

Key	
SC: Statutory Consultee	GLA: Greater London Authority
LA: Local Authority	HBC: Hertsmere Borough Council
LO: Landowner	HSE: Health and Safety Executive
CC: Community Consultee	LBE: London Borough of Enfield
	LVRPA: Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
	LWL: London Waste Limited
	WCC: Westminster City Council

Ref	Issue	SC	LA	LO	CC	CC Respondent IDs	Response
1. Landscape, design and appearance							
1.1 No concerns/proposals are acceptable							
1.1.1	Satisfied with the proposed approach				6	18, 26, 40, 42, 48, 10020	Noted
1.1.2	Supports the proposed positioning of the chimney stack			LVRPA	0		Noted
1.2 Appearance							
1.2.1	Should look better than the current facility				4	19, 22, 24, 27	The ERF and other facilities on site would be new facilities of a high quality of design. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.2.2	Should blend in with the surrounding environment				5	9, 22, 24, 36, 44	The ERF is bring designed to respond to its surrounding context. The design seeks to minimise the visual impact of the building from the Lee Valley Regional Park. This would be achieved by stepping back the massing of the building and through a site wide landscaping strategy which integrates the site into the wider landscape. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available

							during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.2.3	Should be impressive and become a tourist attraction like similar facilities abroad		wcc		2	5, 6	<p>The ERF would be a new flagship facility of a high quality of design. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p> <p>The proposed EcoPark House would include space to be used for education and community purposes, and site tours would continue to be offered, however it is not proposed for the facility to become a tourist attraction because it is an operational waste management site with large numbers of waste vehicle movements.</p>
1.2.4	Should be modern and pleasant to look at			LVRPA	4	41, 45, 10006, 10010	The ERF would be a new flagship facility of a high quality of design. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.2.5	Should be simple and in keep with its industrial use				2	21, 25	The ERF would be a new flagship facility of a high quality of design. The ERF has been designed to respond to its surrounding context, including its industrial setting. Further information on the design of the ERF will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.2.6	Should employ a low-cost maintenance approach				1	10019	The maintenance of the ERF and other facilities on site has been considered throughout the design development.
1.2.7	<p>Appearance specific suggestions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use architectural detailing, height variation, fenestration, 		LBE	LVRPA	0		<p>Specific suggestions regarding the detailed design of EcoPark House will be taken into consideration in developing our proposals.</p> <p>LB Enfield's policy including the CLAAP, Core Strategy and DMD have informed the design.</p> <p>EcoPark House is ground plus two storeys and would therefore offer views across Lee Valley Regional Park. Further information on the design of EcoPark House will</p>

	<p>use of high quality finishing materials;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comply with CLAAP, Core Strategy and DMD; • two-stored reception building 						be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.3 Chimney stack							
1.3.1	Prefer an incorporated chimney stack				4	19, 21, 41, 10008	<p>As part of the design development of the stack a number of options have been considered and these were consulted on during Phase 1 Consultation with some respondents preferring an incorporated stack and others a separate stack.</p> <p>On balance it is proposed to have the stack separated from the bulk of the ERF but still part of the overall composition. Comments received during Phase 1 Consultation indicate that reducing visual impact is important. This arrangement would help to reduce the perceived scale and massing of the main processing hall thereby reducing visual impact.</p>
1.3.2	Prefer an independent chimney stack because it is less obtrusive				2	27, 39	The stack would be independent from the remainder of the ERF building, although remain part of the overall composition.
1.3.3	Prefer a chimney stack with two separate flues				2	16, 27	Two separate flues are an operational requirement of the ERF. The design development has considered incorporating both flues into a single chimney stack and

1.3.4	Prefer a chimney stack with a single flue because it is less obtrusive				8	19, 21, 39, 40, 41, 45, 10010, 10019	<p>having two chimney stacks. These options were consulted on during Phase 1 Consultation with some respondents preferring two separate flues and other preferring the flues to be combined into one chimney.</p> <p>On balance it is considered that a single chimney stack which incorporates both flues is a less visually intrusive option.</p>
1.3.5	Oppose a chimney stack altogether				1	24	The chimney stack is an operational requirement of the ERF and as such it is not possible to eliminate it entirely from the design.
1.3.6	Preference that the stack is green/brown to blend in and that a waterfall mural is used to emphasise that the plume not smoke				2	27, 47	The stack has been designed to be as unobtrusive as possible in line with comments raised during Phase 1 consultation. As such it is considered that a sculpture and water mural are not suitable. The intention is that the stack would be of a high quality design and would remain a visual marker of the site for the surrounding area.
1.3.7	Suggest that the design is innovative, with a narrower diameter, and that it is low and unobtrusive		LBE		1	24	<p>The size and profile of the stack is largely dictated by structural and operational requirements. The design intention is to minimise if possible the width in the views from the East and West where the residential areas are predominantly located.</p> <p>The height of the stack is determined by the air quality modelling work which will be set out in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> which will form part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. The stack has been designed to be as unobtrusive as possible.</p> <p>The stack has been designed to be as unobtrusive as possible in line with comments raised during Phase 1</p>

							Consultation. The stack has been designed as a component part of the overall design of the ERF.
1.4 Landscaping							
1.4.1	Landscaping is essential. Suggest that landscaping should comply with EcoPark Supplementary Planning Document, Suggest that landscaping should include Lee Navigation and area around A406		LBE	LVRPA	5	5, 16, 27, 41, 10006	<p>The proposals include landscaping to create a high quality environment that maximises ecological enhancement and sustainable water management. The landscaping design also seeks integrate the site into the wider landscape character to minimise visual impact.</p> <p>The proposals include habitat enhancement and creation including open woodland, tree planting and scrub planting along the site's eastern boundary, as well as marginal planting along Enfield Ditch. Landscaping would also be provided along on the eastern boundary of the Lee Navigation opposite the site. These improvements would enhance the setting of the development. Landscaping would also be provided on the eastern side of the Lee Navigation. In addition, a connection to the tow path from the bridge on Lee Park Way would be provided.</p> <p>Guidelines for the landscaping of the EcoPark are predominantly set out in the <i>Edmonton EcoPark Planning Brief</i> (LB Enfield, May 2013). The landscape design has been developed in accordance with the principles in this document. The key points are to create a green edge along the eastern boundary and create high quality waterside areas, both of which have been incorporated in to the landscape strategy.</p> <p>Further details on landscaping will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p>
1.4.2	Support for the use of trees/shrubs.	National Grid		LVRPA	6	9, 16, 25, 27, 37, 10010	The proposals include a habitat enhancement and creation including open woodland, tree planting and scrub planting

	Suggestions that these should be native species, wildlife friendly and slow and low growing (near National Grid overhead line)						<p>along the eastern boundary, as well as marginal planting along Enfield Ditch. The proposals also include meadow planting (species rich mown grass) along the western boundary and tree planting is proposed along Lee Park Way.</p> <p>All trees and the vast majority of shrubs would be native. A small number of ornamental shrubs would be used in locations which require smaller species, for example next to EcoPark House. A schedule of the proposed species will be included in the <i>Design and Access Statement</i> which will form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>All trees and shrubs proposed are wildlife friendly.</p> <p>There is only a small area of the scheme which is located underneath or adjacent to National Grid overhead lines – this is at the junction with Advent Way and Lee Park Way. In this location only slow and low growing ornamental planting is proposed.</p> <p>Further details on landscaping will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.</p>
1.4.3	Support for green walls / roofs to mitigate visual impact, increase biodiversity and harvest water harvesting. Brown roof also noted as acceptable		LBE	LVRPA	9	16, 19, 27, 39, 43, 47, 48, 10006, 10019	<p>A green roof is proposed above the tipping hall and a brown roof is proposed above the waste bunker. These would mitigate visual impact and increase local biodiversity.</p> <p>It is proposed to have an earth bund incorporating landscaping along the eastern end of the ERF. This bund softens the effect of the building on the landscaped edge thereby mitigating the visual impact of the ERF from the Lee Valley Regional Park. The earth bund also provides</p>

							ecological enhancement. Further details on landscaping will be available during Phase 2 Consultation.
1.4.4	Support green walls/roof with the caveat that they must be maintained with water used in the process				1	27	Where possible, rain water would be harvested and used to water the green roof as process water is unlikely to be suitable for this purpose.
1.4.5	Oppose green walls/roofs because they are not cost-effective and not important. Suggestion to keep greenery and buildings separate				3	18, 10010, 10018	On balance, given the significant maintenance required for green walls, along with the other mitigation measures already incorporated into the design, it is not proposed to also have green walls. Green roofs are proposed as these would provide visual mitigation and ecological enhancement.
1.5 Other specific suggestions and comments							
1.5.1	Other suggestions/queries including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • swift nests in the walls; • nature trail; • reduce bulk and massing on east side; • buffer zone to Lee Navigation; • public access to western bank of 		LBE	LVRPA	6	12, 25, 47, 10008, 10009, 10019	The proposals takes significant account of ecology in the local area however swift bricks are not proposed. It is assumed that the suggestion to create a nature trail means within the Lee Valley Regional Park which is located outside the boundary of this project and as such it is outside the scope of this project to deliver a nature trail in this location. The ERF has been designed to reduce the overall bulk and massing, particularly on the eastern side of the site. The building would step back from the eastern site boundary. The proposals include a habitat enhancement and creation including open woodland, tree planting and scrub planting along the eastern boundary, as well as marginal planting

	<p>canal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restore ditch along Lee Park Way and install coir rolls; • use a natural barrier like Camden Aggregates; • liaise with local food growing projects re edible landscaping; • consult Capel Manor; • include Design Code in the submission; • would detached stack require ancillary structures 						<p>along Enfield Ditch.</p> <p>Lee Park Way runs along the western side of the Lee Navigation; this route is already open to pedestrians and cyclists. As part of the proposal it is proposed to use Lee Park Way to provide access for light vehicles to the RRF. This route would be upgraded and trees would be planted alongside the road.</p> <p>The proposals include marginal planting along Enfield Ditch as well as opening up the ditch by removing some vegetation. Coir rolls are not suitable due to the low volume of water flows in the ditch.</p> <p>Landscaping proposals to minimise the visual impact of the ERF have been incorporated into the proposal. The landscaping would include a bund partially obscuring the ERF at the northern end of the site and habitat enhancement and creation along the eastern boundary, as well as marginal planting along Enfield Ditch. These measures would screen the ERF and enhance the overall environment.</p> <p>The EcoPark does not include a sufficiently sized landscaped area which can be accessed safely by the public for edible landscaping to be a practical solution.</p> <p>Capel Manor will be consulted during Phase 2 Consultation.</p> <p>A Design Code will be included in the <i>Design and Access Statement</i> which will form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>More details on the design of the ERF chimney stack will</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							be available during Phase 2 Consultation. It is not anticipated that it will require ancillary structures.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--