Above: Option for the hub building; a partially buried ‘green’ building on two levels, with functional components such as sports pitch changing (to replace the 1970s central changing block), toilets and showers in the lower level (option for kiosk facing on to pitch side), with upper level accessed via equal access ramps and formed by destination café, viewing terrace for full site surveillance, flexible exhibition/events/lettable space, public toilets and park staff office/accommodation (exact form/uses to be set by future Activity and Business Planning).
Key aspects/rationale:

• **Consolidation** of the dominant existing pitch provision upon a smaller footprint offering higher quality, more flexible provision to address wear and tear and peaks/troughs in usage. Maintaining the existing 7 adult pitches in the northern part of the site, plus an area for informal kickabout/junior pitches east of The Squatts LNR.

• Space for **informal cricket provision** as identified in the playing pitch strategy. Discussions with the English Cricket Board have identified that a minimum of 40m stand-off is required from any cricket provision and adjacent properties.

• As part of the approach to **flexible** use, provide for 2 lit ‘3G’ pitches (all weather artificial turf pitches) in the southern/central part of the site, away from ecologically sensitive receptors and to avoid adverse impacts upon residential amenity.

• **Remove** the existing 1970s changing block and **restore it’s site to parkland**, removal of the existing car park and access road (and restoration as before), relocating the access road and flexible parking integrated with ‘woodland and trees’ alongside the eastern boundary of Sydney Russell School and integrated with the new park hub.

• Remove the existing poorly drained easternmost pitches on the site of the culverted Gores Brook to **facilitate restoration** of the same, and replace these with an informal kickabout area near the existing changing block site.

• Creation of areas of low level landshaping and tree planting to create **microclimate** in the context of prevailing wind. Also opportunities for spectating and alternative prospects and vantage points in this open and exposed part of the site, plus provision of benches and bins of an appropriate style.

• Creation of a **variety of access links** to a new perimeter path/5km park run route to also connect the principal spaces/character areas within the site.
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Gores Brook

Above: Enhance landscape variety and ecological diversity. The Squatts LNR - Meadow, copse, ponded areas
Key aspects/rationale:

• **Daylighting the Gores Brook tributary** and associated river restoration broadly on its original alignment but also creating new additional **meanders and riffles** (to slow the passage of water in times of flood), plus on and off line ponded areas/scrapes for habitat and additional water storage. One of these could be located in the depression visible immediately east of the northern poplar clump which marks the site of a lost pond and sluice.

• Creation of new **riparian habitat** – reed, rush, wet meadow and new willow, alder and poplar riverbank tree planting to accent the river and to complement and reinforce the surviving mature former riverbank trees on site.

• Creation of **safe points of access** to and **contact with the water**, in the form of boardwalks and bridges, linked to a wider path and desire line network (surfaced/mown).

• Provision of **appropriately sited benches** and bins. Benches should be sited to take advantage of restored riparian views and across the park/distant views to the hub – a modern reflection of the view captured in the painting of 1867.
15.0 Proposals-
Risks, issues and opportunities: Assessment of potential impacts

With a site as large and diverse as Parsloes Park, the broad compass of the restoration proposals and the variety of existing and potential user groups, there is a clear need for careful consideration and progression of proposals to avoid potential conflicts. These are discussed below in relation to the following key themes:

- Environmental (archaeological/hydrological) risks associated with the scheme
- Access, safety, use and misuse
- Balancing competing drivers (heritage, ecology, recreation and visitor management; Sensitive integration of new facilities.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potential source of impact/risk</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Environmental (archaeological/hydrological) risks associated with the scheme | **Archaeology and heritage significance:**
  - Potential damage to buried heritage at mansion/home farm/lodge sites, plus to historic build-up of carriage drive
  - Impact on buried heritage associated with ponds and former pleasure grounds/gardens of the mansion
  - Determination of the most appropriate approach to heritage restoration (as opposed to reconstruction) | • Archaeological watching brief, plus scope for appropriately supervised community archaeology projects to increase local involvement and interest. Scope to increase the current documentary record in relation to Parsloes/exhibition material for Valence House/ the potential park hub. Potential need to further refine design to reflect findings and weave into a future Interpretation Strategy for the site. This could also make links with Discover ME (historical treasures of Metropolitan Essex)
  • Sensitive design (overlay paving) in relation to carriage drive and entrance features, recording and interpreting remains and ensuring paving build up does not disturb buried remains. Where remains are to be revealed ensure an appropriate programme of stabilisation, protection and presentation with an archaeologist.
  • In respect of the approach to heritage restoration, the masterplan has been developed on the basis of best practice conservation principles of restoring to the most complete surviving design layer (in this case the 1930s People’s Park). A creative conservation approach has been employed, conserving the best features of this and the earlier landscape park, whilst interpreting lost heritage. |
### 15.1 Proposals—Risks, issues and opportunities: Assessment of potential impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potential source of impact/risk</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ecology:** | • Potential protected species issues (in particular bats) in relation to buildings to be demolished/altered  
• Avoiding net loss of heathland habitat  
• Potential conflict between historic landscape/designed view restoration and habitat interest (trees with bat and other habitat interest)  
• Addressing problem species (Canada geese etc) | • Need for species surveys in areas of potential (roof voids/soffits) of buildings subject to works (species survey window limitations to be factored in). This should also include trees subject to potential works (e.g. vegetation clearance to restore designed views/sight lines).  
• For heathland habitat diversification works (flower rich meadows and pond restoration), these should be supported by expanded areas of re-wilding and long grassland, to connect areas and help avoid fragmentation.  
• As part of detailed design and construction/aftercare to establishment, implement measures to control and discourage Canada Geese (such as low level netting/mesh to establishment of low level lakeside planting/avoid bankside erosion). Linked to programme of education for visitors.  
| **Hydrology and flooding:** | • Need for early consultation with the respective teams within the Environment Agency, to determine the scope of the local Flood Risk Assessment and Water Framework Directive assessments that will be required. |
| • Need to consult with the Environment Agency on flooding and Water Framework Directive issues. | • Anti-social use increases resulting from boundary treatment alterations  
• Vandalism of new facilities/provision/structures  
• Integration of sensitively designed safe, equal access and avoidance of user conflict to path networks  
• Issues around access to water and particularly areas of deep water at the lake | • Replace fenced boundary enclosures with appropriate defensive treatments which still maintain aesthetic quality and permeability (landshaping, long grass areas and tree planting, allied to existing timber bollards, to physically discourage unauthorised vehicular access). The same treatment should be employed to the external edges of new car parking provision. Ensure appropriate type of fencing where it is needed e.g. in relation to water play garden for very young children, whilst maintaining good visual permeability.  
• Two principles should be employed to avoid vandalism: 1) Good design which foresees and designs out potential problems and 2) linking proposals to an organised programme of events and activity planning in which the local community is fully immersed and involved (as part of the ongoing activity planning and audience development work). In relation to 1), this masterplan sets out the first principles for good, inclusive design. Building briefs will need to be developed with external funders for the next stage e.g. for the hub (consideration of issues such as night time use/shuttering when out of hours, use of long overhangs/brise soleil structures or similar to rooflines to discourage climbing onto roofs, appropriate lighting). |
15.2 Proposals-
Risks, issues and opportunities: Assessment of potential impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potential source of impact/risk</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>visual permeability and natural surveillance). With regard to 2), development of a parallel activity plan and audience development study (linked to on-going community engagement) to inform the next phase of design development as part of funding applications to Heritage Lottery Fund and others is a key recommendation falling out of this masterplan.</td>
<td>• With regard to sensitively designed safe and equal access and avoidance of path user conflicts, the following points will be relevant: Use of low level lighting to selected paths (away from areas of habitat potential as far as possible) to avoid light spill/urbanising influences. Integration of Disability Discrimination Act requirements in relation to equal access seamlessly with other path surfaces and as part of landshaping/gradient design generally, to avoid additional foci for potential vandalism, such as handrails. Ensure that path repairs/surface top dressing are of an adoptable standard for cycling and that key shared use commuting routes are wide enough for pedestrians and cyclists/pushchairs/wheelchairs (2.4m and appropriately signed – markings in paving or similar).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to water: Use of boardwalks and knee rails plus appropriate planting to create physical distance to water’s edge to areas of deep water at the lake, as well as creation of safe access by terracing/beached areas. Supported by appropriate signage, plus discreet fencing integrated with planting to areas where access is to be restricted. Use of appropriate riparian planting and controlled access points to the restored Gores Brook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing competing drivers (heritage, ecology, recreation and visitor management); sensitive integration of new facilities</td>
<td>• Making heritage of the earlier landscape park and the People’s Park relevant to modern users and the local community.</td>
<td>• Making heritage and interpretation relevant to modern users should be a central part of an Interpretation Strategy to be delivered for the next phase /for grant funders requirements, linked to audience development and activity planning. Interpretation should seek to be flexible, available in a variety of formats whilst not dating/remaining timeless, as well as linked to way-finding – heritage trail/guided walks/programming. It should focus as much on the social aspects of the park’s history/local memory and associations as on bigger picture history. Seek to set the history of Parsloes in other cultural contexts e.g. the Denman family and abolitionist movement could be linked to country-wide programmes such as Black History Week and other events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Park hub – consideration of visual and archaeological impact; avoiding competing facilities</td>
<td>• Continue to work with the key stakeholders and user groups engaged with the masterplan, such as Sydney Russell School. There is potential to link heritage interpretation, the proposed community garden and outdoor classroom/ natural play to aspects of the school curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15.3 Proposals-
Risks, issues and opportunities: Assessment of potential impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potential source of impact/risk</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel works being developed by other partners: Youth Zone, Football Foundation Bid, plus cross reference to drivers for other scheme elements • Impact on Metropolitan Open Land</td>
<td>• Integrating the park hub and related contemporary features should be subject to a good building design brief, drawing on the framework set by this masterplan, and sensitive to the landscape and heritage context. Further site investigations and archaeological studies will be required to inform siting and design. The level of design documentation for the eventual planning application should be informed by local validation requirements, and may include consideration of potential landscape and visual impact. The same principles apply to the Youth Zone to be delivered by others. • The exact mix of facilities in the hub will be determined by building brief development and the Activity Plan. Catering provision and any future concessions/leases will need to be carefully considered to avoid competition and conflict between different facilities in the park and with any offer in the Youth Zone. For instance the 1930’s tea huts are likely to be more appropriate for hot and cold refreshments, ices and snacks with more of a full service offer in the hub which is likely to have a longer day time and seasonal use span. • With regard to the parallel works (Youth Zone, Football Foundation bid), discussions have taken place with the organisations developing these proposals. The masterplan and the Football Foundation proposals are closely aligned and the masterplan has set out recommendations for a sensitive and appropriate location for the Youth Zone (‘like for like’ development footprint, with the old depot site instead remediated, capped and restored to parkland). These should form part of a building brief for the Youth Zone proposal. • OnSide Youth Zone Planning Considerations: An alternative location for the proposed OnSide Youth Zone has been considered which would meet the operational requirements of the charity as well as responding to planning challenges. Initial planning discussions with London Borough of Barking and Dagenham have supported the potential of the alternative location in principle, and the location has been discussed with OnSide with regard to their principles for Youth Zone site selection and siting. The location on the corner of Gale Street and Porters Avenue would benefit from the following: - The potential to integrate the Youth Zone offer into the Parsloes Park masterplan in terms of increased visibility and reduced conflict of user activities for example in terms of play offer and the heritage potential of the pavilion. - A less sensitive context in terms of residential neighbours and effect on amenity for example relating to the presence of a dual carriageway and the level of street activity compared to Ivy House Lane. - A more appropriate location in terms of scale, opposite the three storey Porters Avenue Health Centre. - Better public transport connections, walkable from Becontree tube station and with a number of bus routes adjacent. Proposals would need to take into account the scale, visibility and location of the Youth Zone when considering how appropriate development proposals are in Metropolitan Open Land. The potential to bring forward a leisure use as part of a holistic masterplan for the Park would be an advantage for a future proposal. The sensitivity of residents at properties on Gale Street would need to be considered. • The masterplan has set out options for the most sensitive and appropriate siting of the lit 3G pitches to minimise impacts on residential amenity and ecology. • With regard to Metropolitan Open Land, the detailed form and exact footprint of new build versus demolitions will need to be carefully considered (and informative for the building briefs) with any footprint increases considered sensitively in context and appropriately justified as part of the pre application process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.0 Delivery plan

This section sets out an initial delivery plan for the masterplan proposals, considering outline costs, likely funding streams and next steps.

Outline capital costs:
Below are set out outline/ballpark capital costs for the main elements of the scheme, based on Arup’s recent knowledge of delivering comparable works on similar schemes. These will need to be developed and refined further and an itemised cost plan developed, as design proposals advance for individual funding bids.

• Park hub, including excavation and landshaping/integration works: £1.5million – £1.8 million
• Refurbishment and conversion of 2No existing pavilions: £500,000
• Demolitions: £200,000–£300,000
• Pathworks (repair and top dressing, new paths): £750,000 - £1 million

• Vegetation clearances and crown lifting/tree surgery to lake, plus re profiling and boardwalk: £250,000 - £300,000
• Tree planting and structural landscape planting: £200,000
• River restoration scheme: £600,000–£1million, depending on scope
• Site signage, way-marking and interpretation: £50,000
• Street furniture: £50,000
• Water play and new plant: £300,000–£350,000
• Natural play provision: £250,000
• 2No 3G pitches at £600,000 each: £1.2 million
Total estimated capital costs would be between £6 million and £7 million, exclusive of contingency sums (typically 10%), professional fees (around 8% in addition in respect of landscape, architectural and engineering design and contract administration, plus professional fees in respect of the Construction Design and Management Regulations and supporting surveys – ecology, archaeology, site investigations). Main contractor’s preliminaries would also need to be factored in, as would any enabling works not listed above plus remediation of contaminated land. Aspects such as landform/landshaping design would need to be costed as more detailed design was worked up based on the material and volumes involved.

**Funding streams:**
Due to the varied nature of the works they will need to be delivered through more than one funding stream. Scoping of potential delivery models and discussion with the client has identified the following as the most likely models:

- Heritage Lottery Fund/Big Lottery Fund Parks for People Funding
- Veolia Environmental Trust Funds
- Big Lottery Reaching Communities (Green Angels)
- Environment Agency Funding
- Football Foundation Funding

Below is a summary of the funding streams, key requirements and issues, aspects of the masterplan scheme which could be eligible for funding and recommendations for what needs to be happen next.

**Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF)/Big Lottery Fund Parks for People Funding:**
This funding stream offers grants of up to £5 million for capital works (and for revenue activity for a period of 10 years after practical completion, tied to a Management and Maintenance Plan developed in an HLF compliant format) for heritage restoration and conservation works in primarily urban parks. The funding stream also funds complementary capital works which support and enhance essential infrastructure to sustain the park, subject to HLF’s approved purposes and demonstrating delivery of their outcomes, which are:

- Heritage will be better managed
- Heritage will be in a better condition
- Heritage will be identified/recorded
- Heritage will be better interpreted/explained
- People will have developed skills
- People will have learnt about heritage
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- People will have changed their attitudes/behaviour
- People will have had an enjoyable experience
- People will have volunteered time
- Environmental impacts will be reduced
- More people and a wider range of people engaged with heritage
- The local community will be a better place to live, work or visit
- The local economy will be boosted
- The park and organisation will be more resilient

Above: Sketch proposal for the water play area
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Clearly the masterplan would be able to deliver significantly upon these outcomes, as it enables greater understanding and appreciation of the park’s heritage, as well as forming the framework to facilitate activities to encourage volunteering and conservation of heritage, and a range of community development projects which could have a significant positive impact. Other aspects which would support the case for Parsloes Park are its heritage value and potential, recognised in its long and eventful chronology, significance and inclusion upon London’s Local Parks and Gardens Register. It is also recognised as a priority urban greenspace for investment in the All London Green Grid, which would further help its viability.

The masterplan has been designed with HLF funding criteria in mind. Aspects of this masterplan report could readily form key parts of the baseline for the Conservation Plan which would be required to form a key part of a bid to the Parks for People Fund. The heritage evolution and evaluation, landscape characterisation, statement of significance and heritage risk, opportunity and impact assessment developed for this masterplan document could all form key parts of the Conservation Plan, to form a compelling and persuasive document to secure funding, as well as to help develop a scheme which could ultimately secure Green Heritage accreditation as part of the Green Flag scheme.

Issues and considerations:
There are two funding windows and decision periods per annum. The overall process can take 2 years or more before works start on site and requires significant time commitments and professional advice. Funding is delivered in three separate phases or rounds. Round one is concerned with assessing a scheme’s potential or feasibility and securing a decision in principle, to release development funds for detailed design development in round two. A successful round two pass will secure the capital funding for the implementation phase (round 3) and for ongoing revenue/management activity, drawn down in phases. Considerable formal consultation needs to take place in the form of design reviews (linked to project work stages) with the HLF grants case officer and a monitor appointed by HLF as a critical friend for the scheme. Match funding would need to be provided by the council. For grants of less than £1 million, this is at least 5% of the cost of the Round Two phase and 5% of the cost of the delivery phase. For grants of £1 million and over this is at least 10% of the cost of the Round Two phase and 10% of the delivery phase.

What could be funded?
The following components of the masterplan could all demonstrate excellent and monitor-able performance with regard to the HLF’s outcomes, and should form the primary foci for a future bid:

• Restoration of key aspects of the People’s Park – lake, path network, formal gardens and original pavilions, plus the water play
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• Aspects which provide a more sensitive design response to the site’s heritage – natural play; restoring the old depot area to parkland

• Design and delivery of signage, interpretation materials and way-marking, plus street furniture

• Restoration of the avenue and the carriage drive, plus enhancements to The Squatts Local Nature Reserve

• Archaeological works to reveal, conserve and interpret the site’s hidden heritage, including potential community archaeology projects

• Restoration of ‘lost’ features such as the Gores Brook

• Aspects of the hub building, particularly those parts which could form an educational or interpretive focus, or provision of exhibition space to tell the site’s story. It should be noted that the hub would potentially need to be co-funded with Football Foundation bid funding, to cover areas outwith HLF’s areas of interest such as sports changing rooms and facilities.

Funding could also be used for the following:

• Professional fees in respect of design, contract administration and specialist surveys

• Development and delivery of an interpretation strategy, audience development strategy and park business plan/activity plan (including further work with user groups)

• Subject to resource needs and making a compelling business case with HLF as part of a bid, additional staffing for the park, often a community ranger and/or park officer (subject to specific HLF guidance, approvals and input to recruitment). On costs/salary costs could be funded for the 10 year life of the grant.

Recommendation:
To advance pre application discussions with the HLF using this masterplan as a basis, with a view to developing a Round One application to gain a decision in principle, as soon as possible.
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**Reaching Communities Fund (Green Angels):**
Reaching Communities funding is for projects that help people and communities in the most deprived Lower Super Output Areas in England.

Early discussions have highlighted that the Reaching Communities fund could be an eligible funding pot for Parsloes Park. Postcodes adjacent to Parsloes Park are eligible for funding and the boundaries of deprived areas would be considered by the Big Lottery Fund where it can be demonstrated that the beneficiaries are located in eligible areas. Since the fund targets those living in disadvantaged areas and the masterplan has the potential to improve community cohesion and improve learning opportunities and health and wellbeing benefits, the objectives of the project would align well. Reaching Communities funding has successfully been secured and delivered in collaboration with the Land Trust for the Green Angels environmental training programme for Liverpool Festival Gardens which received £139,000. The Green Angels scheme aimed to boost the quality of life for local communities by providing introductory training opportunities in subjects such as countryside management, parks maintenance, business skills, environmental education and horticulture.

**Issues and considerations:**
Grants are available from £10,000 upwards and funding can last for up to five years. There is no upper limit for total project costs.

Funding of more than £500,000 is available and should be discussed with the Big Lottery Fund to understand how appropriate the project is. Projects should complement or fill gaps in local strategies where appropriate. Communities should be involved throughout the life of the project. The fund is primarily a revenue programme, covering salaries, running costs and a contribution towards core costs and equipment for up to three years. Up to £100,000 is also available through the Reaching Communities building fund for land, buildings or refurbishment capital for up to two years. The proportion of funding for revenue and capital is optional as long as a minimum of £100,000 is requested for land and building work. There are no deadlines for applications. Building on success at Liverpool Festival Gardens where 200 applications were received, the Land Trust wants to roll out the Green Angels environmental training programme further with potential links to schools, businesses and social enterprises.

**What could be funded?**
Revenue funding could be sourced to set up activities and management, for example those associated with the Park hub or education initiatives. A Green Angels environmental training programme could also be funded with the opportunity to build upon the Land Trust’s experience at Liverpool Festival Gardens. This could include associated revenue or equipment funding to launch the building and deliver project activities such as marketing or salary costs, training or monitoring.
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There is also potential to apply for Reaching Communities buildings funding to part fund the Park hub, noting that construction is only funded in exceptional circumstances, for capital costs such as building and engineering works or professional fees. Funding for the monitoring and evaluation of the project has the potential to act as evidence for future funding bids.

Recommendations:

In order to navigate the three stage application process (approximately 18 months in total), early sign up should be sought with the Big Lottery Fund on the principles and objectives of the project and areas to be funded. This should include initial development of activity planning and a business plan for the Park. The Big Lottery Fund should be contacted in the first instance to confirm eligibility. Discussions should demonstrate that the project would benefit a deprived community and that beneficiaries are located in close proximity to the Park. The areas to be funded should clearly respond to local strategies and initiatives as well as an activity plan and consultation strategy developed for any Heritage Lottery Fund bid. It should be noted that there is potential for HLF to co-fund staffing.

Veolia Environmental Trust Funding:

Parsloes Park lies in close proximity to a Veolia site qualifying for the Landfill Communities Fund. The fund covers community buildings and rooms, outdoor spaces, play and recreation and projects supporting biodiversity, all of which align with the Parsloes Park masterplan. The project emphasis on community consultation, building community users and financial sustainability (amongst others) align with the objectives of the fund, which are set out below:

- Community consultation with evidence of support and need
- A wide range of community users
- Good use of volunteers, with relevant qualifications being sought
- A wide range of fund-raising activities
- Value for money
- Sustainability for the future

- Completion within an expected timeframe – public amenity projects must be completed within 12 months and biodiversity projects within 18 months.
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Issues and considerations:

A maximum of £75,000 is available for projects that have already secured 20% of the total cost. Since eligible projects must have a total cost of under £500,000, the phasing and delivery of the different elements will need to be developed to justify an application.

For awards of £40,000 and above, an independent third party contributor will need to reimburse the landfill operator the 10% shortfall to release the grant. This contribution can be made by another funder, a local council or an individual.

What could be funded?

Given the total cost requirement set out above, this fund could be most valuable for discrete areas of the Parsloes Park masterplan which may not qualify under other funding streams. Funding the delivery of a community garden or community orchard for example would provide a distinct area of the Park where the community could take ownership of development and delivery, with benefits associated with building social capital and volunteer time. This type of project could additionally harness Veolia’s social responsibility objectives cost savings from the lending of specialist equipment for works as well as staff time.

Recommendations:

Applications must demonstrate that 20% of funding has been secured as part of the application. It is therefore recommended that opportunities and areas for funding through Veolia are scoped as applications for other funding sources are progressed. The fund is highly competitive and in-principle support should be sought from Veolia before applications are prepared.

A funding bid for the community garden should be developed in partnership with Dagenham Farm Growing Communities and Company Drinks (local food production and supply chains). Working with these organisations and local school groups would maximise the project’s positive impact, as would work with the Sycamore Trust and local access groups.
Environment Agency Funding:

Parsloes Park lies within an area identified as being at risk of flooding (surface and ground water flooding, covering 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year events). These relate principally to the site of the lost pond near the Gale Street entrance, the lake and the culverted course of the Gores Brook. This is reflected by observations on site through the latter part of 2015 where ground water flooding was evident in relation to the ‘lost’ course of the brook (near and around the poorly draining eastern football pitches), and from anecdotal evidence from community stakeholders.

A naturalistic approach is recommended to dealing with the water resources of the site, seeing them as a primary opportunity for multifunctional green infrastructure, such as opening up the Gores Brook and creating space for water and riffles/meanders to slow the passage of water to the nearby urban areas. This would create benefits not only in terms of water storage and proactive flood risk management, but also landscape character, biodiversity and amenity, as well as creating microclimates and safe environments for play – a recreational focus for a part of the site which lacks one, as well as also restoring aspects of historic landscape character. The evidence of flood risk on site would create a compelling case for capital funding to help deliver the river restoration works.

Immediately south of the site in the opened section of the Gores Brook, invasive species such as Himalayan Balsam were evident on a site visit in October 2015. It is likely that these would spread along the watercourse, creating a potential case also for funding through the Environment Agency’s implementation of the Water Framework Directive (WFD), the purpose of which is to bring the UK’s rivers into good ecological status.

Issues and considerations:

Initial discussions have also suggested funding from the Environment Agency for scoping surveys to determine the type of capital works interventions required and to help with development of studies to assist with design and to secure the required consents for such works. It should be noted that capital works for river restoration could also potentially be co-funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund (restoration of key features of the site’s heritage and which could contribute to a number of their stated outcomes). As part of such a bid and to support parallel planning applications a local flood risk assessment would be required for works in the flood plain. It is likely that a Water Framework Directive checklist would also be required for this stage. Proposals would therefore need to be joined up with a future HLF bid and would also need to secure consensus within the relevant organisations in the Environment Agency (fisheries, biodiversity, hydrology and development management).
16.9

Delivery plan

What could be funded:

Initial discussions with the Environment Agency have suggested considerable interest in the site and for a role for them as a joint Delivery Partner going forward. The evidence of flood risk on site would create a compelling case for capital funding from the Environment Agency (financed through Central Government, local levies, partnership funding and other sources) to help deliver the river restoration works, as a key part of managing such risk and to help the discharge of local authority responsibilities under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.

Recommendations:

Pursue scoping and research funding application to develop the capital project further. Engage with key Environment Agency stakeholders at all stages of the development of a parallel HLF bid so that co-funding opportunities and a range of partnership delivery roles are factored in from the outset. This should include joined up liaison with all of the relevant individual departments in the Environment Agency, so that any risks or conflicts to development of the project are identified and ironed out at an early stage.
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Therefore the focus here is on effective and sustainable management models, drawing from successful local and recent case studies, notably Beam Valley Parklands, where the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham has been working successfully with the Land Trust to secure the site’s on-going management. The borough and the masterplan team have had initial discussions with the Land Trust regarding Parsloes Park. The Land Trust have interest in the site and the proposals and they consider that the project is a good match with their charitable objectives.

The Land Trust:

The Land Trust is an independent Charitable Trust, managing open spaces on behalf of and with local communities to provide cost effective management solutions for open space and green infrastructure. Primary foci include protection of asset value in green spaces and delivering a wide range of community benefits, such as harnessing social capital. Other key aspects of their experience include designing economic, efficient and risk-minimising specifications to deliver and manage green spaces.

Various options are available as part of an approach to working with the Land Trust on long term management of green space sites such as Parsloes Park. These include:

Consideration has been given to sustainable and reduced expenditure futures for the park which positively respond to the site’s character and the conservation objectives in this masterplan. Given the current stage of design development and the fact that the design is likely to evolve further during the forthcoming funding bids and activity planning/business planning, a detailed 10 year Management and Maintenance Plan is not appropriate at the time of writing.
17.1 Management Strategy

- Taking land (whether a site or parts of a site) into their ownership to manage it in perpetuity;
- Acting as an interim manager on sites until an economically viable end-use is identified;
- Offering design services to ensure that on-going management is cost-effective;
- Involving landowners, the local community and other stakeholders in the development of appropriate maintenance plans and management regimes; and
- Providing specialist advice and consulting services, pioneering good practice.

The Trust was established in 2004 to own and manage land in perpetuity for the public benefit by (then) English Partnerships (now the Home and Communities Agency - HCA), in response to the need for a new organisation that could work with private and public sector partners to provide a secure and sustainable exit strategy for brownfield land, land created through development or regeneration, and areas of public open space. They took ownership of 1,000 hectares of land and secured foundation capital for their operations before becoming an independent Charitable Trust in 2010. Currently over 60 sites are in their management.

Cost modelling and funding:

As the proposals for Parsloes Park evolve in detail it will be essential to develop a clear and full understanding of the long-term costs of managing and maintaining the Park in perpetuity. This includes looking at all the management and annual maintenance needs as well as future requirements for capital replacement. This would form a strong foundation for modelling future funding needs and options. This stage would consider the scope for both endowment and/or service charge opportunities that might come forward through the planning process as well as looking at other revenue funding streams that might be available via rents, income, grants and commercial opportunities as well as existing local authority budgets.

Key aspects of this stage would typically include:

- Analysis of on-going costs and modelling of future resource needs;
- Analysis of funding options linked to potential future development and London Borough of Barking and Dagenham budgets; assistance with leveraging funding;
- Presentation of overall costs and funding needs to provide in-perpetuity management of the Park.
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Community engagement

1.0 Introduction

This report summarises the approach and feedback received as part of community consultation exercises to inform the development of proposals for the Parsloes Park masterplan and management plan that meet current and emerging needs and aspirations. The community engagement undertaken was seen as the first steps of a longer term strategy for engagement during the lifetime of the project to restore and regenerate Parsloes Park. The approach therefore aimed to set the tone for engagement and begin to gather relevant information that could support future funding applications.

The objectives of community engagement for this project were:

- To raise awareness of the project to restore and enhance Parsloes Park;
- To communicate the intrinsic value of Parsloes Park and its potential for enhancement;
- To encourage a better understanding of the Park, its heritage, habitat, wildlife and the need for financial sustainability;
- To reach out to groups who currently under-utilise the Park and understand their desires and aspirations;
- To engage potential new users and begin to grow the audience for the Park;
- To encourage a sense of local ownership of, and pride in, the Park;
- To encourage the local community to get involved with the long-term future of the project; and
- To feed into future funding applications for the delivery of masterplan proposals and on-going management and maintenance.

Many of these objectives are also applicable to the longer term engagement opportunities that would be available during the restoration of Parsloes Park.
Masterplan consultation

Parsloes Park

The importance of Parsloes Park in the heart of the borough has long been recognised. It's our largest park, at 58 hectares, just over seven times the size of the Olympic Stadium.

The park was once one of the most popular in the borough, with many opportunities for play, a rich assortment of plants and flowers in and around the lake, gardens, and family events.

Today, we're working to explore opportunities to re-design Parsloes Park in a financially sustainable way. Its central location and good transport links means that Parsloes Park has the potential to become a destination for people once more, reaching more of the community for a wider range of activities and experiences.

Masterplan

We've appointed Arup to lead on masterplanning the regeneration and restoration of Parsloes Park.

This is an opportunity to address a number of priorities for people including:
- healthy living
- opportunities for sport, play and recreation
- managing flood risk
- transition to low carbon lifestyles through encouraging active travel.

These priorities will be addressed while conserving and enhancing the park's heritage and biodiversity assets.

Consultation – We want your views

We're at the very start of this process and it's important to understand and incorporate the views of local people who both use the park and live in the area, into the longer term vision for the Park.

As part of this process, we would really like to hear your views on the park, including how you use it and what improvements you would like to see.

Parsloes Park online consultation

This consultation closes on Sunday 31 January 2016.
2.0 Approach

The approach to community engagement responded to challenges including longer term aspirations and requirements for engagement, a project programme over Autumn and Winter when the Park is less well used, limited recorded information on existing users and managing community expectations to reflect the need for realistic, financially sustainable and deliverable proposals.

The approach to engagement followed two stages:
- information gathering and awareness raising; and
- an engagement event held on Saturday 12th December.

Information gathering and awareness raising
This part of the approach intended to introduce the community to the project at an early stage and to serve as a record of feedback during the project, gathering feedback that could inform later stages.

Information about the project was provided on the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham website at www.lbhd.gov.uk/parsloespark and an online consultation was made available for the community to submit their views from 12th November 2015 and will close on 31st January 2016. A copy of the masterplan consultation questions is shown opposite. The website was accompanied by press releases and social media posts including a residents newsletter, local press, Facebook and Twitter.

An interim report dated 11th December recorded a total of 45 responses, which are summarised in section 3.0 Feedback.

Engagement event
An engagement event was held between 10:00 and 16:00 on Saturday 12th December at Dagenham Library. The event communicated the work undertaken to date and emerging proposals. The event was advertised through local press, social media, a flyer drop to around 11,000 homes in Parsloes, Alibon and Mayesbrook wards and posters sent to Children’s Centres, Community Safety ward panel members, Libraries, Leisure centres, Eastbury Manor House, Valence House and Relish cafe.

Exhibition boards were displayed explaining the project and proposals and representatives from the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham and Arup were available to speak to members of the community. Approximately 25 people visited the exhibition and verbal and written feedback was gathered through discussions and feedback forms. As of 21st December, a total of 16 feedback forms and two feedback emails had been received.
3.0 Feedback

The majority of people visiting the engagement event who filled in a feedback form stated that they were supportive of the initial proposals.

Website
An interim report provided data on the usage of the Park and improvements that people would like to see.
- 38% of respondents used the Park daily and 27% used the Park weekly;
- 34% of respondents used the Park for leisurely strolls or dog walking, 20% used the Park for getting from A to B and 19% of respondents used the Park for play, games or recreation.

Social media
Comments received on social media posts included:
- suggestions for improvements relating to opportunities for play, maintenance and cleaning, a dog park, pull up bars, toilets and a youth centre;
- concern about the removal of some facilities and equipment from other parks in the borough (such as Valence Park); and
- memories of the park including the flamingos, formal gardens, paddling pool and play areas.

Engagement event
The feedback provided at the engagement event included:
- The Park has been overlooked for too long;
- the Park needs to be upgraded;
- support for bringing the Park back to its former glory;
- support for preventing the Park from being left in disrepair; and
- one comment suggested that the proposals had too little play opportunities for children aged 2 to 10 years.

The majority of people completing feedback forms used the Park for leisurely strolls or dog walking (nine respondents).

Changes suggested included volunteering opportunities, more activities for children and women.

Suggestions for improvements included:
- more seating;
- cafe / team rooms and toilet facilities;
- improvements to planting including flowers, indigenous trees and planting;
- opening up the Gores Brook and areas of wetland;
- improvements to the lake and exploring opportunities for fishing;
“A wide-ranging plan to make very good use of the Park and make a more coherent space. Lots of opportunities for education and fun.”

4.0 Next steps

Feedback will continue to be collected through the website until 31st January 2016. The feedback provided will inform the development and refinement of the masterplan and management plan.

In addition to the community engagement set out in this summary report, stakeholder engagement has been undertaken with representatives of the local interest groups and uses adjacent to the Park, Council officers, potential delivery partners and statutory consultees for future proposals (such as the Environment Agency and Natural England).