do not believe the publication of this proposal policy or the judicial review are in the public interest and question use of public funds in this way. The Association believes the sentence proposing to use compulsory purchase powers should be deleted.	This matter has been dealt within correspondence with the relevant parties. Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	See above for amended proposal
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.	Comments and concerns noted. Interpretation is in line with the Authority's statutory purpose and the Proposals are consistent with the findings of the Laurence Gould report "The Lea Valley Glasshouse Industry Planning for the Future " which is part of Epping Forest District Council's evidence base for the draft Local Plan. Amendments are proposed within area 6 and a new glasshouse proposal is set out above for 6.A.4 Environment. References to named areas and sites has been deleted.	See above for amended proposal
SR23.0	Fishers Green Sailing Club	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec. Sailing Boating & Rowing Visitors	Holyfield Lake - centre of excellence for sailing	Taking into account the Adopted Guiding Principles of the LVRPA, and in particular working with partners and stakeholders, the Management Committee of Fishers Green Sailing Club wish to respond to the Consultation as follows: Fishers Green Sailing Club has been established for over 50 years at Holyfield Lake. The sailing at Fishers Green is both competitive and family friendly. On a competitive level, there is club, inter club, national and international racing from the Club in many classes of boat. Many Fishers Green Youth sailors have competed at a top level in national and international events including successes at the Cadet World Championships over recent years and some have gone on to compete at the highest level, with Club winners at World and European champion events as well as GBR Olympic Squad trialists. There is fun, family friendly recreational sailing in a safe environment to encourage participation at all levels. There is fun, family friendly recreational sailing in a safe environment to encourage participation at all levels.	Comments noted and welcomed. Options to relocate ESSA onto Holyfield Lake would need to be explored in detail and feasibility work commissioned.	No change

SR23.1	Fishers Green Sailing Club	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec. Sailing Boating & Rowing Visitors	Holyfield Lake - centre of excellence for sailing	Fishers Green Sailing Club is affiliated to the Royal Yachting Association ("the RYA") which is the national body for the sport of sailing. The Club is in the process of becoming an RYA Regional Training Centre and has already been awarded Champion Club status by the RYA for the excellent youth training it provides. The Club has a clear commitment to engaging the local population in sailing and holds Open Days and Taster Sessions several times during the course of the year together with exhibiting at the Enfield Town Show and the Dinghy Show.	Comments noted , there is a good working relationship between the Authority and the Fishers Green Sailing Club	No change
SR23.2	Fishers Green Sailing Club	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec. Sailing Boating & Rowing Visitors	Holyfield Lake - centre of excellence for sailing	The long-standing membership has built up Fishers Green Sailing Club over the years in a sustainable way with mainly volunteer effort. The members tend to the natural surroundings in a sympathetic manner as well as maintain the sailing facilities at Holyfield Lake. However, a review and re-statement of the Club's vision in 2014 did identify some high priority, shore side improvements that will allow the Club to continue to provide the excellent sailing facilities for which it is now renowned. These are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving the signage to make it easier to find the club; • carrying out repairs to the access track and lake foreshore; • upgrading the toilets and changing rooms. The proposal to move ESSA to Holyfield Lake would put additional pressure on the shoreside facilities and these matters would have to be addressed. The accommodation of ESSA at Holyfield Lake would need to be done under terms that would ensure that none of the stakeholders were disadvantaged and that the aim of providing a centre of excellence for sailing on the lake were achieved. Fishers Green Sailing Club is keen to explore the possibilities for this provision on its Lake and looks forward to engaging with LVRPA in due course.	Comments noted and welcomed. Options to relocate ESSA onto Holyfield Lake would need to be explored in detail and feasibility work commissioned. Text will be amended to clarify this point under Area 7 and 6.	Amend text for River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation as follows: Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake - Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities to be supported. Undertake feasibility work Explore options with stakeholders to explore options for the relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake i.e. move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake Feasibility work will need to consider and assess a range of environmental and access issues including: - the ecological impact of proposals on Holyfield Lake, and the adjacent SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England; an Habitat Regulation Assessment may be required, and options and requirements for new and shared facilities and water space between the different water based clubs and groups.

SR24.0	Fishers Green Consortium	6	Sport & Rec Proposals		<p>Canoeists on River Lea</p> <p>Fishers Green Consortium [FGC] strongly object to the use of the natural river by boats of any description, identified red on the Sport and Recreation plan Area 6. We have several concerns with regard to the water and surrounding land</p> <p>a) From Kings weir downstream to the Fishers green lane car park,</p> <p>b) The Relief channel from Holyfield weir to the confluence with the river at Stubbins hall lane area.</p> <p>The River Lea is historically one of the few rivers where the indigenous Barbel spawns. The spawning takes places over shallow, weedy gravel areas of flowing water that under normal water levels are only six inches deep. The life of the river bed spans twelve months starting in the late autumn and into the winter as the rains and floods clean the spawning grounds, in the early spring the weed growth begins and the Barbel and chub then use the weed and gravel runs to spawn. The eggs holding in the gravel hatch during the summer and the young fish rely on the invertebrates in the weed growth for their food until the autumn. Disturbance at any time of the year would seriously affect the chance of these species surviving.</p>	<p>Objection noted. There is an error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The purple Herts Young Mariners Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area</p>	<p>Amend route notation on Sport & Recreation Proposals Map and remove purple route as shown between Kings Weir and Fishers Green lane car park. Revised notation to follow existing route through Holyfield Lake and Flood relief channel as currently used 6 times a year under the current permission. Amend proposal text under 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation - Herts Yoing Mariners as follows: Work with Herts Young Mariners Base and the Environment Agency to review and potentially increase use of the Herts Young Mariners canoe trail, (currently only available 6 times a year) taking account of angling use and fish spawning areas..</p>
SR24.1	Fishers Green Consortium	6	Sport & Rec Proposals		<p>Canoeists on River Lea</p> <p>The proposal of canoes using the river would be disastrous to the ecology of these areas, it would destroy the weed growth and seriously disturb and affect the gravel runs. If boating of any sort was allowed, on the grounds of safety much of the over-hanging tree and bush growth on the river would have to be removed destroying the habitat of all invertebrates, mammals and animals reliant on vegetation. At present canoes portage across from the navigation above Kings weir into Langridge [Holyfield] lake paddle down, past the proposed new portage point into the river, to the Great Weir at the southern end of Langridge, here they portage out using the specially constructed staging go around the weir and back into the Relief channel using the first angling stage. This occurs by agreement and with advance warning, six times a year. Anglers agree to vacate this stage when canoeing down the channel takes place. The current lease held by the FGC, with a membership of over 5,000, has with our [FGC] agreement a clause prohibiting boats or wading in the river on grounds of both Health & Safety and welfare of the river. With respect to all parties we ask that the existing working agreement continues.</p>	<p>Comments noted please see response above which recognises the error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The purple Herts Young Mariners Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area</p>	<p>Amend route notation on Sport & Recreation Proposals Map and remove purple route as shown between Kings Weir and Fishers Green lane car park. Revised notation to follow existing route through Holyfield Lake and Flood relief channel as currently used 6 times a year under the current permission. Amend proposal text under 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation - Herts Yoing Mariners as follows: Work with Herts Young Mariners Base and the Environment Agency to review and potentially increase use of the Herts Young Mariners canoe trail, (currently only available 6 times a year) taking account of angling use and fish spawning areas.</p>

SR25.0	Kings Weir Fishery	6	Sport & Rec Proposals	Canoeists on River Lea	Having picked my way through Park Development Framework documents two suggestions contained within give me great concern as if implemented they would very soon cause conflicts, disputes and very likely criminal activity within the Park. Firstly it would seem there is a proposal to allow greater access to Canoes which will no doubt cause conflict with Anglers on the site particularly on the Old Lee at Fishers Green if the proposals go ahead . On a small intimate river such as this in-stream disturbance will affect fishing and the fauna of the river . During the spawning season the fish use the shallow gravel runs on the site and would not tolerate the disturbance of canoes. It should be borne in mind that based on anecdotal evidence from Anglers who have fished the stretch of river over a long period of time (myself over 5 decades) the fish recruitment levels on this stretch are already dangerously low due to water quality, silting of spawning areas, loss of habitat, high phosphate levels and predation from signal crayfish at spawn and fry stages of development plus predation at the adult stage by mink, cormorant and probably otter. Furthermore should canoes be allowed to traverse the Old River it is highly likely some will find themselves at the top of the Old River in Kings Weir were in recent years a canoeist lost his life. Kings Weir Pool would also very quickly become a flashpoint for disputes as the pool is leased privately by CRT for fishing purposes to the owners of the Lock House who also own the surrounding land . Any attempt at portage here would be a trespass in law.	Comments noted. There is an error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The purple Herts Young Mariners Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area	Amend route notation on Sport & Recreation Proposals Map and remove purple route as shown between Kings Weir and Fishers Green lane car park. Revised notation to follow existing route through Holyfield Lake and Flood relief channel as currently used 6 times a year under the current permission. Amend proposal text under 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation - Herts Young Mariners as follows: Work with Herts Young Mariners Base and the Environment Agency to review and potentially increase use of the Herts Young Mariners canoe trail, (currently only available 6 times a year) taking account of angling use and fish spawning areas.
SR25.1	Kings Weir Fishery	6	Visitors	Access	The second point of concern is the suggestion of opening access through Green lanes which is already illegally accessed by motorbike scramblers and fly tippers. Should this be officially opened to the public with an access through the Langridge site to connect with Fishers Green opposite Aqueduct Lock this would give poachers and persons who steal fish very easy access and escape from the site . Whats more the track between Langridge Lake from Kings Weir to opposite Aqueduct Lock is totally unsuitable for public access as is in a good length it is very narrow and prone to flooding . Also it is currently leased to a private fishing club whose members would cease to want to pay for the privilege if the site loses its quiet secretive nature which is a great attraction to them and no doubt the large numbers of birds , muntjac and badgers that use this quieter part of the park.	Comments noted. There is a need to establish a balance between improved access for walkers, maintaining quiet areas from which to fish and providing a secure and safe Park. Most of the routes shown seek only to improve access along existing public footpaths i.e. from Paynes Lane west to Green Lane, north along Green Lane across the Flood relief Channel through to Nazeing Road and to link from King's Weir onto the western side of the Navigation. From King's Weir south access will be on the west side of the Navigation only following the Lea Valley Walk. Amendments to the Visitor Proposals Map will be made to clarify these routes. It is proposed to retain the proposal for a path alongside the eastern edge of Holyfield Lake.	Amend the Visitors Map to ensure access improvements are correctly shown, purple notations relating to the Base Mapping are checked and removed where incorrect and that new routes such as that along eastern edge of Holyfield lake are included.

SR27.0	Chairman Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6	Area 6 Sport & Rec Proposals		<p>I strongly object to the use of the natural river by boats of any description, identified red on the Sport and Recreation plan Area 6 We have several concerns with regard to the water and surrounding land</p> <p>A) From Kings weir downstream to the Fishers green lane car park B) The Relief channel from Holyfield weir to the confluence with the river at Stubbins hall lane area.</p> <p>The River Lea is historically one of the few rivers where the indigenous Barbel spawns. The spawning takes places over shallow, weedy gravel areas of flowing water that under normal water levels are only six inches deep.</p> <p>The life of the river bed spans twelve months starting in the late autumn and into the winter as the rains and floods clean the spawning grounds, in the early spring the weed growth begins and the Barbel and chub then use the weed and gravel runs to spawn. The eggs holding in the gravel hatch during the summer and the young fish rely on the invertebrates in the weed growth for their food until the autumn. Disturbance at any time of the year would seriously affect the chance of these species surviving.</p>	<p>Same as SR24 Objection noted. There is an error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The Purple Herts Young Mainers Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area</p>	<p>Amend route notation on Sport & Recreation Proposals Map and remove purple route as shown between Kings Weir and Fishers Green lane car park. Revised notation to follow existing route through Holyfield Lake and Flood relief channel as currently used 6 times a year under the current permission. Amend proposal text under 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation - Herts Young Mariners as follows: Work with Herts Young Mariners Base and the Environment Agency to review and potentially increase use of the Herts Young Mariners canoe trail, (currently only available 6 times a year) taking account of angling use and fish spawning areas.</p>
SR27.1	Chairman Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6	Area 6 Sport & Rec Proposals		<p>The proposal of canoes using the river would be disastrous to the ecology of these areas, it would destroy the weed growth and seriously disturb and affect the gravel runs. If boating of any sort was allowed, on the grounds of safety much of the overhanging tree and bush growth on the river would have to be removed destroying the habitat of all invertebrates, mammals and animals reliant on vegetation. At present canoes portage across from the navigation above Kings weir into Langridge [Holyfield] lake paddle down, past the proposed new portage point into the river, to the Great Weir at the southern end of Langridge, here they portage out using the specially constructed staging go around the weir and back into the Relief channel using the first angling stage. This occurs by agreement and with advance warning, six times a year. Anglers agree to vacate this stage when canoeing down the channel takes place.</p> <p>The current lease held by the FGC, with a membership of over 5,000, has with our agreement a clause prohibiting boats or wading in the river on grounds of both Health & Safety and welfare of the river. With respect to all parties we ask that the existing working agreement continues.</p> <p>Should you go ahead with your proposals I feel it will become a flashpoint for conflict between interested parties.</p>	<p>Comments noted. As stated above There is an error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The purple Herts Young Mariners Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area Same as SR24 apart from last sentence</p>	<p>Amend route notation on Sport & Recreation Proposals Map and remove purple route as shown between Kings Weir and Fishers Green lane car park. Revised notation to follow existing route through Holyfield Lake and Flood relief channel as currently used 6 times a year under the current permission. Amend proposal text under 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation - Herts Young Mariners as follows: Work with Herts Young Mariners Base and the Environment Agency to review and potentially increase use of the Herts Young Mariners canoe trail, (currently only available 6 times a year) taking account of angling use and fishing licences.</p>

SR29.0	Towpath Fishery & Ware Angling Club	6 to 8			<p>Fishing</p> <p>Having been sent a copy of your Park Development documentation I would like to comment as follows. I am reporting as part of the Management Team for the Towpath Fishery which is managed by Ware Angling Club and Hertford Anglings Club and as such we rent waters from the Lea Valley Regional Parks. The Towpath Fishery rents water on the River Lea Navigation between Hertford and Broxbourne and from the Lee Valley Regional Parks it is waters at Dobbs Weir and Carthagen. The Towpath Fishery can give access to approximately 3,000 angling club members. There are also Day Tickets available from the Bailiff for visiting anglers and this could mean a further 500 anglers take up the opportunity to fish the venues.</p> <p>As an action plan the Towpath Fishery are looking to hold Fishing Matches and encourage Junior Angling. This year has already seen this plan taken forward with organised matches and a Junior match with 40 competitors. The management team continue to look at ideas to Promote Angling for the future.</p>	Comments noted.	No change
SR29.1	Towpath Fishery & Ware Angling Club	6 to 8			<p>Access to the river</p> <p>One failure with the modern day angler is that they are reluctant to walk far to pick a spot to fish. (Perhaps they are carrying to 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.</p> <p>Our fishing clubs have an excellent working relationship with your Fisheries Team. Within the development plans should any additional waters become available for fishing I hope that consideration could be given to allow us to work in partnership with the LVRP and take on new rents. Thanking you for allowing us to make this representation.</p>	Comments noted and passed to the Fisheries and Angling Manager	No change

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

SR30.2	ESSA Water Activities Centre (covering letter).	7 & 6		7.A.2 & 6.A.4	ESSA	Moving onto the proposals, our key concerns are as follows: 1. Our initial feasibility study of the LVRPA proposal to <u>relocate ESSA to Holyfield Lake</u> indicates that it would take 3 years of planning and execution by paid staff, specialist transportation of our boats, equipment, and storage containers. Removal costs alone would amount to £50,000 with a total cost of over £1m. Consultation with some of our existing group users has revealed that they would not consider travelling the additional distance to Holyfield Lake, indicating there would be a loss of income to the charity at the new location. With no business case for a move, it would be unlikely to attract the substantial grant funding required to give effect to this proposal. Furthermore, the proposed relocation of ESSA to Holyfield Lake is impractical and would be to the detriment of both ESSA and Fishers Green Sailing Club (FGSC) in that ESSA would, on child protection grounds, require the sole use of the existing buildings at the same times as these would otherwise be used by FGSC. We understand that a possible area for ESSA has been identified at Holyfield Lake. However, this would require a new building, new foreshore and utilities to be provided by LVRPA at their cost before the proposed move could take place. Furthermore, there could be a conflict with the proposed expansion of the power distribution station on what we believe to be the identified potential site.	1. Comments and findings of the ESSA initial feasibility study noted. It is agreed that the proposal to relocate ESSA requires detailed feasibility work. This would need to consider a range of options and the advantages and disadvantages of each. The cost of implementing each option would be a major factor in any decision made. For each option there is a need to consider the cost of moving ESSA to Holyfield Lake alongside the cost of retaining current facilities at Central Lagoon factoring in cost of future upgrades and improvements to facilities. The requirement for separate facilities on child protection grounds is a valid point and an amendment to the draft proposals under 7.A.2 Sport and Recreation was made prior to consultation. Further amendments will be made to proposals under both 7.A.2 and 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation and 7.A.2 Visitors to clarify the need for detailed feasibility work. Please refer to Area 7 document for changes to 7.A.2	Amend proposal text for River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation as follows: Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake - Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities to be supported. Undertake feasibility work Explore options with stakeholders to explore options for the relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake i.e. move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake. Feasibility work will need to consider and assess a range of environmental and access issues including: - the ecological impact of proposals on Holyfield Lake, and the adjacent SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England; an Habitat Regulation Assessment may be required, and options and requirements for new and shared facilities and water space between different water based clubs and groups.
SR30.3	ESSA Water Activities Centre (covering letter).	7 & 6		7.A.2 & 6.A.4	ESSA	2. To achieve the proposed <u>Centre of Angling Excellence at Central Lagoon</u> would require extensive repairs to the fore-shore, new buildings, substantial upgrading of the access track from Meadgate Road to allow vehicle access and a car park with the loss of some of the existing fishing swims. To have an unsupervised building and main services facilities at Central Lagoon would place this area at greater risk of trespass and vandalism in an area where there are already concerns about uses inconsistent with the land uses appropriate to the Lee Valley Regional Park. LVRPA also have proposed to provide angling facilities at Amwell Pits only 4 miles away and much better served by public transport and roads: the area does not require two centres of angling close together.	Comments noted. Feasibility work in relation to a Centre for Angling will need to consider a range of factors including access and security. Proposals will be amended under 7.A.2 Sport & Recreation to make this clearer. It should be noted that Amwell Pits (Area 8) are now in private ownership. It is not therefore feasible to create a centre for angling at this location.	No change under Area 6 but proposal text amended under 7.A.2 Sport & Recreation.
SR30.4	ESSA Water Activities Centre (covering letter)	7 & 6		7.A.2 & 6.A.4	ESSA	3. The proposal that the <u>general public should have access to the ESSA owned and maintained toilets</u> on our existing site are wholly impractical. LVRPA would have to design and build new facilities meeting current standards. It would also raise serious safeguarding issues due to the age of our users, almost all of whom are aged 9-18 years, with some having special needs.	Comments noted. The shared use of existing ESSA toilets is an option discussed in the Carthage Environmental Strategy a supporting document to the PDF. Further feasibility work would be needed regarding the provision of toilets and other visitor facilities in this area. Amendments will be made under Area 7, Visitors 7.A.2 Carthage to clarify the position.	Please refer to changes made under proposal text 7.A.2 Visitors.

SR30.5	ESSA Water Activities Centre (covering letter)	7 & 6	Area 7 only?	7.A.2 & 6.A.4	ESSA	4. The proposal is to provide unregulated <u>public day camping</u> at Central Lagoon is impractical. The area around Central Lagoon is the most remote from public footpaths, roads and facilities and there are already concerns about possible trespass in this area. It would be more practical and cost effective to provide day camping at Dobbs Weir Caravan Site which is to be enhanced as a visitor centre as there are already existing facilities and management of the site is already in place. 5. The area identified for <u>LVRPA Schools camping</u> on our site is not practical as it is on our foreshore, furthest from our facilities, on the wettest part of our leased land and next to a public footpath. ESSA already provides camping facilities to scout, guide and other groups nearer our facilities.	Comments noted, the points made relate to the Carthage Environmental Strategy. The Strategy option for schools camping on the ESSA site has not been included in the Area 7 Visitors Proposals. The reference to 'sustainable huts' is included under Visitor Proposal 7.A.2 but in the context of the need for feasibility work. These are to be located in the south west corner of the North Lagoon.	No change
SR30.8	ESSA Water Activities Centre (Executive summary main response)	6 to 8			ESSA	2. Throughout the proposals for areas 5,6,7,8, LVRPA state that they 'actively support' named private members only sailing clubs. However, there are only consistently negative, detrimental and wholly inaccurate references to and observations about ESSA Water Activities Centre, (itemised in Section 2), with a disproportionate focus on our leased land of approx 3 acres e.g. relocating our boat storage area, altering our camping arrangements etc when compared to the larger schemes of developing Banbury and King George V Reservoirs, and visitor facilities elsewhere in the park where no supporting detail is provided.	Comments noted. The Carthage Environmental Strategy does contain detail in relation to the ESSA site, which has helped inform proposals. However the draft Proposals do not contain the same level of detail and generally recognise the need for more feasibility work to examine options, including in relation to the proposal to relocate ESSA onto Holyfield Lake.	Please refer to amended text as shown under SR30.2 above
SR30.10	ESSA Water Activities Centre (Executive summary main response)	6 & 7		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA	4. Our initial feasibility study for the proposal to <u>relocate ESSA to Holyfield Lake</u> indicates that it would take 3 years of planning and execution by paid staff, specialist transportation of our boats, equipment, and storage containers. Removal costs alone would amount to £50,000. Consultation with some of our group users has revealed that they would not consider travelling the additional distance to Holyfield Lake, indicating there would be a loss of income to the charity at the new location. With no business case for such a move, it would be unlikely to attract the substantial grant funding required to give effect to this proposal (Section 4).	Please refer to the response made under 30.2 above	Please refer to the response made under 30.2 above
SR30.11	ESSA Water Activities Centre (Executive summary main response)	6 & 7		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA	5. The relocation of ESSA to Holyfield Lake is impractical and would be to the detriment of both ESSA and Fishers Green Sailing Club (FGSC) in that ESSA Water Activities Centre would require sole use of the existing buildings at the same times as these would otherwise be used by FGSC. We understand that a possible area for ESSA has been identified by Fishers Green Sailing Club at Holyfield Lake. However, this would require a new building, new foreshore and utilities to be provided by LVRPA before the proposed move could take place (Section 5).	Please refer to the response made under 30.2 above	Please refer to the response made under 30.2 above
SR30.12	ESSA Water Activities Centre (Executive summary main response)	6 & 7		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA	6. The proposal that the <u>general public should have access to ESSA Water Activities Centre owned and maintained toilets</u> is not practical. LVRPA would have to build new facilities meeting current standards. It would also raise serious safeguarding issues due to the age of our users (mainly 9-18 years) some of whom have special needs (Section 6).	Please refer to the response made under 30.4 above	Please refer to the response made under SR30.4 above

SR30.14	ESSA Water Activities Centre (Executive summary main response)	6 to 8		7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Angling	8. To achieve the proposed Centre of Angling Excellence at central lagoon would require extensive repairs to the fore-shore, new buildings, substantial upgrading of the access track from Meadgate Road to allow vehicle access and a car park with the loss of some of the existing fishing swims. Central Lagoon is less popular with anglers than the other waters included within the Nazeing Meads permit and has electricity pylons making it less suitable for fishing. To have an unsupervised building with main services facilities at Central Lagoon would place this area at greater risk of trespass and vandalism in an area where there are already concerns about uses inconsistent with the land uses appropriate to the Lee Valley Regional Park. The proposals also refer to developing angling facilities with disabled swims at Amwell Pits which is only 4 miles away from Central Lagoon, is accessible by existing public transport and roads and has a car park. This would be a more cost effective way to achieve the aims of the LVRPA as well as being easier to achieve and more environmentally sustainable (Section 8).	Please refer to the response made under 30.3 above	Please refer to the response made under 30.3 above
SR30.15	ESSA Water Activities Centre (Executive summary main response)			7.A.2 & 6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Accomm-odation	9. The area identified for LVRPA Schools camping on our site is not practical as it is on our foreshore, furthest from our facilities, on the wettest part of our leased land and next to a public footpath which has been used to cut fencing in order to gain unauthorised access to our site. ESSA already provides camping facilities for scout/guide groups and others nearer our site facilities.	Please refer to the response made under 30.5 above	Please refer to the response made under 30.5 above
SR30.23	ESSA Water Activities Centre (main response)	6 to 8			ESSA	2. <u>Corrections Required to LVRPA's Documents & Proposals</u> . We would draw attention to the extensive positive comments in the proposals and support offered to sailing clubs and water based activity centres within Lee Valley Regional Park, these include: - Support the range of sailing activities at Hertford County Yacht Club (Area 8 Proposals: page 3) at Stanstead Abbots Lake which cater for the casual sailor through to the serious racing enthusiast.(Area 8 Proposals: 8A1 Page 6). - Support the range of sailing activity and training from beginner to world class sailor offered by the <u>Broxbourne Sailing Club</u> on the North lagoon and the facilities they provide for disabled sailing.(Area 7 Proposals: 7A2 Page 12). • <u>Broxbourne Sailing Club</u> is more thriving (Carthagea Environmental Strategy Page 13) • Active recreation ... <u>Fishers Green Sailing Club</u> (Area 6 Proposals: Page 2). - Promote and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Explore options with stake-holders to relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake (i.e. <u>move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake</u> (Area 6 Proposals: 6A4 Page19)). - Explore opportunities to improve facilities at the <u>Lee Valley Boat Centre</u> (Area 6 Proposals: 6A4 Page19). - Explore with Thames Water and other stakeholders the use of <u>Banbury Reservoir</u> for watersports, options to include sailing and paddle boarding.(Area 5 Proposals: 4A1 Page 14 and Page 22 Thematic Proposals)	Comments noted	No change

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

SR30.27	ESSA Water Activities Centre (main response)	6 & 7			<p>ESSA</p> <p>Considering the extensive area covered by LVRPA (26 miles), the more important improvements & future work suggested e.g. Thames Water Depot, land adjoining the Waterworks Centre (Area 2A6 sub-area page19), Hackney Marshes (Area 2A7 Page 21 develop sport and recreation facilities), Broxbourne Gateway and other areas, there seems to be a dis-proportionate focus on (Carthagenia ES Report Fig 4: Master-plan) land leased by ESSA Water Activities Centre (approximately 3 acres) and how we use it by changing where we store our boats and 'swapping' small parts of our leased land for different usage (Carthagenia ES Report page 1) in other areas; and proposing to relocate ESSA Water Activities Centre to Holyfield Lake. The number of recommendations in the Carthagenia ES Report and proposals relating to ESSA Water Activities Centre in general are disproportionate when compared to the rest of the Area 6, 7 and 8 proposals. The Charity Trustees are concerned that the above comments give a strong indication of a widespread prevailing negative attitude to ESSA within the Authority and this indicates that LVRPA do not wish to support or develop ESSA Water Activities Centre.</p>	<p>In 2012 the Authority commissioned consultants to produce draft proposals for areas of landscape stress in the northern part of the Park. Hence the 3 background environmental strategy documents for Spitalbrook, Carthagenia and Wharf Road. These are all areas where the Authority is the principle landowner and a more detailed approach to drafting proposals is possible. The detail in the Environmental Strategy has not been transposed to the Area Proposals as it is recognised that further feasibility work is needed.</p>	No change
SR30.33	ESSA Water Activities Centre (main response).	6			<p>Holyfield Lake - centre of excellence for sailing</p> <p>4. <u>Feasibility of relocation to Holyfield Lake, Fishers Green</u>. There are already 3 organisations using Holyfield Lake, these are: • Fishers Green Sailing Club • UKSA (http:// uksa.org/ about-us/uksa-at-lee-valley/) • Fishers Green Model Boat Club. The existing requirements for use of Holyfield Lake by these organisations would compete for time & space with ESSA Water Activities Centre (WAC) sessions, in particular during our busiest times which are Sat & Sundays. ESSA WAC would be in direct competition with UKSA for any new business opportunities within the catchment area of Holyfield lake which, for ESSA WAC, would be an entirely new location thus inhibiting our ability to generate additional income to replace that lost as a result of the proposed move. UKSA would also be in direct competition with ESSA for time on the water and as well as land based resources. There is a fundamental incompatibility of uses for the water at Holyfield Lake that arises from the substantially lower skill level of children & young persons who have never sailed before, or taken part in the extensive range of water activities that we offer when compared to the members of Fishers Green Sailing Club who routinely take part in class & handicap racing. Whilst a sailing boat or other craft can be quickly and easily retrieved or righted if capsized on our own lake at Central Lagoon, Holy-field Lake is a much larger area of sailing water and it is both unsafe and undesirable to have dragon boat training, novice sailors or canoeists sharing water with experienced sailors who are racing their privately owned boats competitively.</p>	<p>Comments noted. These are important issues that will need to be considered further as part of feasibility work.</p>	No change

SR30.34	ESSA Water Activities Centre (main response)	6			Holyfield Lake - centre of excellence for sailing	<p><u>Possible Location for ESSA at Holyfield Lake</u>. There has <u>never</u> been any indication from LVRPA officers as to where ESSA Water Activities Centre would be located on Holyfield Lake. However we would make the following observations: 1. <u>Sharing facilities / buildings / land</u>. FGSC is a private members club who own and maintain their own club facilities. It would be wholly impractical for ESSA Water Activities Centre to share their Club buildings. The overwhelming majority of ESSA's users are aged 9 to 18 years & some are vulnerable. We would therefore require the sole occupation and use of FGSC buildings and water when we were on site. Further-more, all members of FGSC would be required to have an Enhanced DBS check if they were to be using any of the facilities at the same time as our users. To maintain the income of ESSA Water Activities Centre we would require sole use of facilities every weekend throughout the year plus Tuesday evenings, all day Wednesday, Thursday and Friday evenings from 1st April to 30 September, with additional hours during school holiday periods. The conflict of working requirements would be to the detriment of both FGSC and ESSA Water Activities Centre.</p>	Comments noted. These are important issues that will need to be considered further as part of feasibility work.	No change
SR30.35	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA re-location	<p>Consideration also needs to be given to the numbers of children and young persons using ESSA Water Activities Centre, as we operate with guide and scouts groups we can have 40 + young person on site, taking part in water activities and overnight camping. At Central Lagoon, our existing site is fenced and secure to prevent strangers coming into our site, whereas at Holyfield Lake there is a much larger area of open land and less security. At Fishers Green Sailing Club, all their boats and equipment are privately owned by individual members who pay storage fees and membership fees, who would, naturally be reluctant to have groups of young persons, even well behaved, camping overnight. There is a further concern for ESSA Trustees: FGSC have regular social evenings and a licensed bar. It would not be desirable to have alcohol available or consumed on the premises by their members when ESSA has children and young persons camping overnight, mainly on Friday and Saturdays.</p>	Comments noted. These are important issues that will need to be considered further as part of feasibility work.	No change

SR30.36	ESSA Water Activities Centre (main response)	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake	<p>2. <u>Separate location for ESSA at Holyfield lake</u> The Trustees are aware that FGSC have mentioned to LVRPA that land could be made available for ESSA from within the existing site leased by FGSC. However, this potential site has already been considered and rejected by ESSA in the past. The site suffers from a number of serious disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very close to the flood relief channel outlet which is subject to strong currents from the operation of the automatic gates with 'torrents of water cascading over 5ft above normal water level in wet weather' (LVRPA Lake & Riverside Walk around Holy-field Lake, Item J) therefore not a safe location for sailing, particularly for novices. FGSC do not use this area. • The area in question has islands which makes it much less suitable for beginners who would be blown on to the shore of these islands and could be out of the view of the safety crew. • It is also part of the nature reserve that is not designated as a sailing area. • Has no existing suitable access to this area. • Holyfield Lake has a serious weed problem which reduces the sailing area during the busy sailing months. Dinghies have to be towed to a clear weed free area. The hire of a weed-cutter over several years has been at considerable cost to FGSC. 	Comments noted. These are important issues that will need to be considered further as part of feasibility work.	No change
SR30.37	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake	<p><i>continued...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Grid plan to upgrade the electricity sub-station south of Holyfield Lake (5658-01-034 Map of Area 6 Proposals) by extending in a new position immediately north of the existing site (Epping Forest District Council (EFDC) ref: NOLO-OP009 Planning Inspectorate ref: EN02000) to provide a new 400kV power station necessitating land to be acquired from LVRPA. The new extended site will therefore place the substation much closer to Holyfield Weir, conflicting with the FGSC proposed site for ESSA Water Activities Centre. • Holyfield Lake has power lines crossing the main lake and the increase in power from 275kV to 400kV will almost certainly have safety implications for anyone sailing on Holyfield Lake and RYA advice would be required in view of the increased risk of arcing between the power lines and the top of metal masts. In contrast, ESSA Water Activities Centre's current site at Central Lagoon does not have power lines crossing the area of sailing (Google maps show location of power lines on Holyfield Lake and Central Lagoon). • The existing track is in a poor condition and would deter ESSA users in the same way as the shared ESSA / Fisheries track at Central Lagoon does at present. 	Comments noted. These are important issues that will need to be considered further as part of feasibility work.	No change

SR30.38	ESSA Water Activities Centre			6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake <i>continued...</i> To make this area useable for sailing and other water activities, LVRPA would have to provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a stable and firm foreshore launching sites • water and mains sewage • electricity supply • telephone/internet connections/CCTV • secure fencing with suitable storage area for our equipment and containers. • Car park suitable for minibuses ESSA would also require a new training centre to be designed and built at Holyfield Lake with toilets, changing rooms, showers, kitchen and office as we have received professional advice that it would not be feasible to transport our current training centre and toilet facilities to a new site. Our current Training Centre & facilities measure 2500m x 1331m.	Comments noted. These are important issues that will need to be considered further as part of feasibility work.	No change
SR30.39	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake 3. Accessibility Due to the location of Holyfield Lake, it is only accessible by cars, which means that any young person wanting to try sailing or water activities will require an adult to drive them to the proposed new site increasing carbon emissions and decreasing still further our potential client base. In addition, there would be a loss of income from existing scout, guide and other organisations that use our existing site who would find it impractical to travel the additional distance to Holyfield Lake, particularly for evening bookings. There is an angling consortium based at Holyfield Lake and an increase in sailing/water activities on Holyfield Lake and substantial new buildings required to accommodate ESSA Water Activities Centre may well be opposed by existing users. It is the contention of ESSA Charity Trustees that the proposed relocation of ESSA Water Activities Centre to Holyfield Lake at Fishers Green is neither practicable nor feasible and should be <u>withdrawn</u> .	Comments noted. These are important issues that will need to be considered further as part of feasibility work. The proposal under 6.A.4 is retained but revised as discussed above under SR30.2	Amend proposal text for River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation as follows: Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake - Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities to be supported. Undertake feasibility work Explore options with stakeholders to explore options for the relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake i.e. move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake. Feasibility work will need to consider and assess a range of environmental and access issues including: - the ecological impact of proposals on Holyfield Lake, and the adjacent SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England; an Habitat Regulation Assessment may be required, and options and requirements for new and shared facilities and water space between the different water based clubs and groups.

SR30.40	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake	<p><u>5. Practicalities and estimated cost/benefit of relocating ESSA to Holyfield Lake.</u></p> <p><u>Removal</u> - The Trustees have obtained specialist advice on the implications of transporting our buildings, containers and equipment, the major issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meadgate Road and the access track are not in an acceptable condition to allow the heavy transporter and specialist lifting equipment access to ESSA at Central Lagoon. The track would need to undergo substantial repairs to make it useable by the heavy vehicles that would be required for such a major move. • The over-hanging trees along the access track would have to be trimmed back to allow the high vehicles access to ESSA • Tracks will have to be laid across the land at Central Lagoon to allow the lifting equipment for moving the eight shipping containers that are used by ESSA Water Activities Centre for secure storage 	Comments and detailed advice noted	No change
SR30.41	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would take at least a year to plan including planning permission and prepare for relocation and some considerable time for the actual removal and setting-up on the new site. • Several of our existing buildings will have to be dismantled and removed to leave a clear site as required by the terms of our lease, including the recently refurbished Training Centre which was renovated by our volunteer crew. http://www.essa.org.uk/#/essa-news-april-2014/4584372192 • Skip hire for waste disposal to ensure the site is left cleared in accordance with our lease. • It would take some time for LVRPA to obtain planning permission for a new building to accommodate ESSA Water Activities Centre at Holyfield Lake and to arrange in-stallation of mains services which would be their responsibility. 	Comments and detailed advice noted	No change
SR30.42	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake	<p><u>Resources</u> ESSA Water Activities Centre is managed entirely by volunteers and is it clear to the Trustees that our organisation does not have the capacity to oversee the proposed relocation to Holyfield Lake. In order to ensure that ESSA Water Activities Centre could continue to operate with minimum disruption to activities and income during the plan-ning and relocation period, it has become apparent that suitably qualified employees would have to be engaged for a minimum of a three year period (planning, relocation, in-stallation on new site, marketing, obtaining funding grants etc.):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project Manager / Centre Manager £28,000 pa with expertise in a sailing establishment (37 hour/week) Employer on-cost (Includes 8% pension and overheads), estimated at £55,000 2. RYA Principal / Senior Instructor £28,000 in canoeing (30 hour/week) Employer on-cost estimated £53,500. Currently the position of RYA Principal and Central is held by a volunteer. 3. A team of 4 labourers 37 hours £7.21 living wage, 6 months to dismantle and pack, employer on-costs £54,000. 4. Administrator 37 hour/week £22,000 pa, Employer on-cost £44,110 	Comments and detailed advice noted	No change

SR30.43	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake	<p><i>continued</i> ... Estimated costs for 3 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employer cost of salaries £445,500, • Removal costs: £31,000+VAT at current rates, • Supply and lay a track way to facilitate the move £9,000+VAT at current rates, • Skip Hire: £1000+, • New build Training Centre, male and female changing rooms, showers and toilets with disabled access • Installation of mains sewerage or cesspits, mains water, electricity, internet, telephone and CCTV. • New foreshore with 4 slipways: cost £100,000 minimum, • Protection of ESSA Water Activities Centre's income during the 5 year period following any move: Cost £250,000, • Landscaping between training centre and foreshore, • Essex Council to repair Meadgate Road to a suitable standard for HGV lorries, • LVRPA to clear trees and repair access track to a suitable standard for HGV lorries 	Comments and detailed advice noted	No change
SR30.44	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	ESSA at Holyfield Lake	<p>Benefit analysis: Consideration would have to be taken into account on whether ESSA Water Activities Centre would be able to retain and increase their users during the period of relocation and for the following two years. The Trustees have already received feedback from some of our group users that they would not be prepared to travel the additional distance to Holyfield Lake, and with the access to the proposed site only being by car, the Trustees consider that we would not be able to retain our current number of users, and could not be confident that we would gain sufficient new users to compensate for this loss of income. There is no business case for the move which would leave ESSA Water Activities Centre worse off financially. Grant funders normally insist that costs are recovered in a 5 year period and ESSA Water Activities Centre would not be able to satisfy that requirement.</p> <p>This means that the full cost of relocating ESSA to Holyfield Lake would fall on the LVRPA.</p>	Comments and detailed advice noted	No change

SR30.45	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	<p>ESSA at Holyfield Lake</p> <p>6. Practicalities and estimated cost of the public accessing ESSA Toilets The suggestion of the general public using ESSA Water Activities Centre toilet facilities has never been mentioned to the Trustees by LVRPA Officers. The trustees were unaware of the proposal prior to the publication of the consultation draft. Our toilet facilities are housed in second-hand portacabins and drain into a single cesspit. These buildings do not have disabled access & are situated well within our site behind fencing for the security of our young users. Whilst sufficient for ESSA needs, these are not suitable for use by the general public. Furthermore, the cost of cleaning and maintenance is met by ESSA which is a Charity, and it is totally unreasonable for LVRPA to consider imposing additional cleaning and maintenance costs on ESSA that would arise from public use. Existing public toilets are already available at Dobbs Weir only about 10 minutes walk away along the towpath and at Broxbourne Mill. There are also security issues. For the safety of our users, some of whom are special needs vulnerable, all adult volunteers are Enhanced DBS checked, and any stranger entering our site is challenged. We cannot allow the general public to have access to our site to use our toilets; this would place the children and young persons who make up the overwhelming majority of our users at risk.</p>	<p>Comments and detailed points regarding shared use of facilities noted. These matters would need to be fully considered as part of any feasibility work. Proposal 6.A.4 Sport & recreation has been amended to make this clear.</p>	<p>Amend proposal text for River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation as follows: Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake - Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities to be supported. Undertake feasibility work Explore options with stakeholders to explore options for the relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake i.e. move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake. Feasibility work will need to consider and assess a range of environmental and access issues including: - the ecological impact of proposals on Holyfield Lake, and the adjacent SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England; an Habitat Regulation Assessment may be required, and options and requirements for new and shared facilities and water space between ESSA and other boating and sailing groups.</p>
SR30.46	ESSA Water Activities Centre			6.A.4 Sport & Rec	<p>ESSA at Holyfield Lake</p> <p><i>continued...</i> If LVRPA require the general public to have facilities at Central Lagoon, then identical facilities should be provided for the general public and ESSA crew and users. In accordance with the framework these should include toilets, showers (ESSA requires 3 shower units in each), separate entrances for females and males. To ensure safety of ESSA crew and young users the building will require two fully contained and equipped areas separated with two entrances, one facing the access path for the general public, and one only accessed by our crew and users. Needless to say, the sections used by the general public and ESSA Water Activities Centre will have to be completely and securely self-contained with disabled access. The building will require a new hot water system, electricity, external lighting, heating for the winter to prevent pipes freezing, mains water supplies and a new cesspit as the existing cesspit is only suitable for our purposes and not located near the boundary. If LVRPA does continue with their plan for the public to use our privately owned and maintained toilets, then we would require a sub-stancial reduction in our rent paid, as we currently are required to pay a commercial rent for exclusive use, with no discounts as a charity for young persons.</p>	<p>Comments and detaied points about shared facilities noted</p>	<p>Please see above</p>

SR30.53	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7			ESSA	<p>8. <u>Conclusion and Recommendations</u> Conclusions - The consultation draft contains material that is detrimental to ESSA Water Activities Centre which should be removed from the plan. The Authority has failed to make a case for relocating ESSA Water Activities Centre from the Central Lagoon to Holyfield Lake. The proposal is based on the misconception that ESSA Water Activities Centre is a private members club that can be co-located with an existing private members club at Fishers Green and share its facilities. In a members club, the equipment is owned and maintained by its members who would be responsible for moving their own property to a new location. This is not the case at ESSA Water Activities Centre where the substantial number of boats and related equipment are owned and maintained by our charity for the benefit of young people. This response to the consultation sets out the impracticality of the LVRPA proposals and the considerable cost that would fall to be met by the authority with no discernable benefit to the authority or the users themselves. No business case could be made for the relocation and the project would be unworkable. It should therefore be withdrawn.</p>	Following consideration of the detailed comments raised by ESSA amendments have been made to the proposals and the baseline and proposal maps as stated above. The feasibility work will cover a range of issues and start to examine the business case.	Please refer to amendments shown above
SR30.54	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7			ESSA	<p>As to the proposal that the public should be given access to ESSA Water Activities Centre toilets, this proposal has not been thought through by LVRPA and is clearly not based on any knowledge of the existing facilities on our site which would not be suitable for public use. Furthermore, the proposal raises serious concerns on safeguarding grounds alone since our site is used almost exclusively by young people under the age of 18, and this matter was raised at the Upper Lee Valley Regen and Planning Committee Meeting 23 October 2014.</p>	Following consideration of the detailed comments raised by ESSA amendments have been made to the proposals and the baseline and proposal maps as stated above. The feasibility work will cover a range of issues and start to examine the business case.	Please refer to amendments shown above
SR30.56	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7			ESSA	<p>9.2 <u>Remove</u> the detrimental references made through the consultation document to ESSA Water Activities Centre. 9.3 Acknowledge that ESSA Water Activities Centre provides an easily accessible RYA Training Centre for children and young persons, and list our Centre along with other sailing clubs on the LVRPA website (as previously requested), and in maps and documents.</p>	Comments noted and references to named facilities has been changed.	Area 6 and 7 maps amended
SR30.59	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6 & 7			ESSA	<p>9.8 Remove the proposal that ESSA Water Activities Centre should share its toilets with the general public as it is neither cost effective nor feasible and poses a considerable security risk to the children and young persons who use ESSA Water Activities Centre.</p>	Comments noted. The shared use of existing ESSA toilets is an option discussed in the Carthage Environmental Strategy a supporting document to the PDF. Further feasibility work would be needed regarding the provision of toilets and other visitor facilities in this area. Amendments will be made under Area 7, Visitors 7.A.2 Carthage to clarify the position.	Please refer to amendments made in response to 30.4
SR30.61	ESSA Water Activities Centre	6			Centre for Angling	<p>9.10 Should the responses to the consultation draft indicate that there is a demand for a 'Centre of Fishing Excellence', consider providing a Fishing Information/Support Centre at the proposed major visitor hub at Broxbourne as a primary gateway into the River Lee Country Park (Area 6 Proposal: 6A4 Item 5 page 16) or at Amwell Pits which is only 4 miles away from Central Lagoon, and more accessible direct by road and rail. LVRPA could not justify having a 'centre for angling excellence' at both Central Lagoon and Amwell Pits, approx. 4 miles apart.</p>	Comments noted. A centre for angling would need to be located adjacent to a suitable water body and Central Lagoon is considered the preferred location. Proposals for Amwell Pits (Area 8) suggested supporting the development of angling facilities. This site is now in private ownership and it would not be feasible to create a centre for angling at this location.	No change

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

SR32.5	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8		Bio-diversity Otters	<u>Otters</u> The artificial introduction of otters, must not take place, it would be preferred that the natural migration of surplus populations should be allowed to happen, as this would have deleterious impacts on local fish stocks which are already under pressure for other reasons, resulting in low replacement rates. You could end up with local fish populations being decimated and the otters dying of malnutrition once the fish have gone (FYI, this was the fate of an otter near the Olympic Park at Stratford).	Comment noted. Otters became extinct in the Lee Valley in the 1970's and were re-released in the 1990s. Since then the population has become self-sustaining and no further reintroductions are planned. Work will instead focus on ensuring habitat quality is enhanced to benefit a range of species not just Otter	No change
SR32.6	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8		Bio-diversity	<u>Cormorant predation and its impact on fish population and native fish eaters</u> Cormorant predation must be controlled, whilst larger species of fish are safe above a certain size, the juveniles of these are vulnerable, the smaller species are still vulnerable even at breeding age and it is these smaller species that will provide food for birds like herons & king-fishers and young otters. It is now recognised that this is a pan-European problem and guides to the management of the problem have already been produced, which the authority could use to reduce this problem.	Comments noted, the Authority is aware of this issue and works with the relevant agencies to provide a balanced ecosystem.	No change
SR32.7	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8		Cross Rail	Cross-rail 2 and railway crossings The Authority should vigorously defend all existing vehicular crossing points across the railway lines from Cross-rail 2 closures, as this will:- a) Create no go areas on the Hertfordshire side of the Lee Navigation; b) Counteract the intention to protect canal heritage as any canal side dwellings will become worthless and fall into disrepair if they cannot get goods delivered to them, c) If access routes are blocked, in order to achieve visitor access, the Authority will need to create alternate access routes instead (presumably the cost being born by LVRPA not Railway in that case). As most of these routes are not main thoroughfares, perhaps single carriage way bridges (traffic light controlled) could replace them.	Proposal 6.A.4 Environment - Four Tracking and Crossrail2 supports ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure but seeks the retention of rail crossings to ensure access into the Park for all visitors to the Regional Park. 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. The Authority would not wish to see new roads created within the Park to mitigate for closed crossings. Proposals will be amended to reflect the current position.	Amend proposal 6.A.4 Environment as follows: Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 Support ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and work with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 team, the local and county authorities to develop a strategy for retaining crossing points and access into the Park for all visitors and to enable operational management, without large areas of parkland being lost to new bridge landings, new roads or related infrastructure. and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park. The Authority will seek mitigation for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2 proposals; for example improved rail access at Cheshunt station and supporting infrastructure. These proposals may not be resolved within the timescale of these Area proposals.
SR32.8	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			Car parking enhancement Will any/all car parks be fitted with electric car charging points or are they to be ignored thus increasing carbon footprint of travel to the park or reducing visitor numbers using these vehicles due to range limit issues on current models on a single charge?	There are no proposals for electric car charging points within existing car parks in Area 6	No change

SR32.9	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			Bio-diversity	<p><u>Reed-beds restoration and additional planting</u>. In all documents there seems to be an emphasis on the above, I would suggest a moratorium on the planting of new reed beds until the following investigations are performed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil samples taken from both good areas and bad areas, so comparisons can be made and differences examined as to whether restoration is possible (in one case you mention removal of scrub, this would seem to indicate reed bed has functioned sufficiently well enough in land reclamation to encourage secondary colonization!). • An ecological investigation into why existing reed-beds need restoration, i.e. if not substrate what other forces could be at play hampering growth and natural increase. • A survey of the lake bottom profiles to see where suitable new reed beds could be planted, and soil samples taken to see if suitable for purpose. NB As most lakes are former gravel workings, I would not expect them to have the same profiles as natural lakes, which could be part of the problem. • Are the water bodies strong enough ecologically to cope with increased oxygen depletion caused by rotting down of stems etc. as a result of annual die back from these new reed beds, if not then don't plant them or you will create a greater problem i.e. a turgid lifeless waste which will not be inviting to water fowl. 	<p>Comments noted. Reedbeds are an important habitat for a range of wildlife, many areas of reed have been lost due to a number of reasons such as land drainage, development and succession. Much conservation work is about trying to maintain a certain habitat at a particular stage of succession ie halting succession into scrub and eventually woodland. Areas for reedbed creation are chosen carefully to ensure best chances of success. Reedbeds play an important role in improving water quality which will be of benefit to a range of species.</p>	No change
SR32.10	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8				<p><i>continued</i> ... • Will the reduction of open water space although increasing nesting space, reduce feeding areas for water fowl to the extent they won't be able to support either themselves or their young.</p> <p>I would not expect large scale soil dumping to be used to create necessary shallow areas for reed beds, due to the cost and unknown quality of soil which would be used, also dredging of lakes to create them could disturb existing ecology and result in gas release from anaerobic bacteria polluting the water fatally for aquatic environment.</p>	<p>A mosaic of habitats is of benefit to wildlife. The Authority would aim not to create a monoculture of any one habitat but a range of key habitats that cater for a range of needs of key species using the area.</p>	No change
SR32.11	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.1 Visitors		<p>We have already been consulted by Developers of this area, would you like a copy of our list of requirements to them to be taken into account when planning?</p>	<p>If this comment refers to Hazelmere Marina site this has now been redeveloped.</p>	No change
SR32.12	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.1 Sport & Rec	SR32.12	<p>We have concerns about flat canoe route use of redeveloped marina as a portage point, due to the distance from lock to marina seems to preclude it being used. We have concerns about flat canoe route use of redeveloped marina as a portage point, due to Towpath width in approaches to and underneath Station Road, is inadequate on safety grounds for the transport of canoes to above Waltham Town Lock.</p>	<p>Hazelmere Marina has now been re-developed with a range of residential units, moorings and boating facilities. The opportunity to create a portage point and car park did not form part of the development.</p>	<p>Amend text under proposal 6.A.1 Sport and Recreation "Redevelopment of Hazelmere Marina to consider potential for a portage with car parking and shared use of associated amenities provided for boaters at the new maina"</p>
SR32.13	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.1 Sport & Rec		<p>New off line marina is this in addition to redeveloped existing Hazelmere one, as A) Where's it going to be? B) What impact would it have as a result on access to towpath and angling in area?</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>
SR32.14	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.1 Land- scape & Heritage		<p>Support the latter paragraph whole heartedly, however request former paragraph is done intelligently taking into account angling impact. Would request a) only native species used and b) Salix Fragilis is not used near paths due to safety concerns (not known as Crack Willow for nothing).</p>	<p>Commens noted</p>	No change

SR32.15	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.1 Bio-diversity	Whilst in broad agreement with this regarding water quality, however can the LVRPA influence relevant bodies that although the River Lee is counted as a heavily modified river under WFD rules, it should be treated as un-modified in order to improve the food chain lower down so aquatic mammals and native fish eating birds have a food source i.e. better fish stocks?	The river system has been heavily modified by man. The WFD still aims to improve the ecological potential of the heavily modified waterbodies.	No change
SR32.16	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.1 Bio-diversity	Will the LVRPA finally adopt control measures for cormorant predation reduction as this has an impact on native species survival?	Comments noted, however cormorants are a native species and as such have their place in the foodchain.	No change
SR32.17	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.2 Visitors	Final para. Gunpowder mills already has a café, and with one at Whitewater Centre and another near marina, is this overdoing provision to the point of in viability?	Proposals seek to support improved and additional visitor facilities.	No change
SR32.18	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.2 Visitors	3rd par. Could access road to Hooks Marsh car park be extended and a new car park be made for angling use between Hooks Marsh & Hall Marsh, this would increase disabled access to both lakes and as a bonus return access to Friday Lake (alias Cheshunt Marsh) for our own elderly infirm/ disabled members which was lost due to issues with car park for Bowyers Water by unauthorised persons. It would also make it viable for us to have disabled swims made on Friday Lake for people to use.	Comments noted. 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
SR32.19	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.2 Sport & Rec	Aerial walkways, a) how high will they be? and b) Is there an alternative route to avoid contravening Disability Discrimination Act?	This proposal has been amended. Detailed feasibility work would be required for any future changes and issues relating to access for all levels of ability would need to be considered.	Work with Royal Gunpowder Mills and other stakeholders to promote and create new opportunities for informal recreation and natural play, opening up a wider area within the site, to the public . Options presented in the Royal Gunpowder Mills '2012 Vision Statement' document for a public park within the Northern Woodlands accessed via multi-level aerial walkways; Any proposals to be considered in relation to management of the SSSI and Natural England requirements and the interconnectivity of habitats within the River Lee Country Park. Development proposals should be accompanied by detailed ecological, landscape and access management plans given the sensitivity of the site.
SR32.20	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.2 Bio-diversity	Whilst re-wetting of watercourses would be desirable to improve habitat, what provision will be made to:- A) Keep water in these streams flowing and oxygenated? B) If A is not possible, what measures will be emplaced to avoid, slugs of de-oxygenated water flowing into surrounding watercourses and causing fish kills as a result? C) What measures will be emplaced to avoid leachate from contaminated ground, entering surrounding watercourse?	Comments noted. The Environment Agency, the lead partner on this project would ensure that thorough investigations were carried out prior to works commencing	Amend proposal text under 6.A.2 Biodiversity as follows: Support the investigation into and delivery of the Environment Agency's project to rewet the many dry watercourses on the site

SR32.21	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.3 Visitors	Why does café need improving, seems OK to me?	Comments noted. A number of improvements have been made at the Lee Valley White Water Centre including additional café facilities. This proposal will be updated and amended to take on board these changes.	Amend Proposal 6.A.3 Visitors as follows: "Develop the existing visitor offer at the Lee Valley White Water Centre to create a major visitor destination to complement the Royal Gunpowder Mills and Waltham Abbey Gardens. New investment will diversify the range of activities from 'paddle sports' into extreme sports, to create an 'adrenaline' sports hub. Investment options will also consider the potential for hotel accommodation. New catering facilities and car parking planned for completion 2013/2014 Identify sites for cycle hire for visitors intending to explore the Regional Park Market the Lee Valley White Water Centre as a primary access into River Lee Country Park."
SR32.22	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.3 Visitors	Par 2 - Car parking improvements, as part of this work I would demand reinstatement of former access direct to towpath from the centre as was promised by Herts County Olympic Rep. prior to it being built, rather than just being able to use gate at far end as at present. This would open up to disabled/infirm anglers one of the few stretches of canal not closed due to the presence of overhead power cables.	Comments noted. There are several disabled parking spaces within the northern part of the site close to the access gate onto the towpath.	No change to proposals
SR32.23	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.3 Community	The triathlon cycle track must be kept separate from other footpaths and the canal towpath, there is enough trouble from inconsiderate cyclists already adversely interacting with pedestrians, dog-walkers and angler. Any link to them would exacerbate problem i.e. they would treat them as a racetrack.	Comments noted.. The feasibility and management of a new cycle track for triathlon would need to be assessed given the popularity of this area and potential for conflict with other visitors. Proposal will be amended to make this clear.	Amend Proposal 6.A.3 Community as follows: Explore the feasibility of developing a cycle track for triathlon events; this could be located around the edge of the Showground site but be designed to link to other cycle paths in the River Lee Country Park.
SR32.24	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.3 Environment	Why is this blank, surely there must be environmental considerations?	Comment noted. Text has been added to respond to comments raised by the Environment Agency	Following text added under 6.A.3 Environment "Ensure development and operational proposals are consistent with the Water Framework Directive objectives and support implementation of the Thames River Basin Management Plan and the actions it identifies to secure improved water and ecological quality". Work with the Environment Agency, and other stakeholders to support development projects which integrate measures, including sustainable drainage systems 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.
SR32.25	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Pars 1 & 2. Whilst laudable to prefer users utilise public transport, plan must allow for fact that it is not convenient for all users and provide for alternative means to be used as well. Same would apply to land-train etc timetabling. Will land-train and/or buggies routes be limited purely between facilities or will there be intermediate stops as well?	Comments noted. The proposal is to 'explore options' to improve accessibility. It is understood that any work to improve access will need to take account of different requirements and access issues.	No change

SR32.26	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Visitors	With Crossrail 2 in the planning stage, all railway crossings should be retained or replaced by road bridges to avoid creating no go areas due to impossible access constraints. Substitution by footbridges is not acceptable	Proposal 6.A.4 Environment - Four Tracking and Crossrail2 supports ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure but seeks the retention of rail crossings to ensure access into the Park for all visitors to the Regional Park. 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. The Authority would not wish to see new roads created within the Park to mitigate for closed crossings. Proposals will be amended to reflect the current position.	Amend proposal 6.A.4 Environment as follows: Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 Support ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and work with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 team, the local and county authorities to develop a strategy for retaining crossing points and access into the Park for all visitors and to enable operational management, without large areas of parkland being lost to new bridge landings, new roads or related infrastructure. and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park. The Authority will seek mitigation for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2 proposals; for example improved rail access at Cheshunt station and supporting infrastructure. These proposals may not be resolved within the timescale of these Area proposals.
SR32.27	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Par 4 Shouldn't plan also include exploring with Hertfordshire County & Broxbourne Borough Councils improvement to access from that side as well?	The Proposals identify specific areas where pedestrian and cycle access could be improved. These require joint working with a range of stakeholders including Hertfordshire County and Broxbourne Borough Council	No change
SR32.28	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Water taxi, with the example of Olympics one being an over-priced failure, is there any point in pursuing this?	Feasibility work would identify demand for a water taxi service and fully cost the project.	No change
SR32.29	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Whilst Cheshunt station has a better service, with Waltham Cross station being nearest to Whitewater Centre, I don't find it a practical idea to advertise it as the access point for the Whitewater Centre (FYI, I attended the Olympics there and found the 25 minute plus walk from Cheshunt station too long).	Comments noted. Both stations are promoted as access points. However Waltham Cross is closer and in the future train services will improve and make this a more viable option.	Amend proposal 6.A.4 Visitors - 2. <u>Cheshunt Station and Pindar Visitor Gateway</u> - as follows: "Work with partners to improve access and establish a primary gateway into the Park for all visitors from Windmill Lane and Cheshunt Station by: • promoting Cheshunt Station as the primary public transport point into the River Lee Country Park and to the Lee Valley White Water Centre,... "
SR32.30	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Point 3. Unless previous comment (7) re improvement of fish stocks and controlling predation are taken on board, won't be any Bitterns to watch	Comment noted. However the Lee Valley is still proving to be an important wintering site for Bitterns. The Park Authority is working with partners to ensure that we do as much as possible for it to continue to be this way.	No change
SR32.31	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Point 4 Any improvements to attract a greater number of visitors welcomed, however provision of indoor facilities should be commensurate with outdoor ones, so it can be regarded as an all-weather venue, not just when sun shining. I believe it is not open all year at the present; will the expected number of visitors during winter make this viable?	Comments noted. The Proposal seeks to improve facilities and expand the visitor offer to enable the Hayes Hill Farm attraction to open all year round.	No change

SR32.32	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Visitors		Point 5 3rd par. 4th Bullet. Rationalisation of signs for anglers and angling etc. please can you expand what this means, as it should not be used to restrict access from present status as a cost cutting exercise. Also there should be signs for cyclists to allow for other users of paths & towpath.	There is an abundance of signage in this area and not all of these are helpful in terms of information and direction. The proposal seeks to ensure all signs are needed and provide up to date information. There are no plans to restrict access for any users.	No change
SR32.33	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Visitors		Point 5 1st par. 5th Bullet. With the development of the Lido site, could car parking charges be removed for weekends & bank holidays unlike at present, as this appears to be a tax on leisure	Comments noted. Future development of the former Lido site would need to address parking issues and the current car parks.	No change
SR32.34	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec		RLCP & Abbey Gardens. Flat water route from WwC South to Bow, not an issue as that was what Lee Navigation was built for, portage issue as stated in Comments 2 & 3 needs a lot of thought to location	Comments noted. Proposal identifies the need to explore potential for portage points in the area.	No change
SR32.35	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec		RLCP & Abbey Gardens. Interested in opportunities for angling, can you supply more detail?	Comment noted. Reference to angling opportunities at Waltham Abbey Gardens is an error. The Stream here is too narrow, too shallow and too clear to provide the appropriate habitat for fish in any number. The Sport and Recreation proposal will be amended to delete reference to angling.	Amend Proposal 6.A.4 Sport & Recreation for River Lee Country Park South and Waltham Abbey as follows: "Enhance informal recreational facilities at the Waltham Abbey Gardens and opportunities for angling "
SR32.36	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec		Young Mariners Base Par.2. Limit of 6 times use is a contractual obligation within Fishing licences, so licence agreements would need changing. Increased usage would have detrimental impact on environment of River Lee spawning beds. What is proposed increase to be, as 365 days a year would be excessive and create friction between anglers and canoeists? We would have to insist that canoeists are supervised at all times on safety grounds. NB We are not allowed to use our boats to perform maintenance for that reason. No solo canoeists should be allowed to use the river stretch again for safety reasons (there might not be a convenient angler to help if they get in difficulties). We would require that canoeists are supervised so they don't damage environment or angling platforms. We would require that canoeists are supervised so they don't adversely interact with anglers, who are paying to use the water after all.	Comments noted. As stated under SR24.0 above the purple Herts Young Mariners route is incorrectly shown on the Sport and Recreation Proposals map and will be removed. Additional wording will also be added under 6.A.4 Sport and recreation Herts Young Mariners Base to acknowledge the angling use on the waterway. Any increase in accompanied use of the canoe trail on the Old River Lea would be moderate, and would not be to the detriment of angling use, (a change is allowed under the current licence agreement, site specific clause 49 reads: "There are currently six permitted 'paddles' (events/runs) per calendar year (a planned increase of paddle numbers may be applicable within the duration of this Agreement)". No solo canoeists would be allowed.	Amend Sport & recreation proposal 6.A.4 Herts Young Mariners as follows: " Work with Herts Young Mariners Base and the Environment Agency to review and potentially increase use of the Herts Young Mariners canoe trail, (currently only available 6 times a year), taking account of angling use and fish spawning areas. " Amend Sport & Recreation Proposals Map to remove purple Herts Young Mariners Flat Water Canoe Trail and include a revised route avoiding the spawning area
SR32.37	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec		As we pay a large amount of money to fish the river, will canoeists be charged a fee to use the river stretch? NB To use the canal they should have a C&RT licence displayed. In order to protect its legal rights and generate additional income, the LVRPA should charge a fee to use river stretch, as canoes have no legal right of navigation whatever BCU says. NB A recent legal decision upholds this.	Comments noted. The Lee Navigation is the responsibility of the C&RT who also issue the fishing licences.	No change

SR32.38	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec		Young Mariners Base Par.2. If flat water route is to be used more regularly, we would not be in favour of ease of navigation being used to justify damaging the aquatic habitat, fallen trees and other features provide important fish holding/spawning and flood sheltering sites and should be left alone. Turning the river into a waterway devoid of shelter for fish, so a few canoeists can use it would severely impact its amenity value and have financial implications to the authority as current licence fee of £20,000 would not be a viable amount if turned into a fish desert.	Comments noted. This is not the intention. Please refer to response and amendments proposed above SR32.36.	Please refer to changes made under SR32.36 above.
SR32.39	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec		We have to close the fishery at times to anglers because of low water levels, what procedures will be put in place to stop canoeists using the river for the same reason and to the contrary what happens when the river is in flood, when it will be hazardous to navigate?	Comments noted, these matters would have to be included in any revised agreement for changes in use. See amendments to proposal text under 32.36 above.	No change but see 32.36 above.
SR32.40	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec		Young Mariners Base Par.2, Pindar Hub. What will catering outlet be, especially as not far from alternate provision in nearby HYMB/YHA site? Car park opening hours are restricted at present to avoid commuter parking, will this still be so after improvements? If so could we have a key so we can hold club matches on the canal, which we have a licence for fishing rights?	There are no details available as to the nature of any catering outlet. It is likely that car parking provisions will remain the same.	No change
SR32.41	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Angling	"Protect, manage and continue to improve the fisheries within the RLCP as regional leisure and sporting venues for a diverse range of specimen coarse angling." I find this restrictive, should also cater for the ordinary angler not just the specimen hunters i.e. increase canal angling facilities.	Comments noted. The gravel pits within the River Lee Country Park are best suited to specimen angling. There are many opportunities within the Park for a variety of angling	No change
SR32.42	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Angling	As well as renovating disabled swims where stated, could car parking be increased adjacent to Bowyers Water, then our own disabled/infirm anglers would be able to use Friday Lake and justify disabled swims being installed on it, current half mile walk precludes this. NB This is alternate option to 32.18 above	Comments noted. Redevelopment of Britannia Nurseries does allow for a car park for visitors to the Regional Park within the scheme. This will improve access opportunities in the area..	No change
SR32.43	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Sailing	As licencees of top end of Holyfield lake and Relief Channel above it, in our own right and as Fishers Green Consortium members covering the lower part, we would expect to be consulted on this change of use, to see what effect it would have on us. Why is this change of venue needed, what would then happen to Nazeing Central Lagoon?	Comments noted. All stakeholder would be involved in changes on Holyfield Lake. This proposal is linked to the Proposals for Central Lagoon which seek to explore options for a centre for angling on site. Extensive feasibility work will be needed.	Please refer to amendments made under SR30.45 above.
SR32.44	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Biodiversity	Flora & Fauna	1st par. Add canal & rivers to this list or are they being ignored for some reason?	The first paragraph refers primarily to the waters within the RLCP as owned by LVRPA and not the Canal which is the jurisdiction of the C&RT	No change
SR32.45	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Biodiversity	Flora & Fauna	Reedbed maintenance and enhancement, a balance needs to be drawn between this and accessibility to anglers, otherwise you end up with very large reedbeds that no one can penetrate, whether angler, birdwatcher or visitor and a resultant loss of income.	A mosaic of habitats is of benefit to wildlife so we would aim not to create a monoculture of any one habitat but a range of key habitats that cater for a range of needs of key species using the area.	No change
SR32.46	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Biodiversity	Flora & Fauna	Outside designated areas. You will need to work with C & RT plus Environment Agency, regarding non-invasive species e.g. Virile & Signal crayfish, as only a co-ordinated approach on river, canal & lakes will be successful as they are mobile pests and will migrate into previously cleared areas if not controlled by area.	Comments noted and agreed. The Park Authority is involved with a number of forums that ensure partnership working to tackle such issues, such as the Lea Catchment Nature Improvement Area (NIA).	No change

SR32.47	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Biodiversity	Flora & Fauna	Outside designated areas, bullet 3 & 4. My previous 32.20 applies to this point, heavy rainfall should not result in downstream fish kills. Would deeper areas be hazardous, and thus need signing? My previous comment 11 applies to this point, heavy rainfall should not result in downstream fish kills.	Comments noted. Prior to works all areas on site are risk assessed as part of the site Risk Assessment process.	No change
SR32.48	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Biodiversity	Access to nature	Par 1. What's a BIP? Will this require enhanced access routes	BIP stands for Bittern Information Point. Access will be via exiting paths.	
SR32.49	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Biodiversity	Access to nature	Para 3. As most anglers at these venues appreciate their solitude, what impact will this have?	The Proposal seeks to "explore opportunities" to enhance access to nature at Turnford and Cheshunt Pits. A balanced approach will be needed in any improvements made given the sites SSSI status.	No change
SR32.50	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6	Community Proposals Map	6.A.4 Community	Fishers Green	Where would shelters along Navigation be placed?	No specific locations have been agreed. However the Community Proposal Map will be amended to rationalise the notations for Shelters and reposition some. One option includes a Shelter close to Cheshunt Lock alongside the River Lee Navigation.	Amend Community Proposals Map to rationalise Shelter notation and reposition some existing notations.
SR32.51	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Landscape & Heritage		Two heritage subject areas omitted, these are the Canal itself and angling itself in the person of Izaak Walton	Comments noted. The Lee Navigation is identified on the Landscape and Heritage Proposal Map to be protected and promoted for its heritage value. Given the right heritage within the area the Proposals Map also states that throughout Area 6 Proposals for Heritage themed trails will be supported. The history of angling could be a potential subject matter.	No change
SR32.52	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Environment	Lee Valley Park Farm	Par 3. Split on this as fully agree with first part i.e. need better quality water to improve fish population, two issues on latter part, why only recreational boating use as a)It's not a cheap hobby and b)Why not angling as well (as it's more popular cheaper and less likely to be a source of pollution)?	Comments noted, water quality is an important issue in the Park both in terms of recreational boating and angling. Proposal will be amended to add angling.	Amend Environment Proposal 6.A.4 as follows: "Work with the EA and the C&R Trust to improve and maintain water quality and encourage greater use of the waterways for recreational boating and angling. "

SR32.53	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Environment	Crossrail	Rail crossings must be retained as is i.e. if vehicles could cross line before i.e. a level crossing is in place, they must be able to do so after, rail improvements must not be allowed to create an unapproachable island between the railway and the canal. Otherwise the LVRPA will need to build access roads from road crossing points to replace them. NB If deemed to need to be done, it should be at Cross Rail 2 s cost, not footed by LVRPA.	Proposal 6.A.4 Environment - Four Tracking and Crossrail2 supports ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure but seeks the retention of rail crossings to ensure access into the Park for all visitors to the Regional Park. 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. The Authority would not wish to see new roads created within the Park to mitigate for closed crossings. Proposals will be amended to reflect the current position.	Amend proposal 6.A.4 Environment as follows: Four Tracking & Crossrail 2 Support ongoing investment in the Greater Anglia service and Network Rail infrastructure and work with Network Rail/Crossrail 2 team, the local and county authorities to develop a strategy for retaining crossing points and access into the Park for all visitors and to enable operational management, without large areas of parkland being lost to new bridge landings, new roads or related infrastructure. and retain all rail crossings to ensure access into the Park along its western boundary for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists which encourages visitors to the Regional Park. The Authority will seek mitigation for any adverse impacts on the amenity of the Park as a result of Crossrail 2 proposals; for example improved rail access at Cheshunt station and supporting infrastructure. These proposals may not be resolved within the timescale of these Area proposals.
SR32.54	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Environment	Energy	What's NIA stand for? As this involves using track from Hooks Marsh Car park, could some of money be used to provide car park as asked for in comment 32.18?	Comments noted. NIA is Nature Improvement Area - These were introduced by the Government's Natural Environment White Paper to 'enhance and reconnect nature on a significant scale' in England. Work within these areas is targetted for direct improvement to biodiversity and does not cover visitor access	Add NIA to Glossary
SR32.55	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4 Environment	Contaminated Land	When any contaminated land is dealt with, we would want all precautions necessary to be taken to prevent a) Pollution of aquifers b) Pollution of watercourses and/or lakes ponds etc directly and c) Pollution of watercourses and/or lakes ponds etc indirectly e.g. leachate into land drains.	Comments noted and agreed. Any work undertaken by the Authority would have to comply with strict regulations regarding contaminated land.	No change
SR32.56	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4.1 Wharf Rd Inset	Visitors	Par 1. Concur towpath getting overcrowded, inconsiderate cyclists can be problematic. Could low level overhead power cables be relocated to a safe distance further back from towpath, this would open this area up to anglers and increase footfall in area. Par 3. Any plans for this road would need to take into account, this is also the vehicular access route for Nursery Pit and Turnford Consortium pits.	Comments noted. The moving or removal of power cables is a matter for National Grid and would not form part of visitor access improvements. Improvements to Wharf Road would take account of all current users.	No change
SR32.57	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4.1 Wharf Rd Inset	Sport & Rec	Removal or displacing low level overhead power cables would add angling to what's on offer at this point.	Comments noted, but removal or displacement of power cables is a matter for National Grid.	No change

SR32.58	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4.1 Wharf Rd Inset	Bio-diversity	Bullet 2. In order to promote water voles would pest control measures be taken to prevent mink predation? Bullet 5. Please explain what cyclical management of hedgerows along Navigation entails i.e. tractor with hedge-trimmer attachment going along or what? Last line - (promote site as an access to nature site) - I hope this will not include Turnford Pits as increased footfall can be unwelcome to some anglers.	The Park Authority already undertakes Mink monitoring and control in conjunction with regional partners. Hedgerow management would either be done through cutting, probably using tractor-mounted flail, or by hedgelaying. As indicated by the sub area map the Wharf Road inset area does not include Turnford Pits.	No change
SR32.59	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4.1 Wharf Rd Inset		Why is Community blank?	There are no Community related proposals for this area	No change
SR32.60	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4.1 Wharf Rd Inset	Land-scape 7 heritage	Please avoid using Crack Willow (Salix Fragilis) in planting, tendency for large branches to break off or whole tree to fall over in strong winds is a safety hazard.	The species are yet to be agreed but comments noted	No change
SR32.61	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6		6.A.4.1 Wharf Rd Inset	Environment	Concerned that contaminated land may already be causing pollution, if enclosed what precautions will be emplaced to stop this?	Comments noted. Any strategy for dealing with contaminated or potentially contaminated land will need to include a programme of monitoring and contingency planning to deal with pollution events.	No change
SR 32.131	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6	Area 6 Sport & Rec Base map			In the map 5658-01_004_LVRPA_Area6_Base_SportRecreation_Rev1.pdf document the flat water route is not shown at all, let alone using the old River Lee for canoeing purposes. Following conversations with other members of the Fishers Green Consortium, the previous canoe route used involve the Relief Channel instead of the old River Lee on environmental grounds i.e. to avoid damaging spawning beds, so why is a change necessary, when you already have an alternate safer route? Above point also raises the issue that if use of Fishers Green Consortium waters has not been formally planned prior to this document, was this use on an ad-hoc basis and thus becomes "ultra vires" to Authorities powers?	Objection noted. There is an error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area	Amend route notation on Sport & Recreation Proposals Map and remove route as shown between Kings Weir and Fishers Green Lane car park. Revised notation to follow existing route through Holyfield Lake and Flood Relief Channel as currently used 6 times a year under the current permission.

SR 32.132	Secretary Kings Arms & Cheshunt Angling Society	6 to 8			Improvement to angling sites	It is perceived by my members that the higher echelons of the authority are at the least dismissive of anglers if not taking an anti-angling stance, we don't find this to be so at a lower level, in our frequent interactions with the Fisheries Management team. We think the higher echelons should be reminded of the considerable sums paid to the Authority annually by anglers (According to LVRPA published accounts in the last 3 years Fisheries income was 127,000 (2012), 134,000 (2013) & 144,000 (2014). We feel we should be getting something back in return for this other than just a place to fish. FYI we do a lot of our own maintenance where allowed & 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 suite of facilities will be provided or already exist, including refreshments, cycle and car parking, indoor space for meeting, education etc. Within Area 6 there are a number of visitor hubs with good facilities such as the River Lee Country Park, the WWC and Broxbourne meadows. Temporary facilities in less well connected areas are difficult to maintain and prone to vandalism.	No change
SR 32.133						email re not being consulted 12 Jan when in fact their email address not working?		
GI33.0	Waltham Abbey Town Council	6			General	Waltham Abbey Town Council thanks Lee Valley Regional Park Authority for the opportunity to comment on the Park Development Framework, Lee Valley Regional Park Act 1966 Section 14 Draft Proposals, in particular Area 6. We would also like to thank Mr Stephen Wilkinson for his presentation to the Town Council expanding upon the consultation.	Comments noted and welcomed.	No change
GI33.1	Waltham Abbey Town Council	6		6.A.1	Town Mead	In particular, we were pleased to see the inclusion of Town Mead Leisure Park, ref Site No 6.A.1, and the intended support for the leisure park. We would like to see not only "Support measures to enhance the access route into Town Mead Leisure Park through the adjoining industrial estate" but also support and encourage an additional vehicular and pedestrian entrance to the Leisure Park off the A121 road (Meridian Way), close to Highbridge Street.	Comments noted. The creation of a new vehicular access to the Leisure Park would be a matter for the County Highway Authority in the first instance.	No change
GI33.2	Waltham Abbey Town Council	6		6.A.3	WWC	We are pleased to see continued investment and enhancement of the Lee Valley White Water Centre, ref Site No 6.A.3, and would very much like to see cross-promotion of the LVWWC and Town Mead Leisure Park as both cater to activity breaks/days out.	Comments noted and passed to the Lee Valley Leisure Trust Vibrant Partnerships who run the Lee Valley White Water Centre.	No change
GI33.3	Waltham Abbey Town Council				NGAR	Under the environment objective, we would also like to see a commitment to strenuously object to the Northern Gateway Access Road across Rammey Marsh. Enfield Borough Council, as part of its development strategy, the North East Enfield Area Action Plan, has brought forward this proposal to build a road across the Marsh to the detriment of this local area.	These comments refer to sites within the Area 5 Proposals which were adopted in April 2013. Note also that references to NGAR were removed from the North East Enfield Area Action Plan which was adopted in June 2016 and it is s not therefore being taken forward.	No change

GI33.4	Waltham Abbey Town Council				Green Belt	We would also like to see a commitment to the protection of the Green Belt, wherever possible, in particular where the Green Belt is essential to maintaining the green boundaries between the London Boroughs and Waltham Abbey, e.g. Sewardstone Road	Comments noted.	No change
GI35.0	Waltham Abbey Historical Society and Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Friends Association	6		6.A.2	RGM	Thank you for giving members of the public and community groups an opportunity to comment on your ideas for the development of the northern area of the Lee Valley Park. I represent two community interest groups that share concerns about the future of the Royal Gunpowder Mills (RGM). The managing committees of both groups have endorsed the views expressed in this letter. The RGM lies wholly within the statutory boundary of the Lee Valley Park. Like the Park as a whole, it constitutes a public amenity funded entirely from public sources and commercial activities. As a visitor attraction, it provides a complementary experience to the facilities provided, for public benefit, within the Park.	Comments noted and welcomed	No change
GI35.1	Waltham Abbey Historical Society and Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Friends Association	6		6.A.2	RGM	The public consultation documents outlining the Authority's ideas assume the RGM will continue to offer a heritage-orientated visitor attraction indefinitely. This assumption is flawed. The RGM site owner, The Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Charitable Foundation, is proposing to lease on a long-term basis most of the 'listed' buildings and land currently used by the visitor attraction to a private company for use as camp providing 'adventure' holidays for school children. The Foundation's trustees would like to relocate most of the visitor attraction to the wooded northern area of the RGM site and make use of currently derelict buildings. The Foundation's relocation plans are unrealistic. Development of the northern area of the RGM site is restricted by its designation as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) and as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Foundation's limited funds will be depleted by the enablement work required to facilitate commercial development. Sensitive restoration of buildings within SAM/SSSI area to provide exhibition space for the RGM's unique collection of military and industrial artefacts, and high quality visitor facilities, will only be possible if substantial grants can be obtained from external sources.	Comments noted. Whilst the Authority did not object to the planning application for the outdoor recreation and activity centre it did raise concerns and seek further detail about how the important onsite ecology and landscape would be protected and enhanced and how access would be managed including in relation to the existing visitor attractions. The application was refused by Epping Forest District Council 9 June 2016 and is now the subject of an appeal. Changes have been made to the proposal.	Amend Sport & Recreation proposal 6.A.2 as follows: Work with Royal Gunpowder Mills and other stakeholders to promote and create new opportunities for informal recreation and natural play, opening up a wider area within the site, to the public. Options presented in the Royal Gunpowder Mills '2012 Vision Statement' document for a public park within the Northern Woodlands accessed via multi-level aerial walkways, Any proposals to be considered in relation to management of the SSSI and Natural England requirements and the interconnectivity of habitats within the River Lee Country Park. Development proposals should be accompanied by detailed ecological, landscape and access management plans given the sensitivity of the site.
GI35.2	Waltham Abbey Historical Society and Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Friends Association	6		6.A.2	Access to historic buildings	The Lee Valley Park, north of the M25, will be diminished if the RGM visitor attraction closes. Waltham Abbey, with the RGM, the Abbey Church and Gardens, its historic town centre with Epping Forest District Museum, is the most important 'heritage' visitor destination in this area. The Authority now has the opportunity to include within its plans, a commitment to the conservation and promotion of public access to historic buildings within its boundaries. The RGM, and other heritage sites, complement the extensive visitor facilities provided by the Authority for sport and general recreation and enable the Park to appeal to a wider demographic commensurate with its reliance on public funding. In view of the current proposals for commercial exploitation of part of the RGM site, the Authority's development plans should confirm support for maintaining public access to the RGM's historic buildings and artefacts as part of a heritage-orientated visitor attraction.	Comments noted. These points are covered by current proposals under landscape and Heritage theme.	No change

GI35.3	Waltham Abbey Historical Society and Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Friends Association	6		6.A.2	RGM	The Authority should in addition: - Oppose any development on the RGM site that has any adverse environmental impact on the adjacent Lee Valley Country Park and Cornmill Meadows SSSI. Work with stakeholders to promote Waltham Abbey as a Lee Valley park heritage visitor destination. - Promote the continuing use of RGM as a venue for open-air events. The RGM offers a more compact event site than the Lee Valley Showground. - Provide land within the park boundary for a children's holiday camp, as alternative to the RGM site. This would enable the operator to make use of the Lee Valley Park facilities with no detrimental impact on the RGM visitor attraction/historic buildings. - Examine options for improving pedestrian and cycle access between the Lee Valley White Water Centre, the RGM, Cornmill Meadows and Waltham Abbey Gardens. - Work in partnership with the Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Charitable Foundation to improve public access to the northern wooded area of the RGM site within the constraints imposed by its SAM/SSSI designation.	Comments noted. These points are covered by the proposals. The recent planning application to redevelop part of the WARGM site as an outdoor recreation and activity centre for children was refused by Epping Forest District Council 9 June 2016 and is now the subject of an appeal.	No change
GI35.4	Waltham Abbey Historical Society and Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Friends Association	6		6.A.2	RGM	The Authority is urged to consider carefully the issues raised here. The RGM is an integral part of the public amenity offered by the Park north of the M25. Decisive action now will enable the Authority to publicly assert its credentials as a conservator of heritage with a commitment to ensure the Park appeals to a wide demographic. Representatives of both Waltham Abbey Historical Society and the Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Friends Association would welcome the opportunity to discuss the issues raised here with members of the Authority and/or its officials.	Comments noted	No change
GI 43.0	Individual 5. A. Bennett	6	Sport & Rec Thematic Map		Canoeists on River Lea	Possible canoeists on river lee - as they do not pay to use the river i do not see why they are allowed to use it i am an angler and i have to pay so why shouldn't they i know this argument is on-going but they seem to think they have i right to use and abuse the river at our expense	Objection noted. There is an error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area	Amend route notation on Sport & Recreation Proposals Map and remove route as shown between Kings Weir and Fishers Green lane car park. Revised notation to follow existing route through Holyfield Lake and Flood relief channel as currently used 6 times a year under the current permission.
GI44.0	Individual 6 C. Fundrey	6	Sport & Rec Thematic Map		Canoeists on River Lea	I would like to raise my objections to using any part of the River Lee contained in your documentation for increased canoeing and similar water recreation. I am an angler and feel that more canoeists etc will greatly affect the sport we enjoy by; - Scaring off fish/waterway fauna with there canoeing activity and talking/shouting between themselves. - Inability to us to fish properly and having to constantly wind in our equipment to allow canoeists to pass to prevent expensive fishing equipment being damaged - It will lead to a lot of conflict between fishing community and the boating community	Objection noted. There is an error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area	Amend route notation on Sport & Recreation Proposals Map and remove route as shown between Kings Weir and Fishers Green lane car park. Revised notation to follow existing route through Holyfield Lake and Flood relief channel as currently used 6 times a year under the current permission.

GI44.1	Individual 6 C. Fundrey		Sport & Rec Thematic Map		Canoeists on River Lea & Angling	As you are probably well aware Anglers pay for an annual rod license (& club subscriptions for most of these stretches) to fish the river. This goes towards the upkeep of our rivers & waterways. As far I am aware canoeists to not pay to use rivers/waterways so that initially is not fair on the fishing community. That would not be fair to the angler. Also the River Lee is renowned in the angling world & press as having exceptional fishing and is very famous for some huge fish in these stretches including Dobbs Weir etc. By being unable to effectively fish these stretches due to the issues above will be affecting a huge majority of people who contribute to the uptake of the river. I look forward to a response to my email and for it to be used as a contribution towards my objections to this plan.	Comments and objection noted and as stated above there is an error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area	Please refer to the map notation amendments above
GI46.0	Individual 8. D Willis	6			Litter	I have literally only come across this document today, rather by accident and it is too late to fully digest and comment. Nevertheless hopefully there is still time for me to make a few comments. As daily dog walkers I believe we are in a strong position to comment. 1. Dog Mess, - This is dreadful. Too many people don't pick up, even on the paths. Others bag and leave which is possibly worse. Also there aren't enough bins, especially along the canal where the regular bin by the lock is always overflowing. Where are the wardens? What about penalties? 2. Litter, - Again, there is litter everywhere, especially along the banks of the streams. Sadly this is man/woman made and a terrible indictment of the society we live in. Where are the wardens? What about penalties? The walk from the top of the showground to the lock is one we call Werther's Walk. This is because it is littered with Werther's wrappers which are distinctively gold. We suspect the same person has been discarding them along this path for years. Sadly like the Otters I have never spotted them!	These management issues have been noted and passed to the Authority's Head of Parklands.	No change
GI46.1	Individual 8. D Willis	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Facilities	3. Paths, - Parts of the site have no paths (Dragonfly Sanctuary, Showground) or paths have been badly damaged (Bowyer's Water). Also the path/road past the substation towards the weir is terrible. Any vehicles using this risk serious damage to their cars. It is also dangerous to walkers as when wet you cannot see how deep the potholes are! 4. Toilets, - Where are there any near to Waltham Abbey?	Many areas of the Park have hard surfaced paths for use by those walking or cycling. In some areas however this type of path is not considered appropriate due to the conditions on site or the nature conservation requirements in which case more informal mown grass paths are provided. Toilets are available at the Lee Valley White Water Centre.	No change
GI46.2	Individual 8. D Willis	6		6.A.3	WWC	5. White Water Centre, - I have suggested before that in the summer there should be some kind of family splash zone in the lagoon together with a picnic area. I appreciate that there are Health and Safety concerns but I would happily volunteer. Although a fabulous venue and legacy it is too expensive for most local people.	The Centre offers a range of activities and events at a number of different price points. During summer there is free access to 'The Beach' and other waterside events. Other schemes desinged to attract families are being actively developed.	No change

GI46.3	Individual 8. D Willis	6		6.A.2	RGM	6. Royal Gunpowder Mills, - We have visited, but only twice. More needs to be done to attract people but the access is poor (and dangerous) and much of the site remains a derelict eyesore, hardly attracting passers-by!	Comments noted, This site is managed by the Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Mills Charitable Foundation, with the help of volunteers. The site has considerable heritage and ecological value and proposals in the PDF seek to support sensitive restoration and improvements to visitor facilities.	No change
GI46.4	Individual 8. D Willis	6			Consultation	With no specific local paper or signs I have no idea where this consultancy was advertised. Clearly I missed it but hope it's not too late to make these comments. Please let me know if there are to be any further displays of the plans or outcomes.	Comments noted and you have been added to the consultee database for future consultation events.	No change
GI48.0	Individual 10 E. Whorne	6	Area 6 Proposals Map Sport & Rec		Canoeists on the River Lea	In respect of the Lea Valley Park consultation document (leevalleypark.org.uk/gov/go/678consult) and specifically regarding section 6 reference the old river Lea watercourse running down from Kings wears to the confluence with the relief channel, known as Fishers Green and to the change of use, ie, canoe access. I would like to object to the proposed opening of the waterway to canoe use which will cause damage to the fragile aquatic environment of the old river watercourse and therefore equally to its wildfowl and water mammal population.	Objection noted. There is an error on the Sport & Recreation Proposals Map which will be amended. The Flat Water Canoe Trail is incorrectly shown between Kings Weir and the Fishers Green Lane car park as described. A revised route will be shown avoiding the spawning area	Amend route notation on Sport & Recreation Proposals Map and remove route as shown between Kings Weir and Fishers Green lane car park. Revised notation to follow existing route through Holyfield Lake and Flood relief channel as currently used 6 times a year under the current permission.
GI48.1	Individual 10 E. Whorne	6	Area 6 Proposals Map Sport & Rec		Angling	During the spring and summer months, some gravel areas of the river can be very shallow, 6" to 12" in places and these areas are vital breeding habitats for some of the fish species such as Barbel and Chub, plus invertebrate. Canoes even with a shallow draft and paddle movement will cause damage to these areas. Reed and weed beds are desperately required to offer cover and breeding grounds for other, egg laying, fish species such as Roach and Dace plus importantly the water insect population and a food source for the waterfowl. Some years ago the water plants, natural to this environment, such as ranunculus proliferated however due to past overzealous cutting and destruction of the reed and weed beds they now struggle in places along this short section of natural river. Canoe and paddling will cause further damage to these fragile beds. Some overhanging trees and bushes that have grown into the water are used as nesting and roosting sites for many of the waterfowl such as coots and moorhens, plus offer valuable refuge for much of the fish population. The river is narrow, canoes and paddling will cause disturbance and damage. During times of heavy rainfall, summer and winter, the river becomes swollen, powerful and very dangerous.	Comments noted, please refer to the response above	Please refer to the response above
GI48.2	Individual 10 E. Whorne	6	Area 6 Proposals Map Sport & Rec		Angling	There will likely be a financial implication for the Parks authorities relevant to the current revenue received from the lease holders, Fishers Green Consortium. This short section of the old river Lea, is a nationally renowned fishing venue of over 50 years standing. Many anglers, from near and far, still join the clubs in the current consortium for a chance to fish the venue. In recent years the venue has struggled to maintain its fish population due to environmental problems and predation, with the now added canoe/paddling damage and disturbance its popularity will suffer and potentially, if members show little interest in the venue, clubs could withdraw from the consortium.	Comments noted, please refer to the response above	Please refer to the response above

GI48.3	Individual 10 E Whorne	6	Area 6 Proposal Map Sport & Rec		Canoeists on the River Lea	There is a viable alternative to the proposed canoe route outlined on the map referenced (5658_01_022_LVRPA_Area6_Proposals_SportRecreation_Rev3) . Instead of leaving Holyfield Lake and moving onto the old river at the section marked (Investment In Current Angling Infrastructure Exclusion & Buffer Zones) the canoe route can remain on the Holyfield Lake and continue around the lake until Holyfield weir. Then portage onto the Relief channel which will then re-join the proposed new route, approximately one mile downstream opposite Stubbing Nursery.	Comments noted, please refer to the response above	Please refer to the response above
GI49.0	Individual 11 C McGuire	6 to 8			Horticulture	I read with interest your proposals re horticulture. Do you wish to miss out on the possibility of a large slice of 4 billion pounds turnover per year; well I inform you. That is what the Cherry Industry is worth to Spain, including canning , preserving and fresh crops. Due to climate changes and water supplies the industry has to relocate northwards, Essex and Hertfordshire have been researched 4 years ago and it looks good. The soil tested. Well its up to you.	Comments noted	No change
GI50.0	Individual 12 H Phillips	6		6.A.2	RGM	I have been reading this excellent document and it's proposals to develop and enhance this area. I have a particular interest being a long standing volunteer at the Royal Gunpowder Mills. I am sure you must be aware of the ongoing negotiations with PGL to lease the a major part of the site for use as a children's adventure camp. The proposals would result in changes that are diametrically opposite to the Area 6 proposals for the Gunpowder Mills. If the agreement with PGL goes ahead it will result in major building work on the open land, wholesale destruction of the visitor attraction and closure of most of the land to the general public. I sincerely hope that the LVRA will be objecting to this plan if and when it should reach planning application stage.	Comments noted. The recent planning application to redevelop part of the WARGM site as an outdoor recreation and activity centre for children was refused by Epping Forest District Council 9 June 2016 and is now the subject of an appeal. Whilst the Authority did not object to the planning application for the outdoor recreation and activity centre it did raise concerns and seek further detail about how the important onsite ecology and landscape would be protected and enhanced and how access would be managed including in relation to the existing visitor attractions.	No change

GI51.3	Individual 13 J Nokes	6 & 7		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	Fishers Green Sailing Club I visited Fishers Green and feel that access is not suitable . The lake is a lot further, access is from the notorious Crooked Mile road down a very long drive into the middle of the park, followed by a approx 20 minute walk to the actual club. This rules out any youngsters attending on foot or on their bikes. The lake itself although bigger appears to be dotted with hazards (islands) and has a large weir at one end. (photo 2) <i>Photo of island supplied</i> The report states that the Lee Valley Park wants to create a Centre of Excellence for sailing. This cannot be created by putting everyone in the same place. Beginners and experts have different needs. A sailing club has a membership who pay to belong. They decide their sailing programme. This generally includes a Day of racing and of race training. They do not have beginners out when they are racing. When sailors are racing they want to win and they hate having anyone in their way. Youngster who are learning do not know how to keep out of their way and can be really upset by the experienced sailors. (I know, as a youngster at Herts Young Mariners I was subjected to abuse because I managed to in someones way when I was learning to sail some 40 years ago).	Comments and detailed points regarding shared use of facilities and water space noted. These matters would need to be fully considered as part of any feasibility work. Proposal 6.A.4 Sport & recreation has been amended to make this clear.	Amend proposal text for River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation as follows: Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake - Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities to be supported. Undertake feasibility work Explore options with stakeholders to explore options for the relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake i.e. move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake. Feasibility work will need to consider and assess a range of environmental and access issues including: - the ecological impact of proposals on Holyfield Lake, and the adjacent SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England; an Habitat Regulation Assessment may be required, and options and requirements for new and shared facilities and water space between the different water based clubs and groups.
GI51.4	Individual 13 J Nokes	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA As a Water Activity centre the youth groups have exclusive use of the building with all adults DRB checked - If Lee Valley does move ESSA to Fishers Green would they provide a new Building or tell the Sailing club they are not able to use their building at certain times?	Comments noted. The matter of shared facilities is an important consideration for further feasibility work. Please refer to comments above	Please refer to the proposed changes above
GI51.5	Individual 13 J Nokes	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA In the report there is mention of replacing the buildings at Central Lagoon - This is a good idea - BUT work with ESSA water activity centre so that they can continue on Central Lagoon and during School times the buildings could offer an excellent facility for school to enjoy the outdoors. I feel that schools would appreciate a location that had a boundary.	Comments noted, please see related comments above.	Please see related amendments above under GI51.3
GI51.6	Individual 13 J Nokes	6 & 7		7.A.2 Visitors	Meadgate Road Look forward to seeing the improvements in Meadgate road - I believe Lignacite are currently making another entry to the factory from the main road which might help a bit.	Comments noted	No change
GI52.0	Individual 14 L Elks	6			Visitors Area 6 is a wonderful space providing freedom to wander and appreciate the beauty of the place and the diversity of birds and plant life. I do not know what analysis the Park Authority has made of the habits and preferences of visitors but my very strong intuition (having spoken to many visitors over the years) is that the great majority of visitors are regular visitors and that what they value most is the ability to roam freely in the area using a diversity of routes. I do not at all disagree that the Park Authority should promote awareness of the Park to new visitors but I think that there is a danger of over-emphasising entrances, gateways and signposts into the Park as opposed to movement within the Park.	Comments noted	No change

GI52.1	Individual 14 L Elks	6		6.A.4 Visitors	Access	I make the following proposals: 1. The possibilities for circulation would be increased if there were better possibilities for movement between Fishers Green and Broxbourne and Kings Weir. The path to the Grebe Hide is a dead end and the circumnavigation of 70 Acre Lake on the east side is quite daunting (and extremely muddy). I would suggest: a. A path from the Grebe Hide to Kings Weir b. A light new bridge over the Navigation from a point close to Grebe Hide c. Proportionate footbath improvements around 70 Acre Lake.	Comments noted. Some pathway improvements are planned/completed/proposed	Update mapping where appropriate
GI52.2	Individual 14 L Elks	6		6.A.4 Visitors		2. Your proposals moot the possibility of refreshment facilities in Fishers Green. It would indeed be good to have some modest facility at Fishers Green or Hooks Marsh. But if the Park Authority does go down this route, please let it be respectful of the quietness of place. The beloved tin huts at Epping Forest would be a good model.	Comments noted	No change
GI52.3	Individual 14 L Elks	6		6.A.4 Visitors		3. There are paths going eastwards towards Galley Hill, Galley Wood and Aimes Green with some excellent circular walks. Some modest improvements of signposting and path maintenance would be helpful.	Comments welcomed and noted	No change
GI52.4	Individual 14 L Elks	6			Accommodation	4. I believe that there is a need for some bed and breakfast accommodation.	Comments noted	No change
GI52.5	Individual 14 L Elks	6		6.A.4 Landscape & Heritage	Waltham Abbey Gardens	5. Finally, I have been surprised over the years by the Park Authority's lack of horticultural ambition for Waltham Park Gardens. It is a magnificent site, of the highest historical interest with glorious beautiful walls. The Park Authority should work with the very best landscape architects (and possibly seeking HLF funding) to develop plantings worthy of the site.	Comments noted	No change
GI54.0	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	These comments are submitted with the intention of supporting, and improving, the opportunities for ESSA at the Central Lagoon, in alignment with the policies and intentions of the Lea Valley Regional Park Authority as set out in the "Area 7 Draft Proposals Schedule". ESSA is a small independent water sports facility located on the south west bank of the Central Lagoon, Nazeing. ESSA has been in this location since 1993. ESSA provides opportunities for local individuals and groups, particularly youth groups, to learn to sail and do other water activities. As a member of a Hertford youth group with a water-based remit, this facility is extremely important as it is our best accessible and economical local sail-training facility. In the Draft Proposal for Area 7, development of the environs of Central Lagoon is discussed in some detail with various possibilities proposed. There is mention of opening this area of the park to a greater amount of public access. The land adjacent to ESSA to the north contains former residential plots that might be redeveloped to "open woodland" for "Day Camping". There is mention of providing a "Centre for Angling" and of relocating ESSA to Holyfield Lake. There is the suggestion of a new set of amenities and car park in that vicinity. There is alternatively, mention of use of ESSA facilities as public toilets for passing visitors and for users of the open woodland.	Comments noted. Information about ESSA, its operations status and activities also noted.	No change

GI54.1	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA <i>continued..</i> ESSA is an independent RYA Training facility and whilst it is open to members of the public by prior arrangement, for reasons of safeguarding it is not appropriate for members of the public to enter unannounced to use amenities. ESSA is not a sailing club and instead is a Charitable Trust that provides water-sport opportunities to members of the local community, typically Scout and Guide groups. Some of these groups come from far away to use the venue, to stay for days at a time. ESSA has been in its present location since 1993 despite the access being poor and an urgent need for investment in the infrastructure. This clearly emphasises that the water sports venue is highly popular and attractive to individuals and groups within the local community and it is hoped that Lea Valley will recognise this is a significant asset within the Lea Valley Park. It is hoped the LVRPA will do everything it can to support it. The ESSA trustees clearly wish to make progress in the level of provision ESSA can make to the community, and ESSA deserves the opportunity to continue in the secure knowledge that Lea Valley Park will give them full support for many years to come.	Comments and information about ESSA and its operations noted. ESSA have provided detailed comments on the draft proposals.	No change
GI54.2	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA Comment upon plans for the use of the Central Lagoon. Presently the use of the lagoon is primarily two-fold – for ESSA and for Anglers. Several swims were located around the lake, some of these have fallen into disrepair. These two activities can, with a little mutual tolerance, coexist on the lake, as is also the case on the Northern Lagoon. One of the proposed plans is for a “Centre for Angling” to be established on the Central Lagoon, with a amenities, unspecified, to cater for both anglers and the General Park Visitor. The plans state this may require ESSA to relocate to Holyfield Lake. “This will require relocation of the ESSA Water Activities Centre sailing and boating activities; options to be explored with ESSA and other stakeholders to make provision for the sailing base at Holyfield Lake in Area 6. The option analysis will require feasibility studies into the use of shared facilities between ESSA and other boating and sailing groups.” It appears that at the time of this statement the options have not been discussed with ESSA and the other stakeholders; nevertheless the Consultation Process does invite response upon this. The ESSA Trustees had been asked to consider relocating to Holyfield Lake in 2010 and rejected the proposal on several grounds; those grounds have not changed since then – please refer to ESSA Trustees for full details.	It is the case that the proposal to relocate ESSA requires detailed feasibility work as does the proposal for a 'Centre for Angling'. ESSA have provided detailed comments on the draft proposals. Amendments will be made to proposals under both 7.A.2 and 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation and 7.A.2 Visitors to clarify the need for detailed feasibility work. Please refer to Area 7 document for changes to 7.A.2	Amend proposal text for River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation as follows: Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake - Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities to be supported. Undertake feasibility work Explore options with stakeholders to explore options for the relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake i.e. move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake. Feasibility work will need to consider and assess a range of environmental and access issues including: - the ecological impact of proposals on Holyfield Lake, and the adjacent SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England; an Habitat Regulation Assessment may be required, and options and requirements for new and shared facilities and water space between the different water based clubs and groups.

G154.3	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	Centre for Angling The proposals refer to a "Centre for Angling" on the central lagoon – this might be considered of restricted overall benefit to the community. Anglers prefer privacy and seclusion. This proposal seems of little merit to the myriad of community of youth groups and independent water sports enthusiasts from the local area up the valley to Ware and to Hertford. Sailing and Angling coexist on the Northern Lagoon and both may continue to be accommodated if ESSA is sustained in its present location. Further it is noted that the attraction of the Central Lagoon for anglers is restricted to the number of swims, and that one of the planning diagrams proposed shows swims only on the East side of the lagoon - 5658-01_004_LVRPA_Area7_Base_SportRecreation, although elsewhere in the Proposal there is talk of renovated disabled access swims on the East side. If the Lea Valley feels strongly that amenities and facilities are required in this area, the investment might be done in conjunction with ESSA which draws the majority of users to the Central Lagoon. Whilst there might be the possibility of investing where Meadgate Road reaches the river bank, investment near ESSA could be of mutual benefit, however there are issues of privacy and safeguarding to be taken into account. ESSA would benefit from improvements to the track, and perhaps from interest from members of the public using adjacent public amenities, nevertheless, for reasons of safeguarding, seclusion and privacy is significant to ESSA.	Comments noted. Angling is a very popular activity within the Regional Park and although both angling and sailing have managed to co-exist on the Central Lagoon this has required restrictive practices for both operations which are not sustainable. The larger size of water on the North Lagoon, the lower number of fish and the more advanced sailing skills of those sailing with the Broxourne Sailing Club has enabled a much more successful co-existence of sailers and anglers on the North Lagoon. The proposed detailed feasibility work will need to consider the advantages and disadvantages of moving ESSA to Holyfield Lake alongside the cost of retaining current facilities at Central Lagoon, factoring in cost of future upgrades and improvements to facilities. Further amendments will be made to proposals under both 7.A.2 and 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation and 7.A.2 Visitors to clarify the need for detailed feasibility work. Please refer to Area 7 document for changes to 7.A.2	Amend proposal text for River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation as follows: Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake - Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities to be supported. Undertake feasibility work Explore options with stakeholders to explore options for the relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake i.e. move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake. Feasibility work will need to consider and assess a range of environmental and access issues including: - the ecological impact of proposals on Holyfield Lake, and the adjacent SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England; an Habitat Regulation Assessment may be required, and options and requirements for new and shared facilities and water space between the different water based clubs and groups.
G154.4	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Visitors	ESSA The proposals mention the possibility of opening the former residential land between the river and the Central Lagoon for "day camping". The woodland and temporary shelters therein may not bring in as many visitors as these again require a degree of seclusion, however they may create issues such as littering, whilst the cost of servicing the necessary amenities might not be recovered.	Comments noted. Feasibility work for the proposed day camping will need to take account of operational issues such as services and day to day management issues. Hence the proposal state "investigating the feasibility of designing and constructing a limited number of carbon neutral 'sustainable' huts.... A detailed scheme is currently being developed with ESSA closely involved.	No change
G154.5	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Visitors	ESSA Investment in the track along the East side of the Central lagoon from Meadgate Road to ESSA would be appropriate if LVRPA were to support the community effort and opportunity that ESSA has been providing since 1993. Investment in ESSA is deserved. ESSA had 3000 visits last year. Due to difficulty obtaining grants for investment, pending securing a long-term lease, considerable investment in ESSA is highly sought after by the users and trustees. The many attractions and benefits of water sports are clearly recognised by those whom it is not appropriate to belong to a Sailing Club. The benefits of water-sports activities to the community are substantial in terms of enhancing interpersonal communication and community cohesiveness. Supporting cooperative investment from Lea Valley, in recognition of the demand for ESSA, would enhance what is already a significant asset to the community. Nevertheless the Trustees of ESSA are merely seeking to be given a long term lease in their present location so that they can seek the investment from further afield, such as Sport England, and the Landfill Trust. Investment is urgently required to improve the foreshore, and grant applications demand a long term lease.	Comments noted.	No change other than those made under G154.3 above

G154.6	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Visitors	<p>ESSA</p> <p>For the LVRPA to utilise the land between the river and the Central Lagoon for public recreation – Day Camping, investment in access would be beneficial – and that would assist ESSA too. A car-park, toilets and waste facilities would support local Anglers. The Meadgate Road, and the track to the swims and to ESSA deserves investment. ESSA is already paying a significant rent for the short term leasing agreement, this may be considered a greater contribution to the Park than may be collected by Day Camping visitors and anglers whose numbers must be low since they seek seclusion.</p> <p>In consideration it would make sense for LVRPA to support the Trustees of ESSA by providing a robust lease that allows ESSA to source funding for investment; and LVRPA would also be able to support ESSA through investment in the track to ESSA and the East-side swims, and to Meadgate Road, to enhance car parking and shared public amenities. This would enable ESSA to grow and offer better facilities to young people and community groups. In supporting and promoting ESSA, the LVRPA would be promoting the interests of many Park visitors.</p>	<p>Comments noted, feasibility work will need to consider these issues and the investment options.</p>	<p>No change other than those made under G154.3 above</p>
G154.7	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		6.A.4 Sport & Rec	<p>ESSA</p> <p><u>Comment upon the Suggested of Relocation of ESSA to Holyfield Lake.</u> - Already there is an independent private, sailing club at Holyfield Lake. Considerable investment would be required to relocate ESSA to Holyfield Lake. A new training building would be required, due to safeguarding issues of sharing facilities with the existing club. There would be issues relating to Safeguarding if the same facilities were to be used by the two different groups at the same time.</p> <p>Access to ESSA from the North, despite the poor track, is easier than to Holyfield Lake. ESSA is certainly much more accessible from Hertford and Ware. For ESSA, the visitors from Hertford and Ware can cycle along the river-side safely and conveniently. Holyfield Lake is too far away to undertake this readily. ESSA is readily accessible on foot from Broxbourne mainline rail station, and as such may attract visitors from London. Holyfield Lake is less accessible by rail. The nearest station is Cheshunt and from there, Herts Young Mariner's Base is accessible.</p> <p>The private users of the sailing club may not appreciate the medley of young people sailing for the first time, an activity which is best kept secluded and to some extent private, not only for safeguarding reasons but for other practicalities.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is agreed that the proposal to relocate ESSA requires detailed feasibility work. This would need to consider a range of options and the advantages and disadvantages of each. The cost of implementing each option would be a major factor in any decision made. For each option there is a need to consider the cost of moving ESSA to Holyfield Lake alongside the cost of retaining current facilities at Central Lagoon factoring in cost of future upgrades and improvements to facilities. Likewise issues of access, particularly using public transport and cycle/walking routes will also need to be considered. The requirement for separate facilities on child protection grounds is a valid point and an amendment to the draft proposals under 7.A.2 Sport and Recreation was made prior to consultation. Further amendments will be made to proposals under both 7.A.2 and 6.A.4 Sport and Recreation and 7.A.2 Visitors to clarify the need for detailed feasibility work. Please refer to Area 7 document for changes to 7.A.2</p>	<p>Amend proposal text for River Lee Country Park 6.A.4 under Sport & Recreation as follows: Sailing, Boating and Rowing Holyfield Lake - Holyfield Lake to be managed and promoted and support the management of Holyfield Lake as a centre of excellence for sailing. Improvement of and investment in existing sailing and boating facilities to be supported. Undertake feasibility work Explore options with stakeholders to explore options for the relocation of the existing Water Activities Centre relocate sailing and boating facilities from Nazeing Central Lagoon Area 7 onto Holyfield Lake i.e. move the ESSA Water Activities Centre onto Holyfield Lake. Feasibility work will need to consider and assess a range of environmental and access issues including: - the ecological impact of proposals on Holyfield Lake, and the adjacent SSSI/SPA in consultation with Natural England; an Habitat Regulation Assessment may be required, and options and requirements for new and shared facilities and water space between the different water based clubs and groups.</p>

GI54.8	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	<p>Personal Interest</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As an adult member of a Hertford Youth Group with intentions to support the ongoing use of ESSA and Central Lagoon for water activity training. 2. Volunteering at ESSA for several years has provided personal skills and social benefits. 3. Recognition that ESSA is an excellent venue for socialising amidst many community groups. 4. Recognition that a prosperous ESSA at the Central Lagoon brings more benefit to Lea Valley than other uses. 5. Recognising that the independently run charitable organisation is a key asset in the community, and that the Trustees of ESSA have maintained that Central Lagoon is the preferred location. 	Comments noted.	No Change
GI54.9	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>ESSA presently serves a large number of individuals and community groups within the Lea Valley and further afield. ESSA is on an excellent location from the perspective of accessibility and seclusion.</p> <p>ESSA deserves investment both in terms of obtaining a longer lease that can be used to facilitate investment grants, and in improvements to road access and car-parking. Investment in these would support other users of the Park too. Provision of additional nearby amenities such as toilets and waste collection would be needed if Day Camping and "Centre of Angling" were introduced. While these may be of general benefit, they may not draw sufficient members alone to be worthwhile; done in conjunction with a little investment for ESSA, there might be mutual benefit. Safeguarding issues would need to be respected.</p>	Comments noted and have been addressed above	Please refer to responses above.
GI54.10	Individual 16 M Fry	6 & 7		7.A.2 Sport & Rec	ESSA	<p><i>summary continued</i>.. Presently ESSA is a source of visitors and income to the Central Lagoon area which may not be replaced solely by day-campers and a Centre of Angling.</p> <p>It would not serve the public interest by relocating ESSA to Holyfield Lake. Relocating would require investment and introduces safeguarding issues as well as problems of accessibility.</p> <p>The Trustees of ESSA and the Users of ESSA prefer for Lea Valley to endorse and promote ESSA as an independent charitable trust for the benefit of the local community – and for the Park.</p>	Comments noted and have been addressed above	Please refer to responses above.
GI56.0	Individual 18 B Smith	6 to 8			Glass-house Industry	<p>For your information I have directed my "objections" to your plans to take into ownership any land or property currently part of the Lee Valley Growers Industry to the Prime Ministers Office some days ago.</p> <p>I totally object to the Lee Valley Park Authority continuing to "Empire Building!"</p> <p>Many years ago, much of the Lee Valley was open Marshland & Common land which has been steadily, since 1945 been fenced by local Councils and others against Public Common Land Legislation, sold for Mineral Extraction, left to become derelict and then absorbed into ownership of the Lee Valley Park in a disgraceful corrupt manner contrary to the original origins of "Commons and Public Ownership!.</p>	Comments noted. The Regional Park was set up by an Act of Parliament in 1966 to regenerate and manage derelict, contaminated and disused land as a leisure, recreational, sporting and nature conservation resource for the benefit of people within the Greater London, Essex and Hertfordshire area.	No change

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 Slipe 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.	Text has been amended under Community Proposal 8.A.2 to add reference to the development of health walks, "and short quiz trail/orienteering courses" using existing network of routes and local rail stations.
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 evidenc. 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

OA60.6	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			Contamination	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
OA60.9	HMWT	6		6.A.4 Environment	Holyfield Hall Farm	10. Holyfield Hall Farm. This mixed farm is a rarity in this part of the country. The good work that has been achieved over the last 15 years to blend commercial farming with wildlife habitats and public access should be further consolidated to establish it as an exemplar of best practice. Given the shortage of grazing animals for conservation purposes, the Park has a potential niche to help restore habitats beyond its boundaries but within the region it serves.	Comments noted and welcomed	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 cahnge
OA61.0	Canal & River Trust					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: <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					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.	Comments Noted	No change
OA61.2	Canal & River Trust					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.	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					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	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 emntal health programmes. The waterways are also an important habitat for a range of species creating a wildlife corridor the length of the Park.	No change
OA61.5	Canal & River Trust					2. Promoting the waterways as 200-year old 'working heritage' which are part of the third largest heritage estate in England and attract innovative and entrepreneurial businesses on and by the water; 3. Place-making with the waterways integrated at the heart of new and existing communities contributing towards high quality environments; 4. Transforming the city with well-maintained and managed waterways in iconic locations with high quality modern architecture, complementing 200-year old working heritage that can help to improve Londoner's health (open air gyms), welfare (strong focus for communities) and development (opportunities for volunteering, education, etc); 5. Helping London to mitigate and adapt to climate change; and 6. Providing a truly sustainable 100-mile long, transport network right across London for walking, jogging, cycling, waterborne passengers and freight.	Comments noted. This approach can be adapted to ensure that within the Hertfordshire and Essex area of the Park the waterways and associated towpaths continue to provide recreational walking and cycling opportunities, space for educational activities and contribute to healthy living and emntal health programmes. The waterways are also an important habitat for a range of species creating a wildlife corridor the length of the Park.	No change
OA61.6	Canal & River Trust				general	We have the following specific comments to make on the Park Development Framework: We note that the Lee Navigation is spelled inconsistently throughout the documents as either the Lea Navigation or the Lee Navigation. The correct spelling is Lee Navigation and we request that this is used consistently throughout the documents. Please also note that the Canal & River Trust uses an ampersand (&) within its title, we would appreciate the correct form being used throughout the document.	Comments noted - within Area 6 three instances of incorrect selling have been corrected.	Minor changes made to correct spelling.

OA61.7	Canal & River Trust	6		6.A.1	Hazlemere Marina	With regard to part 6.A.1, Broxbourne Borough Council have resolved to grant permission for planning application 07/15/0119/F at Hazlemere Marina. The application includes the provision of a publicly accessible café, however the scheme does not include a hotel or restaurant. The scheme also includes the provision of four residential moorings and there will be improved facilities for recreational and leisure boaters as part of the development. This section of the Framework should be updated to reflect these recent developments	Comments noted and agreed. Proposal will be deleted as new development has been delivered.	Delete the following under 6.A.1 Visitors: Support provision of new hotel, café or restaurant facilities adjacent to the River Lee Navigation as part of the redevelopment of the Hazlemere Marina site and work with Broxbourne Council and the Canal & River Trust to ensure these are available to the general Park visitor.
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
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 considerably. 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 <u>contact this office for further information.</u>	Comments noted and support for a 'shared use' of towpaths is welcomed. This has been endorsed in the Authority's recently adopted Cycling Strategy.	No change
OA61.13	Canal & River Trust	6 to 8			Partnership 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
PE62.0	Individual A Troll					Resident at Broxbourne Mill area, suggested more seating areas picnic tables etc onsite of former Leisure Pool – no where to sit. Suggested 'high wire' type activity in the area and described experience of visiting Thetford Forest, a Forestry Commission site with a Gruffalo Trail. This attraction/site very popular despite a £11 parking/entrance fee for the day. Offers a range of activities, natural play, cycle hire, go ape type activity – concept for leisure pool site. Check web site - http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infd-6yfg7y	Comments welcome (made at the Ware consultation event). The 'high wire' concept is being explored as part of the attractions at the Lee Valley White Water Centre as it develops its offer as a major family leisure destination	No change

PE64.0	Individual R Ottery					keen to see dedicated separate cycle lane, for access	Comments made at the Ware consultation event. These views are understood but there are no proposals to provide segregated routes. The Authority has recently reviewed its approach via workon a Cycling Strategy. Whilst this recommends improvements to the network and entrances to the Park it does not require segregation of routes.	No change
PE65.0	Individual ?	6				Two people who run guided walks raised concerns about lack of toilets, especially at WWC. When an event is on the area is closed off. This means the toilets are unavailable or you have to pay to go in. Separate provision is needed outside the fence. Also like to see a path through from Cornmill Meadows to Hooks Marsh. Also mentioned the problem of speeding cyclists on footpaths – would like to see separate provision.	Comments noted (made at the Epping consultation). The Lee Valley White Water Centre (LVWWC) Café and toilets are open to the public between set hours, generally 10:00 to 16:00 in the winter and longer in the summer. The website provides details and will highlight any changes to these times. https://www.gowhitewater.co.uk/visitor-info/the-terrace Additional stand alone toilets will not be provided within the vicinity of the LVWWC. However toilets and other refreshment facilities are available within the River Lee Country Park, at Fishers Green. Concerns about shared use of paths is noted but there are no proposals to provide segregated routes.	No change
PE66.0	Individual?	6				RSPB member – like to see as much as possible preserved as is, particularly enjoys Cornmill Meadows.	Comments noted and welcomed (made at Epping consultation). Management Plan for Cornmill Meadows currently being finalised.	No change
PE67.0	Individual M. Seymour	6			Gun-powder Mills	Volunteer at RGM very concerned about the future of the existing visitor attractions if the PGL proposal for the site is successful. Can see the positives of the PGL activity but very concerned that they will take over the main facilities and buildings currently used for the visitor attractions and there will be no services or facilities available to enable the RGM to continue, The remainder of the site to the north has no buildings or services so it will be impossible to operate a viable visitor attraction. Major archive on site – where will this be stored. Proposed shared use of the educational buildings unlikely to work as PGL requirements are likely to take precedence. Access to northern section could only be on guided basis.	Comments made at the Epping consultation event. The recent planning application to redevelop part of the WARGM site as an outdoor recreation and activity centre for children was refused by Epping Forest District Council 9 June 2016 and is now the subject of an appeal. Whilst the Authority did not object to the planning application for the outdoor recreation and activity centre it did raise concerns and seek further detail about how the important onsite ecology and landscape would be protected and enhanced and how access would be managed including in relation to the existing visitor attractions. Please note changes proposed under Sport & Recreation proposal	Amend Sport & recreation Proposal 6.A.2: Work with Royal Gunpowder Mills and other stakeholders to promote and create new opportunities for informal recreation and natural play, opening up a wider area within the site, to the public. Options presented in the Royal Gunpowder Mills '2012 Vision Statement' document for a public park within the Northern Woodlands accessed via multi-level aerial walkways, Any proposals to be considered in relation to management of the SSSI and Natural England requirements and the interconnectivity of habitats within the River Lee Country Park. Development proposals should be accompanied by detailed ecological, landscape and access management plans given the sensitivity of the site.

PE68.0	Individual R Penfold	6			Gun-powder Mills	Member of the Friends Association of Royal Gunpowder Mills check out Save-RGM.org website. His concern with PGL proposal is how much of the visitor attraction will be left. Once the PGL deal has been done he would like to see the Park Authority take over the remainder of RGM. Looking at Visitor Proposals map and the 2 footbridges proposed to link the Park in the east and west with the RGM there is no detail on the route to be taken between the two bridges. Given PGL will probably need to have a secure site the routing of a path between the bridges may be very difficult to achieve. Also raised the issue of traffic congestion – only one access point for vehicles for PGL to use and if children are coached in there will be congestion within the site and an increase at the MacDonald's junction	Comments made at the Waltham Abbey consultation event. The recent planning application to redevelop part of the WARGM site as an outdoor recreation and activity centre for children was refused by Epping Forest District Council 9 June 2016 and is now the subject of an appeal. Whilst the Authority did not object to the planning application for the outdoor recreation and activity centre it did raise concerns and seek further detail about how the important onsite ecology and landscape would be protected and enhanced and how access would be managed including in relation to the existing visitor attractions. Please note changes proposed under Sport & Recreation proposal	Amend Sport & recreation Proposal 6.A.2: Work with Royal Gunpowder Mills and other stakeholders to promote and create new opportunities for informal recreation and natural play, opening up a wider area within the site, to the public. Options presented in the Royal Gunpowder Mills '2012 Vision Statement' document for a public park within the Northern Woodlands accessed via multi-level aerial walkways, Any proposals to be considered in relation to management of the SSSI and Natural England requirements and the interconnectivity of habitats within the River Lee Country Park. Development proposals should be accompanied by detailed ecological, landscape and access management plans given the sensitivity of the site.
PE69.0	Individual L Faulkner and R Parish					Commodore Liz Faulkner and Vice Commodore Ray Parish from Hertfordshire County Yacht Club interested in proposals around Stanstead Innings and Stanstead Abbotts. Largely happy with the way things operate at the moment. They have been sent maps for Visitors and Sport and rec to take a closer look. Currently do the circular walk via underpasses and not sure what more can be done to improve the underpasses themselves.		
PE70.0	Individuals	6	Landscape and Heritage Proposals 6.A.4		Waltham Abbey	Group of individuals all with an interest in RGMs including Lance Bourne (operations manager), and colleague Liz (educational?). Lance.bourne@royalgunpowdermills.com 2 Trustees, two local residents. Topics covered included heritage – Park could do a lot more, especially around Waltham Abbey, need for better co-ordination and partnership working between Town Council, RGM, LVRPA, Museum (ECC) and EFDC, how do the Abbey Gardens figure in future of area with RGM and WWC and how will proposals be delivered	Comments made at Waltham Abbey consultation event. Heritage Proposals under 6.A.4 recognise the importance of Waltham Abbey Gardens and its potential role as a major heritage attraction and the need to work with partners or 'stakeholders'. Future of wider area in terms of heritage links between Waltham Abbey Gardens, RGM and other attractions uncertain due to recent refusal of planning application to redevelop part of the WARGM site as an outdoor recreation and activity centre for children. Minor amendment to proposal to make clear heritage links should also be with RGM site.	Amend landscape and Heritage Proposal 6.A.4 as follows: "...Link the various aspects of the heritage offer at the Abbey Gardens site with the important heritage sites within Waltham Abbey including the Royal Gunpowder Mills and continue to engage and work with the local community partnerships on heritage related projects and enhancements."