



Epping Forest & Commons Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 17 JULY 2025
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS - 2ND FLOOR WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Deputy Caroline Haines (Chair)	Alderman Sir Nicholas Lyons
Deputy Benjamin Murphy (Deputy Chairman)	David Sales
George Abrahams	James St John Davis (Ex-Officio Member)
Elizabeth Corrin	Philip Woodhouse
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson	Verderer Michael Chapman DL
Alderman Vincent Keaveny, CBE	Verderer William Kennedy
Gregory Lawrence	Verderer Paul Morris
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP (Ex-Officio Member)	Verderer Nicholas Munday

Enquiries: Zoe Williams
Zoe.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:

<https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

Whilst we endeavour to livestream all of our public meetings, this is not always possible due to technical difficulties. In these instances, if possible, a recording will be uploaded following the end of the meeting.

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

NB: Certain matters for information have been marked * Members are encouraged to submit any questions on these items to the Committee Clerk or the Chair prior to the start of the meeting. Subject to the complexity and length of the agenda, the Chair would like members to be aware that if they do not submit questions in advance they may not be taken due to time constraints. These information items have been collated in a supplementary agenda pack and circulated separately.

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. APOLOGIES

2. MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

3. MINUTES

To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the previous meeting held on Thursday 29 May 2025.

For Decision
(Pages 7 - 24)

4. APPOINTMENT OF CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES AND GROUPS

Committee to consider the appointment of a Member to serve as an observer on the Natural Environment Board.

For Decision

5. EPPING FOREST AND THE COMMONS GOVERNANCE PROPOSALS

Report of the Executive Director, Environment.

For Decision
(Pages 25 - 30)

6. *NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CHARITY REVIEW – UPDATE ON FUNDRAISING WORKSTREAMS

Report of the Chamberlain and Executive Director, Environment.

For Information

Burnham Beeches & The Commons

7. ***ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (SUPERINTENDENT) BURNHAM BEECHES AND THE COMMONS UPDATE (APRIL - JUNE 2025)**
Report of the Executive Director, Environment.
For Information
8. **VETERAN TREE CONFERENCE UPDATE**
Committee to receive verbal update from Officers of the Environment Department.
For Information
9. ***RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE (BURNHAM BEECHES AND THE COMMONS)**
Report of the Executive Director, Environment.
For Information
10. ***NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CHARITY REVIEW - ASSETS UPDATE FOR THE ASHTEAD COMMON CHARITY**
Report of the Director, Natural Environment.
For Information
11. ***NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CHARITY REVIEW - ASSETS UPDATE FOR BURNHAM BEECHES AND STOKE COMMON CHARITY**
Report of the Director, Natural Environment.
For Information
12. ***NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CHARITY REVIEW - ASSETS UPDATE FOR THE COULSDON AND OTHER COMMONS CHARITY**
Report of the Director, Natural Environment.
For Information
13. ***NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CHARITY REVIEW - CHARITY ASSETS UPDATE FOR THE WEST WICKHAM COMMON AND SPRING PARK WOOD CHARITY**
Report of Director, Natural Environment.
For Information

Epping Forest

14. ***ASSISTANT DIRECTOR SUPERINTENDENT'S EPPING FOREST UPDATE (MAY - JUNE 2025)**
Report of the Executive Director, Environment.
For Information
15. ***RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE (EPPING FOREST)**
Report of the Executive Director, Environment.
For Information
16. **MOTORGATE WAYLEAVE FEE INCREASE 2025**
Report of the Executive Director, Environment.
For Decision
(Pages 31 - 38)
17. **PURCHASING OF GROUNDS MAINTENANCE MACHINERY CHINGFORD GOLF COURSE**
Report of the Executive Director, Environment.
For Decision
(Pages 39 - 42)
18. **ROOKERY WOOD RESERVOIR REMEDIAL WORKS**
Report of the Executive Director, Environment.
For Decision
(Pages 43 - 62)
19. ***NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CHARITY REVIEW - CHARITY ASSETS UPDATE FOR THE EPPING FOREST CHARITY**
Report of the Director, Natural Environment.
For Information
20. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
21. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

22. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

MOTION: The following matters relate to business under the remit of the Court of Common Council acting for the City Corporation as charity Trustee, to which Part VA and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 public access to meetings provisions do not apply. The following items contain sensitive information which it is not in the best interests of the charity to consider in a public meeting (engaging similar considerations as under paragraphs 3 and 5 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Act) and will be considered in non-public session.

For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

23. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

To agree the non-public minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 May 2025.

For Decision
(Pages 63 - 66)

**24. *CITY CORPORATION GOVERNANCE OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT
CHARITIES – UPDATE ON PLANNED CHANGES**

Report of the Chamberlain and Executive Director, Environment.

For Information

25. COMPLEMENTARY LAND POLICY AND ASSETS APPRAISAL

Committee to receive verbal update from Officers of the Environment Department.

For Information

Burnham Beeches & The Commons

26. UPDATES ON BURNHAM BEECHES & THE COMMONS

Officers of Environment Department to provide any further updates about Burnham Beeches & The Commons.

For Information

Epping Forest

27. **EPPING FOREST DEER MANAGEMENT UPDATE FOR 2024/25 SEASON AND 2025/26 ANNUAL DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN PROPOSALS REPORT**

Report of the Executive Director, Environment.

For Decision
(Pages 67 - 116)

28. **APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS BY THE RANGER**

Report of the Executive Director, Environment.

For Decision
(Pages 117 - 122)

29. **NON PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

30. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

EPPING FOREST & COMMONS COMMITTEE

Thursday, 29 May 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Epping Forest & Commons Committee held at
Committee Rooms - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 29 May 2025 at
1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Caroline Haines (Chair)
Deputy Benjamin Murphy (Deputy Chairman)
George Abrahams
Elizabeth Corrin
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson
Gregory Lawrence
Alderman Sir Nicholas Lyons
David Sales
Verderer Michael Chapman DL
Verderer William Kennedy
Verderer Paul Morris
Verderer Nicholas Munday
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP (Ex-Officio Member)

Officers:

Pauline Mouskis	- Chamberlain's Department
Jack Joslin	- City Bridge Foundation
Edward Wood	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Katie Stewart	- Executive Director, Environment
Emily Brennan	- Environment Department
Tanith Cook	- Environment Department
Jacqueline Eggleston	- Environment Department
Juliane Heinecke	- Environment Department
Joanne Hill	- Environment Department
Jo Hurst	- Environment Department
Laura Lawson	- Environment Department
Geoff Sinclair	- Environment Department
Tristan Vetta	- Environment Department
Callum Southern	- Town Clerk's Department
Zoe Williams	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

At the outset of the meeting, Alderman Sir Nicholas Lyons, as senior Member present, was moved into the Chair.

Apologies for absence were received from Alderman Sir Vincent Keaveny and Philip Woodhouse.

2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

Verderer Nicholas Munday made a declaration of interest as they had recently been appointed as a trustee of the Copped Hall Trust. The Member noted this had been recorded in the register of interests.

3. **ORDER OF THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**

The Committee received the Order of the Court of Common Council dated 25 April 2025.

4. **ELECTION OF CHAIR**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Chair in accordance with Standing Order No. 28.

Deputy Caroline Haines, as the only Member expressing their willingness to serve, was duly elected as Chair for the ensuing year and took the Chair.

RESOLVED – That, Deputy Caroline Haines be elected Chair of the Epping Forest and Commons Committee for the ensuing year.

The Chair thanked the Committee and made opening remarks.

5. **ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIR**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Deputy Chair in accordance with Standing Order No. 29.

Deputy Benjamin Murphy, as the only Member expressing their willingness to serve, was duly elected as Deputy Chair for the ensuing year.

RESOLVED – That, Deputy Benjamin Murphy be elected Deputy Chair of the Epping Forest and Commons Committee for the ensuing year.

Gregory Lawrence moved a vote of thanks to Deputy Benjamin Murphy, the outgoing Chairman.

RESOLVED – That, Members of the Epping Forest & Commons Committee wish to express our sincere appreciation to

DEPUTY BENJAMIN MURPHY

for his exceptional leadership and unwavering commitment during his tenure as Chairman of the Epping Forest and Commons Committee.

Ben's time as Chair has been marked by resilience, innovation, and a deep respect for the natural environment. Despite navigating significant challenges—including budget reductions, the aftermath of the pandemic, and structural reviews—he remained steadfast in championing the value of open spaces for both community wellbeing and ecological sustainability.

Under his guidance, the Committee secured an additional £1 million in local risk funding, increased staffing by 25%, and addressed longstanding health and safety concerns. He also led the development of a refreshed strategy and risk register, ensuring a more robust and forward-looking approach to governance.

Ben's passion for volunteerism has been transformative. From launching the first Volunteer Guide and the "50 for 50" campaign to initiating inclusive events like Lend a Hand Day, he has reinvigorated community engagement. Over 51,000 volunteer hours were logged during his tenure—an extraordinary contribution equivalent to over half a million pounds in value.

His legacy includes the creation of new learning trails, the restoration of heritage sites, and the celebration of biodiversity—from tree plantings and fungi discoveries to the launch of augmented reality tools and inclusive play areas. He was also pivotal in the celebration of the Rangers Golden Jubilee, championing the recognition of long-serving volunteers, and supporting the recruitment of diverse new voices across the organisation.

Ben's leadership has left an enduring mark on Epping Forest and the Commons. We thank him for his vision, energy, and heartfelt dedication to protecting and enhancing these treasured landscapes for generations to come.

Thank you, Ben.

The Deputy Chair expressed his gratitude to the Committee, Officers, and volunteer organisations for their support during his Chairmanship.

The Chair expressed appreciation to Alderman Bronek Masojada, who recently stepped down from the Committee.

The Chair welcomed Elizabeth Corrin as a new Member of the Committee. The Chair also welcomed James St John Davis and Charles Edward Lord OBE JP, Chair and Deputy Chair of the Natural Environment Board, to the Committee as ex-officio Members.

A Member noted concerns they had about governance structure, and that these would be raised at relevant points in the meeting. The Chair assured the Member that these concerns would be noted.

8. APPOINTMENT OF CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES AND GROUPS AND REPRESENTATIVES ON OTHER BODIES

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk about appointments to consultative committees and groups, and representatives on other bodies.

RESOLVED – That:

- a) Members noted that the appointments to the Epping Forest Consultative Group were as follows:
 - Deputy Caroline Haines (ex-officio)
 - Deputy Benjamin Murphy (ex-officio)
 - Verderer Michael Chapman
 - Verderer William Kennedy
 - Verderer Paul Morris
 - Verderer Nicholas Munday
 - i. That, the terms of reference for the Epping Forest Consultative Group be amended to reflect the appointment of 6 Members from the Epping Forest and Commons Committee, inclusive of the Chair and Deputy Chair as ex-officio Members.
 - ii. That, Verderer Paul Morris continue as Chair of the Epping Forest Consultative Group for the ensuing year.
- b) Members noted that the appointments to the Ashted Common Consultative Group were as follows, with the exception of any Members who were not in attendance at the meeting:
 - Deputy Caroline Haines (ex-officio)
 - Deputy Benjamin Murphy (ex-officio)
 - Verderer Michael Chapman
 - i. That, the terms of reference for the Ashted Common Consultative Group be amended to reflect the appointment of 3 from the Epping Forest and Commons Committee, inclusive of the Chair and Deputy Chair as ex-officio Members.
- c) Members noted that the appointments to the Burnham Beeches and Stoke Common Consultative Groups were as follows:
 - Deputy Caroline Haines (ex-officio)
 - Deputy Benjamin Murphy (ex-officio)
 - Verderer Paul Morris
 - i. That, the terms of reference for the Burnham Beeches and Stoke Common Consultative Group be amended to reflect the appointment of 3 Members from the Epping Forest and Commons Committee, inclusive of the Chair and Deputy Chair as ex-officio Members.

- d) Members noted the appointments to the West Wickham, Spring Park and Coulsdon Common Consultative Group were as follows, with the exception of any Members who were not in attendance at the meeting:
- Deputy Caroline Haines (ex-officio)
 - Deputy Benjamin Murphy (ex-officio)
- i. That, the terms of reference for the West Wickham, Spring Park and Coulsdon Common Consultative Group be amended to reflect the appointment of the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Epping Forest and Commons Committee.
- e) Members noted the appointments to the Deer Management Oversight Group were as follows:
- Verderer Michael Chapman
 - Verderer William Kennedy
 - Verderer Nicholas Munday
 - Gregory Lawrence
 - George Abrahams
- i. That, the terms of reference for the Deer Management Oversight Group be amended to reflect the appointment of 5 Members from the Epping Forest and Commons Committee.
- ii. That, Verderer William Kennedy continue as Chair of the Deer Management Oversight Committee for the ensuing year.

7. MINUTES

RESOLVED – That, the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 23 January 2025 be approved as an accurate record.

Matters arising

Clarification was provided in relation to car parking fees for multiple cars at Burnham Beeches. Officers noted that car park users could register two cars, for a slightly higher price, but only one car was allowed on site at a time.

Additionally, the Chair suggested that in future Members receive information packs only in digital form, rather than hard copy papers, moving forward. The Chair noted that the Town Clerk would contact Members following the meeting to get an indication of preference. A Member noted their disagreement for this proposal and that they would like to continue receiving information packs in hard copy.

The Chair advised Members that in future, any inquiries regarding informational items should be submitted to the Town Clerk at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. A Member disagreed with the proposal, concerned they could not ask questions arising from the meeting discussion. Additionally, a Member queried

whether they could receive papers earlier than when they were usually published. The Chair responded they would discuss this with Officers after the meeting. The Deputy Chair explained to Members that giving advance notice for questions allows Officers to ensure that the right people were in the room to answer the questions. Another Member suggested there be more flexibility in this approach by encouraging Members to ask questions 48 hours in advance, rather than requiring this.

8. MATTERS ARISING

a) Action Log

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk which provided an updated Action Log.

Regarding the Biodiversity Net Gain update, Officers explained that the consultants had presented their draft finding to Officers and the Committee would receive a finance summary report on this matter in the next Committee meeting.

In response to clarification sought by the Deputy Chairman, the Chair confirmed that this item would be taken off the action log and moved to the Committee's forward plan.

The Chair explained that future information about the action log would be presented in a different form in future meetings.

Burnham Beeches & The Commons

9. INCOMING CHAIR'S INTRODUCTION: BURNHAM BEECHES & THE COMMONS

The Chair made an introduction to the Burnham Beeches and the Commons portion of the agenda, and the separation between the charities.

10. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR'S GOLDEN THREAD

The Committee received a verbal presentation from the Assistant Director about the overarching themes for high-level plans over the next three years.

11. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (SUPERINTENDENT) REPORT

The Committee received a report from the Executive Director, Environment which presented key data for Burnham Beeches and the Commons for the period January 2025 – March 2025.

The Chair congratulated the Burnham Beeches Ranger for his 43 years of service.

The Deputy Chair commented that there was a growing desire for more liaison with various Government agencies. They noted that there had been helpful liaison with the London Borough of Bromley about integrating volunteers into existing groups in the local community and gaining access to S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy funding. The Deputy Chair commented that it would be helpful for Officers to consider how the planning framework fit into the high-level plans for the next three years. Officers agreed, commenting this would be a significant part of the landscape working. They commented that there were a range of planning and development issues on the horizon, highlighting the need to determine views on these and begin considering income generation options.

A Member sought assurance that fire prevention was included in the future plans. Officers responded that the plan was high-level and fire prevention processes were always under review. They noted that the processes employed on the wildfire earlier in the year had proved to be effective.

In response to a query about the Ancient Tree Forum Conference being hosted on 25 and 26 June 2025, Officers explained that it was a two-day international conference that would outline the research and work that had been done on the biodiversity of ancient and pollard trees.

RESOLVED – That, Members noted the report and its contents.

12. NATURE RESILIENCE AND LANDSCAPE

The Committee received a verbal update from the Assistant Director about nature resilience and landscape.

The Chair noted that in the next Committee meeting, Members would consider the membership and terms of reference of the Epping Forest and the Commons Member Oversight Groups.

13. ANNUAL REPORT AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2024 - BURNHAM BEECHES AND STOKE COMMON

The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and Executive Director, Environment which presented the final version of the Trustee's Annual Report and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 March 2024 for Burnham Beeches and Stoke Common.

Officers explained that this report was filed with the Charity Commission before the required deadline, however due to its timing it was not able to be considered at the previous Epping Forest and the Commons Committee meeting.

RESOLVED – That, Members noted the Trustee's Annual Report and Financial Statements for the 2023/24 Financial Year.

14. **ANNUAL REPORT AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2024 - WEST WICKHAM COMMON AND SPRING PARK WOOD AND COULSDON AND OTHER COMMONS**

The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and Executive Director, Environment which presented the final versions of the Trustee's Annual Report and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 March 2024 for both West Wickham Common and Spring Park Wood.

Officers explained that while the report had now been submitted, they had been unable to meet the Charity Commission's reporting deadline this year as it had taken time to link the two charities and be compliant with Charity Commission regulations. They further noted that two separate reports for each of the charities had to be produced. Officers commented that operations had returned to normal and they did not expect these reporting issues in the future.

The Deputy Chair commented that moving forward, it would be useful for the Committee to consider these reports as a 'for discussion' item, before it was submitted to the Charity Commission. They explained that this would allow the Committee to have more input into the content of the report and recommend amendments to the Audit and Risk Management Committee. Officers agreed with this comment and assured the Deputy Chair that were intending to take that approach for the current reporting period. They explained they were in the process of arranging this, and noted there were some difficulties due to the timing of Committee meetings in the year.

The Deputy Chair explained to Members that the reason for linking the two charities was that all of the assets were being shared between the sites, so it was decided that they would be consolidated for reporting purposes, whilst retaining the two separate charities.

Officers commented that in the future they would incorporate more fundraising requests into the annual report, as part of the output from the Natural Environment Charity Review.

RESOLVED – That, Members noted the Trustee's Annual Report and Financial Statements for the 2023/24 Financial Year for both charities.

Epping Forest

15. **INCOMING CHAIR'S INTRODUCTION: EPPING FOREST**

The Chair made an introduction to the Epping Forest portion of the agenda and explained to Members the proposal for three additional Member Oversight Groups. They noted that these would have a focus on the upcoming 150th Anniversary of the Epping Forest Act 1878; wildlife and biodiversity; and engagement and access. The Chair noted that Members would be contacted about these groups before the next meeting to identify what oversight groups they would like to be a part of.

The Assistant Director (Superintendent) outlined the key themes and Golden Thread of Epping Forest's plan for 2025/26, 2026/27 and 2027/28.

16. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment which presented updates on business activity delivered in Epping Forest for the period January to April 2025.

The Chair acknowledged the work that had gone into preparing for Volunteer Week, which was taking place in the coming week, and encouraged Members to extend their congratulations to any volunteers they encountered at Epping Forest.

A Member noted that it would be helpful for the plans discussed in the previous item to be developed further so they could be used as guiding principles to help inform the committee of the progress being made in those areas.

The Member commented that managing Epping Forest and the complementary land as a whole had allowed the Superintendent to develop bold plans. They also highlighted the distinction between the land governed by the Epping Forest Act 1878 and the complementary land, emphasising that any attempt to separate this would need to be carefully managed.

A Member thanked Officers for the work that had been done on the car parks, noting that this had been well overdue.

The Deputy Chair commented that the Ranger of Epping Forest recently invited two of the forest's longest-serving volunteers to a garden party at Buckingham Palace, which the Deputy Chair also attended. They expressed hope that such recognition of the volunteers work at Epping Forest continued and noted improvement in how volunteer contributions were being celebrated.

RESOLVED – That, Members noted the report and its contents.

17. MEMBERSHIP OF THE EPPING FOREST CONSULTATIVE GROUP

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which summarised the applications received and made recommendations for the appointment of twenty members to the Epping Forest Consultative Group.

The Chair noted this would likely go through a revaluation reassessment in the coming year's cycle, and that there had been some new groups included in the list detailed in appendix 1 of the report.

A Member commented that improvements were needed to the operation of the Epping Forest Consultative Group, particularly in how the discussion was communicated back to Members. The Chair acknowledged that they would need

to find a way to improve the communication processes. Officers noted that the revised terms of reference reflected the Consultative Group's preference for a more collaborative approach, favouring site visits and workshops over the previous format of three formal meetings. They explained that there would be an Annual General Meeting held where business would be recorded. Officers commented that they would need to work out how an effective two-way feedback mechanism could be developed.

A Member congratulated Officers on the increase in both the number and diversity of the groups involved, noting that the organisations represented in the Consultative Group reflected the diversity of Epping Forest. The Chair added that this demonstrated the system was functioning effectively, though there remained a need to refine communication processes.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Appointed the 20 organisations recommended in appendix 1 of the report to the Epping Forest Consultative Group.
- Extended thanks to the organisations that had applied, particularly those who had attended for the last three years but had been unsuccessful in their application.

18. RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which provided the Epping Forest and Commons Committee with assurance that risk management procedures in place within the Environment Department were satisfactory and that they met the requirements of the Corporate Risk Management Framework and the Charities Act 2011.

A Member expressed concern about the removal of the reference to the Committee “acting as Trustee of the charity” in the Annual Report and Financial Statements recently filed with the Charity Commission. In their view, this meant that the Committee was no longer responsible for the management of the charity in the eyes of the Commission. Officers responded that they had written to the Member prior to the meeting to provide an explanation for the change, and that there was nothing to prevent the Committee from proceeding with the items on the meeting's agenda.

Officers clarified that the risk score for the declining condition of built assets and infrastructure in Epping Forest had been reduced to 12, as heritage assets were now treated as a separate risk category. They also noted that the health and safety risk score for Epping Forest and the condition of asset risk score for Ashted Common had been reduced following work that resolved key issues.

The Deputy Chair queried whether 12 was an appropriate risk score for heritage assets and whether there was enough focus in this area. Officers noted that they would consider this when the risks were reviewed.

The Deputy Chair commented on the negative impact of development and encroachment reflected in the Epping Forest Risk Register. They noted that the register only referenced Epping Forest and emphasised that it should also acknowledge that Surrey would also fall under the devolution arrangements. Officers responded that they would consider this matter in the Ashted Commons Risk Register.

In response to clarification sought, Officers assured a Member that visitor pressure was included in the Epping Forest Risk Register, under 'Negative impacts of development and encroachment'.

A Member was interested in whether there was a delineation between the ownership of risk in Epping Forest land and complementary land. They queried whether Warren House was considered part of the Epping Forest risk portfolio. Officers responded that the risk register did not reflect that Warren House was Epping Forest risk. They explained that Warren House was an anomaly in this case, and it had not been identified in the risk register as it was not considered as local risk, and there was not the budget or management responsibility for it. They also noted that, unlike some of the other assets on the risk register, it had not been included in the Heritage at Risk Register. Officers commented that they would be considering this in more detail in the future.

Another Member noted that this highlighted the governance issues and conflicts of interest that were arising. The Chair acknowledged the concern and indicated that it would be addressed under a later agenda item. Officers noted that where Warren House risk sat was up to the Controller of Premises Policies within the City Corporation's Health and Safety Department, rather than with the ownership of the land. Officers explained that more clarity would be achieved once those policies had been revised and redrafted.

A Member expressed concern that the issues surrounding Warren House had been raised on numerous occasions, and the issue had not yet been directly addressed. They cautioned that, without appropriate action, the Committee risked revisiting the same discussion in future years. The Chair responded that the ongoing reviews, along with their associated deadlines, would help move the matter closer to resolution.

A Member noted that, during a recent visit to Great Gregories Farm they noticed issues such as asbestos roofs, walls that were in disrepair, and sub-standard amenities. They queried why this was not addressed in the risk register. Officers responded that there was a lot captured in the risk register that was summarised in wider headings. They noted that Great Gregories Farm came under the 'Decline in condition of built assets and infrastructure'. The Deputy Chair noted that the Cyclical Works Programme captured many of these issues. They assured Members that the issues at Great Gregories Farm had been raised with the Superintendent and would be addressed through the Cyclical Works Programme.

The Chair questioned why the report format did not provide clarity for these assets, and whether consideration should be given to reclassifying Great Gregories Farm as a red risk. Officers responded that each risk category encompassed a broad range of individual items. They clarified that not every asset was assigned a separate risk in this report format, as many were addressed through the Cyclical Works Programme. Officers assured Members that the risk scoring was reviewed each time the report was produced and that the Committee's comments would be considered in the next update.

In response to a Member's query, the Deputy Chair clarified that the Warren House was a complementary asset. The Deputy Chair expressed concern that the Warren House was not identified as a red risk, given that there was no plan to manage the heritage asset. They requested that Officers reassess this risk for the next update. The Executive Director agreed that this risk would be reassessed.

In reference to their previous question concerning visitor pressure, a Member requested that visitor pressure was mentioned in risk 10 of the report, as the current risk appeared to focus more on housing. Officers responded that this matter would be taken away to be considered.

RESOLVED – That, Members confirmed, on behalf of the City Corporation as Trustee, that the risk registers appended to the report satisfactorily set out the key risks to each of the five charities and that appropriate systems were in place to identify and mitigate risks.

19. **EPPING FOREST SSSI FEATURE CONDITION SURVEYS UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment which summarised Epping Forest's Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) condition assessments and provided updates on assessments completed in 2024 and those proposed for 2025-2028.

The Deputy Chair questioned whether the rest of the cycle for the SSSI assessments were on track. Officers responded that they were in contact with Natural England and that the acid grassland surveys were scheduled to begin the following month. They noted that the remaining surveys were still on track as planned through to 2028. Officers added that they would continue to follow up and seek clarification on the process, particularly for the specialist surveys that would need to be commissioned by Natural England.

RESOLVED – That, Members noted the report and the change to the SSSI monitoring approach, the condition assessments and updates from 2024 and the proposed condition assessment monitoring for 2025-2028.

20. **FOREST KEEPER ROTA AND RECRUITMENT UPDATE PRESENTATION**

The Committee received a verbal presentation from Officers of the Environment department which updated Members on the progress made in creating the new Forest Keeper rota and ongoing recruitment.

The Chair commended the Officer on the presentation and how the issue of the rota had been addressed.

The Committee extended its thanks to the Officer for an excellent verbal report.

A Member expressed deep concern over the ongoing challenges the department faced with regard to the Forest Keeper Rota. They emphasised the need for collective awareness of the severity of the issue. It was noted that they rarely encountered keepers in the Forest, due to the insufficient staffing levels. Another Member observed that the Verderers had been raising this issue consistently throughout the Target Operating Model (TOM) review and questioned why it had been allowed to persist. In response, the Chair noted that all key Officers present were new to their roles since the TOM review and that significant changes had taken place since then.

A Member commended Officers for their efforts under challenging circumstances.

As this point, the Chair sought approval from the Committee to continue the meeting beyond two hours from the appointed time for the start of the meeting, in accordance with Standing Order 39, and this was agreed.

21. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT COMPLEMENTARY LAND POLICY AND COMPLEMENTARY LAND USE APPRAISAL

The Committee discussed a report of the Executive Director, Environment which proposed the scope and terms of reference for two specific pieces of work to review and improve management of assets originally purchased by the City Corporation to support charity operations, being the development of an updated Complementary Land Policy and a Complementary Land Use Appraisal.

The Chair thanked Officers for holding additional sessions with Members about this matter to improve the communication channels.

The Chair noted that Members had received an email from the Epping Forest Heritage Trust about the Complementary Land Policy, followed by a posting of a public message. The Chair expressed their disappointment about this and requested that Members discuss anything specific in reference to organisations or people in non-public session.

A Member noted that the terms of reference should make more reference to the Epping Forest and Commons Committee, and the Epping Forest Charity, rather than being just a consultee. They also requested that the terms of reference were

amended to reflect that any consultant considering complementary land should have regard to the present and historic use of the land. The Member highlighted that the current terms of reference focussed too much on the City Corporation and did not reflect what happens in Epping Forest.

Officers explained the reasoning for changing the name from buffer land to complementary land, stating that they were taking an integrated holistic approach across the Natural Environment division. They explained that there were other parcels of complementary land across the Natural Environment Charities, in addition to the land at Epping Forest, which was not described as buffer land and did not serve the same purpose. Therefore, Officers explained that they were developing a policy to apply to all those parcels of land. They noted there were specific issues, restrictions and history relating to each of the separate sites, and assured Members that specific appendices to accompany the complementary land policy would be developed in these instances. They assured Members that the policy would encompass the key reasons why Epping Forest Buffer Land was designated and that its importance would be reflected in the assets appraisal.

Concerning the potential conflict of interest raised by the Chair, Officers noted that they were developing a comprehensive handbook for Members as trustees of the Natural Environment Charities so that they could ensure the City Corporation's responsibilities as a corporate trustee flowed down to the Members of the Natural Environment Charities. They explained that this handbook would have a section that would address potential and existing internal conflicts of interest. Officers noted that the Committee would consider a draft version of this handbook in its July meeting. Officers assured Members that they would engage the Committee at the earliest opportunities throughout development of the complementary land policy and assets appraisal.

A Member questioned whether the change in terminology should have been a matter for decision by the Epping Forest and Commons Committee. In response, the Chair clarified that complementary land also referred to land held by other Natural Environment charities outside of Epping Forest. The Chair asked whether the buffer land associated with Epping Forest would continue to be referred to as 'buffer land' to preserve consistency in language. Officers confirmed that this terminology could be incorporated into the policy and the asset appraisal, acknowledging its significance in reflecting the land's historical context.

A Member observed that potential conflicts of interest were inherent within the City Corporation's structure but were typically managed by enabling committees to fulfil their designated roles and responsibilities. They noted that the Committee was typically the decision-making body for Epping Forest and expressed concern that the Committee was only being treated as a consultee. The Chair acknowledged the Members concern, noting that they had emphasised to the Policy and Resources Committee that they must do things 'with' the Natural Environment Charities, rather than 'to' them. They noted that as this process began from a decision at the Policy and Resources Committee, this had been difficult to do.

The Executive Director informed Members that, although the issue had arisen during discussions at the Policy and Resources Committee, it had already been recognised that such matters would need to be addressed through the Natural Environment Charity Review. They explained that the City Corporation was now seeking to develop a more coherent approach to asset management across the organisation, acknowledging that this had not always been effectively handled in the past. The Executive Director noted that this presented an opportunity to review the purpose of these sites, and to consider how the City Corporation's resources could be better utilised to allow them to reach their potential.

A Member expressed concern about the governance process and conflicts of interest, highlighting that key decisions were being made by other Committees. They stated that they didn't trust the advice they had been given, noting that it was produced or obtained by Officers of the City Corporation that were setting the direction for the work. The Member emphasised the Committee's duty, as the Grand Committee responsible for Epping Forest, to pause and reassess the current direction. The Member also requested that separate independent legal advice be provided to the Committee on the matter.

The Deputy Chair reminded Members that this process had always been needed and clarified that it was not intended to be about selling the assets. They also highlighted the City Corporation's public commitment to protecting the buffer land, and its alignment with the Climate Action Strategy and long-term goals for carbon sequestration.

The Deputy Chair noted that the term 'charity operations' in the terms of reference should be revised to 'charity objects' for greater accuracy. They emphasised the Committee's desire to be actively involved in the governance of the process and acknowledged the need to determine where such involvement would be appropriate. The Deputy Chair also highlighted the importance of managing potential conflicts of interest arising from the City Corporation's two capacities. Regarding the terminology of complementary land, the Deputy Chair explained how land had previously been identified and noted that the new terminology was much clearer. The Deputy Chair supported the Committee's role in reviewing the outcomes of the process and stressed the importance of ensuring that the appendices were site-specific, clearly detailing the history of each parcel of land.

A Member highlighted to the Committee that they must consider The Commons as part of this, in addition to Epping Forest, as they were part of the strategy. The Member also emphasised the importance of considering the history of all these areas.

A Member cautioned the Committee that the appraisal would lead to the selling of assets in the future and encouraged the Chair and Deputy Chair to be vocal in the Policy & Resources Committee on this matter.

A Member proposed that both the Superintendent and Members be included in the Task and Finish Group, as they would offer constructive input. They noted the uncertainty surrounding the future use of the land and emphasised the

importance of considering its historical context while planning for the present and future. The Member supported the review of whether the land was being used appropriately and expressed the view that the Epping Forest and Commons Committee should play a more active role in the process, rather than serving solely as a consultee.

Officers provided a summary of the feedback that had been received from Members.

RESOLVED – That, Members noted the report and its contents.

22. TRANSFORMATION FOR THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CHARITIES – PROJECT UPDATE AND GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on project governance arrangements as the work transitions to implementation phase.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the work to date on implementation of improvements identified by the NECR across assets, grant funding, governance and income generation.
- Noted the upcoming reporting schedule bringing detailed updates on these four areas.

23. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

A Member requested clarification on the Forest Keeper rota, specifically asking whether all filled and available positions were for five working days per week. The Chair noted that relevant Officers would respond in due course.

25. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no urgent business.

25. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED – That, the following matters relate to business under the remit of the Court of Common Council acting for the City Corporation as charity Trustee, to which Part VA and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 public access to meetings provisions do not apply. The following items contain sensitive information which it is not in the best interests of the charity to consider in a public meeting (engaging similar considerations as under paragraphs 3 and 5 of Schedule 12A of the 1972 Act) and will be considered in non-public session.

26. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED – That, Members approved the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2025.

27. EPPING FOREST AND COMMONS COMMITTEE DIARY 2025/26

Members received an update on the Epping Forest and Commons Committee Diary for 2025/26.

28. BURNHAM BEECHES & THE COMMONS

The Committee received a verbal update on Burnham Beeches & The Commons from the Assistant Director.

29. GRANT OF EASEMENT (SEF 12-25)

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment.

30. GRANT OF EASEMENT (SEF 11-25)

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment.

31. PERMISSION TO LET (SEF 13-25)

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment.

32. NON PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no non-public questions on matters relating to the work of the Committee.

33. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There were no items of other business raised in non-public session that the Chair considered urgent.

34. CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

RESOLVED – That, Members approved the confidential minutes of the previous meeting held on 23 January 2025 in non-public session.

The meeting ended at 4.29pm.

Chair

Contact Officer: Zoe Williams
Zoe.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee(s): Epping Forest and Commons – For Decision	Dated: 17/07/2025
Subject: Epping Forest and The Commons Governance Proposals (SEF 16/25)	Public For Decision
This proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes • provides statutory duties • provides business enabling functions 	Diverse Engaged Communities Dynamic Economic Growth Leading Sustainable Environment Vibrant Thriving Destination Providing Excellent Services Flourishing Public Spaces
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of:	Katie Stewart, Environment Executive Director
Report author:	Jacqueline Eggleston, Assistant Director, Epping Forest and Geoff Sinclair, Assistant Director, The Commons

Summary

This report proposes changes to the format of the meetings of the Epping Forest and Commons Committee along with the introduction of new member oversight groups.

Recommendation(s)

Having regard to the City of London Corporation's (CoLC) trustee responsibilities for each of the Natural Environment charities listed in paragraph 32 and in that case being satisfied that it is in the best interests of each relevant charity and its beneficiaries, Members are asked to:

- approve the retention of the Epping Forest & Commons Committee (EF&CC) meetings on a bimonthly basis, holding six meetings each year, however, moving to four formal quarterly meetings for Committee business for decision making with two further meetings focused on strategy and policy development held on site at Epping Forest and / or The Commons.
- endorse the principle of three Epping Forest and Commons Committee Saturday Visits annually, (March, July and November) on the Saturday preceding each Committee meeting that follows in the next week
- Appoint representative members to the proposed oversight and steering group meetings and Wanstead Parkland Steering Group.

Main Report

Background

1. The Epping Forest and Commons Committee (EF&CC) governance arrangements were last reviewed in 2023.

Current Position

2. Since this review there are areas that may now benefit from some revisions.
3. Current reporting arrangements for the Superintendents Update have not effectively met the intentions for business reporting aligned to the financial quarters. This is partly due to lack of detailed business plans to report against, business information being 'owned' elsewhere in the Corporation, and a lack of appropriate tools / resource to collect information.
4. There is also a desire to report more current news updates to meet Members' interest, and role on behalf of the Conservators and trustee, meaning that the reporting dates covered are often mixed within one report.
5. Action Logs have not necessarily aligned with business plan objectives and priorities.
6. In relation to Epping Forest, Local Authority Liaison Group meetings could be further refined to be specific about scope and purpose.
7. 'Lead Member' arrangements are in place to enable greater involvement and best use of individual Members' expertise ahead of matters being reported to the formal Committee. This could be expanded to gain additional benefit.

Options

8. Refine the governance arrangements for the Epping Forest and Commons Committee as outlined in the proposals section of this report. This option is recommended for the reasons set out within the proposals section.
9. Provide comment on the proposals, with some amendments, seeking a further report mapping out the implications of those proposals (if required).

10. Leave governance arrangements as they are currently. This will not make the business improvements intended in the proposals for this report by creating more opportunities for in depth scrutiny and partnership working. This option is not recommended

Proposals

Epping Forest & Commons Committee

11. The arrangements of the Epping Forest & Commons Committee (EF&CC) meetings are currently on a bimonthly basis, holding six meetings each year. Four operate as formal quarterly meetings for Committee business to allow for decision making and the other two are informal meetings. Of these, one is a 'Deep Dive' enabling deeper scrutiny of particular topics, to take place in September, the other an Away Day focused on strategy and policy development to take place in May. The latter two meetings would not have any formal papers.

12. These are proposed to be held, effective from 2026, as follows:

<i>January</i>	Committee meeting covering Q2 (July to September)
<i>March</i>	Committee meeting Q3 (October to December)
<i>May</i>	Away Day off-site
<i>July</i>	Committee meeting Q4 - End of Year
<i>September</i>	Deep Dive
<i>November</i>	Committee meeting Q1 (Apr-June)

13. The EF&CC meetings are to be moved from a Thursday back to a Monday at 11.00am, where at all possible (noting various factors such as clashes with other Committees, the Chair's and senior officer diaries).

14. Committee Members are invited to attend visits to the respective sites three times per year on the Saturday preceding the March, July and November meetings.

<i>March</i>	Epping Forest
<i>July</i>	The Commons
<i>November</i>	Epping Forest

15. Members are requested, as far as possible, to submit questions on for information papers 48 hours in advance of meetings so that officers can obtain a fuller response.

Epping Forest Consultation & Stakeholder Engagement Groups

Epping Forest and Commons Oversight Groups

16. It is proposed that three 'oversight' groups are established for Epping Forest and one oversight group for The Commons. These will replace the previous lead member structure.
17. The aim of these groups is to provide focus on priority areas, allowing for strategic oversight and, where required, more detailed scrutiny of key subject or project areas.
18. The oversight groups will have no decision-making powers but may choose to make recommendations to the Epping Forest and Commons Committee, or to provide more detailed insight into subjects under discussion during the Committee's meetings. They will be managed and co-ordinated by officers within the Environment Department.
19. Members are invited to nominate themselves for one or more of these groups, according to their interest or expertise. The Chair and Deputy Chair will be invited to attend each group.

Oversight Groups	Lead Officer(s)
<i>EF Act 150th Celebrations (EF)</i>	Head of Engagement and PA/Stakeholder Officer
<i>Nature Resilience and Landscape (EF)</i>	Head of Conservation / Conservation Manager
<i>Engagement and Accessibility (EF)</i>	Head of Learning and Access & Development Manager
<i>Nature Resilience and Landscape (The Commons)</i>	Assistant Director (The Commons)

Deer Management Oversight Group.

20. The DMOG was inaugurated in 2022 focusing on the Deer Management Strategy Review to provide oversight of the management of deer across Epping Forest and the Epping Forest Buffer Land. This group will remain until Members consider all objectives have been achieved. The Chair and Deputy Chair will be invited to attend.

Stakeholder Engagement

21. The Epping Forest Local Authority Liaison Group will be removed and replaced with proactive site based or authority-based meetings to target more specific issues and encourage partnership work.
22. Epping Forest Consultative Group revisions have previously been reported to this Committee.

23. Further Project Boards or steering group meetings may be set up to provide additional insight into more complex areas of work. In relation to Epping Forest, a Wanstead Parkland Plan steering group will be set up and it is recommended that a Member of the EF&CC chairs this group.

Corporate and Strategic Implications

Financial implications

24. All the proposals can be met within local risk / grant budgets.

Resource implications

25. The TOM Phase II proposals included provision for a Stakeholder Engagement Officer to support the administration of the new governance arrangements beyond the work of the EF&CC which will continue to be managed by the Town Clerks Department. This post was reviewed and with the majority of the meetings under Epping Forest the work was absorbed into the post of PA and Support Services Officer at Epping Forest.
26. There is no additional resource at The Commons for committee and stakeholder engagement, so this work is delivered by the Superintendent.

Legal implications

27. None

Risk implications

28. None

Equalities implications

29. None

Climate implications

30. None

Security implications

31. None

Charity Implications

32. Epping Forest (number 232990), Ashted Common (number 1051510), Burnham Beeches & Stoke Common (number 232987), West Wickham Common & Spring Park Wood (number 232988) and Coulsdon and other Commons (number 232988-1) are registered charities. Charity Law obliges Members to ensure that the decisions they take in relation to the Charity are taken in the best interests of the Charity.

Conclusion

33. Committee reporting and business arrangements for the Epping Forest and Commons Committee and associated consultative and liaison activity have been

reviewed recommending changes that will enable Members to better monitor activity and progress, while providing stakeholders and beneficiaries more in-depth opportunities to engage with the relevant charities.

Background Papers

Stakeholder Engagement & Lead Member Proposals – Epping Forest and Commons Committee, 13 July 2023

Jacqueline Eggleston

Assistant Director/ Superintendent
Natural Environment Division - Epping Forest
T: 020 8532 1010
E: Jacqueline.eggleston@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Geoff Sinclair

Assistant Director / Superintendent
Natural Environment Division – The Commons
T: 01753 647 358
E: geoff.sinclair@cityoflondon.gov.uk

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee(s): Epping Forest and Commons Committee	Dated: 17/07/2025
Subject: Motorgate Wayleave Fee increase 2025 (SEF 18/25))	Public report: For Decision
This proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes 	Flourishing Open Spaces
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	£0
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of:	Katie Stewart – Executive Director of Environment
Report author:	Brian Pallett – Epping Forest Licensing and Wayleave Officer

Summary

This report is necessary to seek Committee approval for the increase in wayleave fees for domestic motor access (motorgates) as of 1 October 2025.

It is proposed to maintain the existing model of basing charges on council tax bands. As the last time charges were reviewed was 2015 a Retail Price Index (RPI) uplift will be applied on the 2015 charges (April 2015 to April 2025). This represents a 55.9% increase in fees.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Approve the increase in motorgate wayleave fees in line with RPI as proposed in Option 1.

Main Report

Background

1. Following the enactment of the Epping Forest Acts 1878 & 1880 which established the City Corporation as the Conservators of Epping Forest, further land acquisitions were finalised in the Arbitrator's Award of 1882, which established the initial Forest Land holding. While the Arbitrator's Award settled many of the access issues for properties associated with the Forest, given the purchase of individual estates within the Forest and the settling of many illegal enclosures, over 150 properties were found to rely on crossing Forest Land to access the public highway. Section 33(1)(iv) of the Epping Forest Act 1878 recognised this situation and provided power to the Conservators to 'afford facilities and grant rights of way for access to inclosures'.
2. Wayleaves are a widely recognised form of personal licence, which allow the Conservators to continue to manage rights of access across Forest land and prevent access rights from potentially arising by prescription.
3. The wayleave has the benefit of an annual charge rather than a one-off charge based on a full property valuation. Few landowners are prepared or able to make such contributions and therefore wayleaves remain the preferred solution for recording and conferring access rights.
4. There have been some previous misconceptions by some wayleave holders that the wayleave fee is related to some form of maintenance provision to be executed by the Conservators, that the wayleave permits additional uses of Forest land such as parking or material storage and that the holding of a wayleave licence for a prolonged period confers a permanent access right. All wayleave licences directly indicate that the maintenance of the wayleave throughout its continuance is the responsibility of the licensee, that the wayleave is only for the purpose of passing and re-passing to the benefitting property and that it can be determined at any time.
5. Epping Forest Officers have worked to the general principle that where a property has had the benefit of a motorgate wayleave, the same benefit will be offered to new owners/occupiers of the property, by way of a new licence subject in most cases to revised terms.
6. The current wayleave charging model was developed by Strutt and Parker in conjunction with the City of London Open Spaces Department in 2015. This replaced a very basic model which charged all motorgate wayleaves at £50 per annum. The model came into effect as of 1 October 2015 and linked the motorgates to the existing council tax banding A-H. The basis for this model was that it is a charging concept that all households are familiar with and that there is a standard percentage escalation between council tax bands nationally and established valuation principles recognise that the value of land used to provide access to third party property is related to the value of the property that the access serves.

7. It was originally planned that the 2015 charge would be reviewed in 2020. However, this was not pursued due to the uncertainty caused by the Covid Pandemic. Epping Forest Officers have instead used the last five years to improve recording of wayleaves to protect the Forest from the potential establishment of prescriptive rights, pursued debt collection of non-payments and improved wayleave documentation when new wayleaves are requested.
8. Access to commercial wayleaves is addressed by a separate project and is based on the rateable value of the respective property.

Current Position

9. Motorgate wayleave fees raise £30,765 and form a contribution to the Superintendent's (Assistant Director) Local Risk Budget which is applied in pursuance of the Epping Forest Charity's activities, including conservation and recreation objectives.
10. All wayleaves are granted on an annual basis and will renew until determined, which can be completed at any time by either the Conservators as the licensor or by the licensee.
11. All wayleaves contain a clause that states that wayleave fees can be increased at any time by the licensor when notified in writing.

Options

12. **Option 1:** Approve the increase wayleave fee for all domestic properties and agricultural accesses in line with RPI from April 2015 to April 2025 which represents a 55.9% increase and an increase in revenue to the Charity of £17,205 and annual income of £47,970. **This option is recommended.**
13. **Option 2:** Approve an increase in wayleave fee for all domestic properties in line with average Council Tax increases per respective borough. **This option is not recommended** due to the inconsistency across the Epping Forest estate.
14. **Option 3:** Do not approve an increase in motorgate wayleave charges. **This option is not recommended.**

Proposals

15. It is proposed to maintain the existing model and apply a Retail Price Index (RPI) uplift on the 2015 charges (April 2015 to April 2025). This reflects the last available published RPI rate against the rate used in 2015. The RPI increase over this period is 55.9%.

16. Use of RPI is a recognised measure of inflation in UK that includes owner-occupier housing costs (the expenses associated with owning, maintaining, and living in one's own home). As RPI is often used in the setting of cost increases for bills and services, and other government levies it's use in this context is appropriate for the service the licence provides to the respective properties.
17. RPI increases are used annually by the Epping Forest Charity to increase in fees and charges for licences and produce fees.
18. If approved, Officers propose the next increase to wayleave fees in 2030, given the scale of application required to implement the increase.
19. This would result in a £17,205 increase in income to the Epping Forest Charity and a prospective annual income of £47,970.
20. By way of comparison, council tax has increased on average in the UK per dwelling by 39% over the same period. Locally, in the London boroughs of Redbridge and Waltham Forest Council tax has increased by 57% respectively and in the Epping Forest District by 42% over the same period. Due to this inconsistency in a local context, it is not proposed to increase wayleave fees on this basis reflecting the cross-authority extent of the Forest.

Key Data

21. This 55.9% increase would be applicable to all properties across all bands. The increase per property is shown in the table below.

Council Tax Banding	No. Motorgates	2015 Fee	2025 Fee	Increase between bandings	Total Income 2015	Total Income 2025
A	55	£70.00	£109.00		£3,850.00	£5,995
B	1	£81.00	£126.00	16.67%	£81.00	£126
C	2	£93.00	£145.00	14.29%	£186.00	£290
D	13	£105.00	£164.00	12.50%	£1,365.00	£2,132
E	58	£128.00	£200.00	22.22%	£7,424.00	£11,600
F	44	£151.00	£235.00	18.18%	£6,644.00	£10,340
G	45	£175.00	£273.00	15.38%	£7,875.00	£12,285
H	14	£210	£327	20.00%	£2,940.00	£4,578
Agricultural	8	£50	£78		£400.00	£624
					£30,765.00	£47,970

Corporate & Strategic Implications

City of London Corporate Plan 2024-2029

22. Option 1 supports the Corporate Plan's Flourishing Public Spaces as the licence fees received from motorgate wayleaves are used to fund the

activities of the Epping Forest Charity, contributing to the protection of Epping Forest as a place of conservation and public recreation.

Natural Environment Strategy

23. Part 4 of the Five Key Strategies: *Charity Income Strategy- In order to maximise our ability to preserve, protect and develop our open spaces in an era of reducing funding we will seek to increase our income whilst preserving the ethos and culture of the Natural Environment values.*

Financial implications

24. Will increase annual revenue to the Charity by £17,205 to £47,970 p.a. in the year 2025/2026.

Resource implications

25. Epping Forest Officer time will be spent creating letters to all current licensees, answering potential press enquiries and possible complaints.
26. Chamberlains will need to make the respective alterations to Direct Debit and invoice alterations for the respective wayleave accounts.

Legal implications

27. The City Corporation's wayleaves are by their nature, licences. They are granted on the express basis that the permission is personal to the licensee and that such permission continues during the pleasure of the City Corporation, and can be determined by the City Corporation at any time by notice in writing. Licensees are asked to pay an annual licence fee which can also be increased at any time.
28. Under Section 33(1)(iv) of the 1878 Act, the Conservators have power "*to afford facilities and grant rights of way for access to inclosures*". The properties granted wayleaves are considered to be 'inclosures' for the purposes of this section.
29. Section 7(2) of the 1878 Act provides that the Conservators shall not sell, demise or otherwise alienate any part of the Forest. The grant of wayleaves (licences) for access across Forest land to inclosures is not a "sale, demise or alienation" of Forest. However, in all cases the creation of a wayleave would be carefully considered for its appropriateness and impact on the natural aspect and public recreation.

Risk implications

30. The planned increase in motorgate wayleave fees is likely to receive some negative responses from licensees and could result in some negative publicity. However, the increase is in line with RPI, which is a national recognised metric of inflation.
31. As noted in the report to your Committee in 2015, established valuation principles recognise that the value of land used to provide access to third party property is related to the value of the property that the access serves. Therefore, it was considered reasonable to make use of the council tax banding system as the basis to calculate various access cross-over tariffs for the least to the most expensive dwellings, bearing in mind that the charges should remain affordable at the lower end of the tariff.
32. There is a risk that a fee increase will result in refusal of payment. If this situation does occur the Wayleave Enforcement Policy procedure would commence:
- a. The Wayleave holder would be written to informing them of their debt history and the Conservators intention to withdraw the Wayleave Agreement.
 - b. If payment is not received within 28 days, careful consideration would be given to any representations made within the 28 day period. If it was decided by the relevant officers that the status of the way was clearly a terminable wayleave, and there were no special circumstances making obstruction of the way inappropriate or disproportionate (such as occupants reliance on vehicular access due to disability or ill-health of occupants) a further letter would be sent a further letter would be sent terminating the Wayleave in accordance with its terms, and advising that as from a date set 7 days after termination a barrier is to be installed blocking the access.
 - c. On the appointed day a concrete barrier would be installed across the Wayleave with support from Bailiffs and Police Officers if deemed necessary. A £50 admin fee for the renegotiation of the Wayleave will also be required.

Equalities implications

33. N/A

Climate implications

34. N/A

Security implications

35. N/A

Charity implications

36. Epping Forest is a registered charity (number 232990). Charity law obliges Members to ensure that the decisions they take (for and on behalf of the trustee) in relation to

the Charity are taken in the best interests of the Charity. In relation to providing rights of way across Forest land, this includes being satisfied that the proposed terms are the best that can be reasonably obtained for the Charity.

Conclusion

37. The Epping Forest Motorgate Wayleave fees have remained static for the last ten years and therefore the relative value since the introduction is now diminished. In order to ensure fair contribution from properties benefitting from accesses across Forest Land, it is considered appropriate that revised fees are introduced. An application of an RPI upon the existing fees represents a recognised inflation metric which observes owner-occupier housing costs. All monies received from these licences provide essential income in pursuance of the activities of the Epping Forest Charity, including its conservation and recreational objectives.

Appendices

None

Report author

Brian Pallett

Licensing and Wayleave Officer

E: brian.pallett@cityofondon.gov.uk

T: 0208 532 1010

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee(s): Epping Forest and Commons – For decision	Dated: 17/07/2025
Subject: Purchasing of Grounds Maintenance Machinery Chingford Golf Course	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	2, 11, 12
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	yes
If so, how much?	£21,000
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Yes – CGC Machinery Fund
Report of: Katie Stewart – Executive Director Environment	For Decision
Report author: Luke Randall – Environment Department, Epping Forest	

Summary

The industry-wide up take in golf participation rates, golf course season tickets and local competition due to increased demand in the market, all place increased pressure on courses to be presented and maintained to the highest possible standard.

This report seeks to update your Committee on the purchase for grounds maintenance machinery at Chingford Golf Course, with the intention of improving maintenance standards and staff efficiency. The report proposes purchasing an ex-demo machine from John Deere – a 2750E tees mower.

The Chingford Golf Course Machinery Renewals Fund, which has been funded by previous Golf Course operating surpluses, was provided to manage the purchase of machinery that would otherwise distort local risk budgets. The Fund currently has an uncommitted balance of £105,000.00

Recommendation

Members are asked to approve:

1. The purchase of an ex-demo John Deere 2750E Tees mower at a cost of £21,000.00 from the Golf Course Machinery Renewal Fund.

Main Report

Background

1. The Golf Course Machinery Renewal Fund was built up from previous surpluses at Chingford Golf Course which were transferred to a fund to finance the future purchases of grounds maintenance machinery. The current uncommitted balance of the fund is £105,000.00
2. The industry wide increase in demand in golf participation rates continues to grow. Chingford Golf Course has seen profits increase year on year since 2016, last year the golf course made an impressive operating profit of £216,000. The number of rounds has increased at Chingford Golf Course from 20,000 per year in 2016 to over 32,000 for 2024. Chingford Golf Course remains number 1 ranked within the county for online bookings out of 53 courses. However, this places increased pressure on Chingford Golf Course to be presented and maintained to the highest possible standard. Maintaining and improving high quality sports surfaces is an important factor in encouraging repeat visitors to the golf course.
3. The current ride on mowers machinery fleet ranges from machines aged between 31 years old to 4 years old. All are self-maintained by the grounds staff but as the machines get older, the downtime and repairs take longer. Sourcing parts for some of the machines can also take longer due to the age and the consequent machinery downtime has a negative impact of the golf course.

Current Position

4. Chingford Golf Course has one John Deere 2500B tees mower which is 18 years old. This machine is up and running and self-maintained but is key to the golf course set up for daily play. However the quality of cut has declined over the years, increased maintenance is being carried out to prolong its lifespan which increases staff downtime. At present it takes one member of staff 1.5 days to cut tees 3 times a week.

Options

5. **Option 1:** Continue with the existing ageing tees mower. Due to the age and use of the machines, reliability will come into question as time goes on along with high costs of repairs and staff down time.
6. **Option 2:** Purchase the ex-demo John Deere 2750E Tees mower at a cost of £21,000.00. This option would improve the quality of cut across the tees on the golf course along with improved staff efficiency helping to maintain increased levels of profit.

Proposals

7. An ex-demo John Deere 2750E Tees mower which is 5 years old is available for £21,000. Funds are available in the 'Chingford Golf Course Machinery

Renewals' account from surplus income from previous years to purchase the mower.

8. This mower would improve efficiency as it will be more reliable and considerably reduce down time both for the machine and the staff time effecting repairs.
9. The improved performance of the newer mower will also improve the standard of the cut.
10. The Golf Course Machinery Renewal Fund was established to allow re-investment into the Golf Course to maintain standards.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

Strategic implications – This proposal supports the City's Corporate Plan :

2. *People enjoy good health and wellbeing.*
11. *We have clean air, land and water and a thriving and sustainable natural environment.*
12. *Our spaces are secure, resilient and well-maintained*

Financial implications – The report requests the spending from the machinery renewal funds. These funds are held for the purpose of purchases, such as those outlined in this report.

Resource implications – The reduction of staff time spent making repairs will release staff resources to make course improvements.

Legal implications – There are no legal implications to this report.

Risk implications – There is no additional risk implications in this report.

Equalities implications – This report does not raise any equalities implications.

Climate implications – The proposed purchase of the new mower runs on diesel. There is not a viable carbon neutral alternative.

Security implications – The increased value of machinery held at Jubilee Yard has been offset by the recent improvements to the security systems covering the yard and workshop.

Charity implications – Improving the quality and performance of Chingford Golf Course, will result in greater profitability and so further strengthen the position of the Epping Forest Charity.

Conclusion

13. The highly competitive local golf market demands that the Chingford Golf Course is presented and maintained to the highest possible standard, both to retain existing custom and attract new play. The investment in new machinery is

considered to be critical in maintaining high standards and maximising staff efficiency.

14. That £21,000 taken from the Chingford Golf Course Machinery Renewals Fund currently standing at £105,000.00 to purchase a John Deere 2750E Tees mower.

Luke Randall
Sports Manager

T: 020 8529 2085

E: luke.randall@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committees: Epping Forest and Commons Committee for decision Projects and Procurement Sub Committee for information	Dates: 17 July 2025 21 July 2025
Subject: Rookery Wood Reservoir Remedial Works Unique Project Identifier: <i>PV ID 12477</i>	Gateway 2: Project Proposal Regular
Report of: Executive Director of Environment Report Author: Jagdeep Bilkhu	For Decision
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

Recommendations

1. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Project Description: An important health and safety based engineering project to include culvert remedial works and improvements to the dam to satisfy the design flood conditions led by the Engineering Team.</p> <p>Next Gateway: 3</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appoint a consultant to undertake the options study for the reservoir and dam works. • Appoint a consultant to provide a heritage impact assessment, arboriculture, hydrological and flood risk, and protected species guidance. • Undertake further survey and investigation work. <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That budget of £122,000 is approved for Gateway 2 to reach the next Gateway. 2. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £2,500,000 (excluding risk).
----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
	Staff costs	Project management, site visits, etc.	CWP	15,000
	Consultant Fees	Undertaking of options study and preparation of report with recommendations.	CWP	25,000
	Contractor's Fees	Ground works to prepare site for survey	CWP	10,000
	Consultant Fees	Advice and surveys for a heritage impact assessment, arboriculture, and protected species	CWP	20,000
	Consultant Fees	Hydrological and flood risk assessment. To include modelling of removing the function of the dam/or capacity as a potential statutory reservoir Flood modelling of properties downstream.	CWP	30,000
	Inspection by Panel Engineer	Advising and providing guidance.	CWP	2,000

	Investigation	Extent of damage caused by protected species to dam earthwork.	CWP	20,000
	Total			122,000
Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: None				
3. Governance arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Epping Forest and Commons Committee is responsible for decisions in relation to the management of the buffer land adjacent to Epping Forest. Under the Reservoirs Act 1975, Paul Monaghan has the defined role of the <i>Responsible Person</i>. 			

Project Summary

4. Context	<p>4.1. Rookery Wood is part of the larger Copped Hall Estate, which is a registered Park and Gardens Grade II* listed landscape by Historic England. The Copped Hall Estate is buffer land, held by the City Corporation in its corporate capacity, and managed in support of Epping Forest. The proposed works involve maintaining the existing features as far as practical. The precise details of the listed status and its legal implications that may affect the proposed works are to be discussed with Historic England, e.g. to confirm the materials that could be used for repairing or replacing the culverts as part of maintenance.</p> <p>4.2. Rookery Wood largely consists of a 20th century poplar plantation planted across historic water features dating from the Tudor period and considered to be of high significance. The reservoir is the historic Tudor square pond that is fed from an unnamed watercourse (which is a statutory main river and a tributary of Cobbin's Brook).</p> <p>4.3. The Tudor Pond was dammed by raised trackway that was an ancient routeway into Copped Hall, which was formalised to create one side of the wall of the Tudor pond. This forms a dam. Over time, the water feature was adapted to create a formal canal along the stream leading up to the pond, and later on the pond was remodelled into a serpentine shape. The site has a network of raised historic earthworks. There are 19th</p>
-------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>century culverts along the stream that pass through the dam. The asset is currently in a state of dis-repair, particularly the two culverts in the dam structure (on the eastern boundary of the asset) and these should be remediated as they have been identified as cause for concern on the grounds of matters relating to health and safety for operational staff and from a flood risk management perspective.</p> <p>4.4. This reservoir does not currently meet the water storage volume limit of 25,000m³ that would mean it is deemed a statutory Large Raised Reservoir (LRR). Its volume is approximately 17,200m³. However, statutory provisions have been made to reduce the limit of LRR's to 10,000m³ in the future; those can be triggered (at potentially short notice) when the relevant part of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 is brought into force.</p> <p>4.5. The poplar plantation comprises mature trees, which may be at risk of falling/wind-throw and therefore pose a potential risk of damaging the historic earthworks and or buried archaeology. The removal and management of these trees will be the subject of a separate study by Epping Forest officers, however the Engineering Team will work closely with them to coordinate work where possible.</p>
5. Brief description of project	<p>5.1. Discussions between Epping Forest staff and engineering officers have taken place and officers have considered that full renewal of the dam is not applicable at this time. Therefore, the primary objective is to refurbish or replace the existing two culverts and their associated headwalls. The first inspection under the Reservoirs Act 1975 dated October 2017 identified the aforementioned items as a matter of safety along with registering the reservoir with the Environment Agency as a Large Raised Reservoir and carrying out a Flood Study & Routing Calculations.</p> <p>5.2. The Flood Study has confirmed that the reservoir does not fall within the current limit of a LRR which is a reservoir greater than 25,000m³.</p> <p>5.3. The Corporation did register the reservoir as an LRR but have successfully de-registered it in October 2019, after ascertaining that the volume does not classify it as a LRR. This has removed the need to repair the culverts by October 2020, i.e. within a time limit of 3 years of the original inspection dated October 2017, however, it should be noted that the state of the dam and culverts and their headwalls continues to deteriorate.</p>

	<p>5.4. If it is not treated as a LRR, then work to satisfy the requirement of design flood condition are not immediately required. However, if the reservoir requires re-registration as a LRR in the future, then the creation of a spillway or strengthening the dam such that water could pass safely in the event of the design flood conditions must be undertaken in addition to the culvert works.</p> <p>5.5. Protected species have been recorded on and adjacent to the dam. The extent of the damage to the earthworks (dam, culvert, and outfalls) by the protected species is unknown and will be assessed under the further investigations proposed by this report. It is noted that the protected species are protected by legislation. Any potential future options in relation to the protected species will be considered in relation to the requirements of that legislation and will be brought to the relevant committees for consideration.</p> <p>5.6. The reservoir is an historic water body with Tudor and later features and falls within the Registered Park and Garden area. The earthworks have been assessed, following consultation with Historic England, as having high historic significance. There are poplar trees that are mature and are a potential threat to the earthworks from rooting or falling, some of which are next to the earth dam. However, this would need to be assessed via a Tree Condition Survey. Historic England are keen for all the trees to be removed, which would be best historic feature management practice. This will enable better management of the reservoir structures as well. The strengthening of the dam would be key to allow future management across the whole reservoir area to prevent regrowth of poplar and other trees. Removal of the trees does not form part of this project but the Engineering Team will liaise closely with officers from Epping Forest.</p> <p>5.7. A permanent access road is proposed to be constructed for the dam remedial works as well as future access and maintenance. Current vehicular access is not possible or suitable for construction traffic. This road would need to be appropriately and sensitively designed given the heritage features, with any necessary planning or other approvals obtained before its construction.</p>
6. Consequences if project not approved	<p>6.1. The existing two culverts will continue to deteriorate and, if nothing is done, they will eventually collapse. There is a risk to safety of City Corporation staff and other appointed personnel, e.g. those who manage the area generally and inspect the dam.</p> <p>6.2. There is no dedicated spillway for water in the event of a flood and nor is the dam designed to overtop safely.</p>

	<p>Therefore, if the culverts were to collapse, water would not be able to pass safely in the event of heavy rainfall or for the design flood conditions. The 2018 flood management survey identified that water escaping the dam would likely flow into the nearby brook ('Cobbins Brook'), thus potentially causing flooding in the area directly north and south of the dam. That study recommended that further investigations be carried out to assess any potential risks. The proposed further assessment, modelling, and surveys recommended by this report will provide a better understanding of the potential implications for the surrounding areas in the event of unplanned water escape from the reservoir. We are aware, for example, that property owners have already had to undertake flood alleviation works to protect their properties from flood events at Cobbins Brook.</p>
7. SMART project objectives	7.1. To complete remedial works to both culverts by 2027.
8. Key benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Improvement in the interests of safety of both the culverts after remedial works. (ii) Meeting the objectives of the asset owning department and recommendations of the Copped Hall Conservation Management Plan, which is to preserve this part of the historic landscape in its existing form as far as reasonably practical.
9. Project category	2. Statutory
10. Project priority	A. Essential
11. Notable exclusions	11.1 Removal of poplar trees in the reservoir (square pond) not to be undertaken as part of this project but explored by officers from Epping Forest.

Options Appraisal

12. Overview of options	<p>The options for the remedial works to the culvert have their own options as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12.1 Repair both existing culverts 12.2 Repair both culverts with a new lining. 12.3 Replace both culverts with new culverts (not necessarily in the existing material)
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Project Planning

13. Delivery period and key dates	<p>Overall project: <i>state length of project/expected completion</i></p> <p>Key dates: The reservoir is not deemed a Large Raised Reservoir (LRR) but the repair of the two culverts is recommended. The next gateway is proposed for presentation to Epping Forest and Commons Committee early next year, to secure project approval and funding, upon which consultants will be engaged for the next stage of work.</p> <p>Other works dates to coordinate: None.</p>
14. Risk implications	<p>Overall project risk: Medium</p> <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2).</p>
15. Stakeholders and consultees	<p><u>Internal</u></p> <p>Environment Department (including Epping Forest)</p> <p>Chamberlains Department – Finance Team</p> <p>Chamberlains Department – Procurement Team</p> <p>Town Clerks Department – Project Management Office</p> <p><u>External</u></p> <p>Epping Forest District Council – Local Planning Authority (LPA)</p> <p>Historic England – (in relation to the Registered Park and Garden Grade II* listing via the LPA)</p> <p>Natural England (in relation to protected species)</p> <p>Environment Agency (Enforcement body for reservoirs)</p> <p>Essex County Council – Highway Authority</p>

Resource Implications

16. Total estimated cost	<p>Likely cost range (excluding risk):</p> <p>£500,000 to £2,500,000</p> <p>Likely cost range (including risk):</p> <p>The likely cost range will not be affected due to the total identified CRP of £150,000 in the Risk Register at this early stage of the project but will be revised when the Risk Register becomes more developed at the next stages of the project process.</p>
---------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

17. Funding strategy	Choose 1:	Choose 1:																
	<table><tr><th>Funds/Sources of Funding</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr><tr><td>City Surveyor's CWP</td><td>£122,000</td></tr><tr><td>City Estates (2024/25 Capital Bid)</td><td>£470,000</td></tr><tr><td>Country Stewardship Scheme</td><td>None confirmed</td></tr><tr><td>Funding to be identified.</td><td>£2,058,000</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>£2,650,000</td></tr></table>		Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	City Surveyor's CWP	£122,000	City Estates (2024/25 Capital Bid)	£470,000	Country Stewardship Scheme	None confirmed	Funding to be identified.	£2,058,000					Total	£2,650,000
	Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)																
	City Surveyor's CWP	£122,000																
	City Estates (2024/25 Capital Bid)	£470,000																
	Country Stewardship Scheme	None confirmed																
	Funding to be identified.	£2,058,000																
	Total	£2,650,000																
18. Investment appraisal	Not applicable.																	
19. Procurement strategy/route to market	<p>19.1. It is recommended that this work be put out to the open market to be tendered and completed with the agreement of the appointed reservoirs Supervising Engineer.</p> <p>19.2. The existing term contract that the Corporation have for the appointment of the Supervising Engineer does not preclude the options study or any design work being tendered as a service independent of that contract.</p>																	
20. Legal implications	<p>20.1. If Rookery Wood were to be classed as a LRR under the lower 10,000m³ capacity listed in the Reservoirs Act 1975, as varied by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, then it would fall within the LRR regime and the repair of the reservoir would be required under the relevant provisions of the 1975 Act. This would also require further oversight from the Environment Agency for the reservoir, including (but not limited to) the requirement to prepare, review and test an on-site emergency flood plan for the area. Under the LRR regime, if Rookery Wood were deemed a 'high risk' LRR, the City Corporation would be also required to appoint a supervising engineer, undertake any measures in the interest of safety or maintenance recommended by them, and would have to undertake inspections of the asset at a minimum of every 10 years.</p> <p>20.2. The further investigations proposed by this report will consider whether protected species are causing damage to the reservoir. It is noted that the protected species are</p>																	

	<p>protected by environmental and wildlife legislation and any options for dealing with them at the site in the future will need to take into account (and comply with) the requirements of the legislation. Protected species licences from Natural England may be required to legally undertake the work.</p> <p>20.3. The status of Copped Hall Park and Garden as a Grade II* Listed Park under the National Heritage Act 1983 places certain protections and legal planning constraints on works undertaken on the property and the surrounding area. Any planning permission or other approvals required will need to be obtained before works commence.</p> <p>20.4. The works and assessments proposed in this report will help the City Corporation to assess whether there are potential risks to neighbouring properties in the event of water escape from the reservoir, and enable a better understanding of potential areas of liability going forwards.</p>
21. Corporate property implications	There are no scope overlaps with works of the City Surveyor's Corporate Property team.
22. Traffic implications	<p>22.1. No major traffic implications are envisaged.</p> <p>22.2. It should be noted however that there is no easy direct or indirect route to the dam and best access is via a private road. There is a distance of 500m approximately that would involve off-road driving.</p>
23. Sustainability and energy implications	23.1 Adapting to the likelihood of climate change that could result in higher water levels in the ponds and being better prepared in the likelihood that this does happen.
24. IS implications	None.
25. Equality Impact Assessment	An equality impact assessment will not be undertaken.
26. Data Protection Impact Assessment	The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact assessment will not be undertaken.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Briefing
Appendix 2	Risk Register
Appendix 3	Photos

Contact

Report Author	Jagdeep Bilkhu
Email Address	jagdeep.bilkhu@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1544

Project Briefing

Project identifier			
[1a] Unique Project Identifier	PV 12477	[1b] Departmental Reference Number	Not applicable.
[2] Core Project Name	Rookery Wood Reservoir Remedial Works		
[3] Programme Affiliation (if applicable)	No affiliation with any other programme of works.		

Ownership	
[4] Chief Officer has signed off on this document	Gordon Roy (on behalf of the CO)
[5] Senior Responsible Officer	Paul Monaghan
[6] Project Manager	Jagdeep Bilkhu

Description and purpose
[7] Project Description
Primarily culvert remedial works and potential scope increase to include improvements to the dam to satisfy the design flood conditions.
[8] Definition of Need: What is the problem we are trying to solve or opportunity we are trying to realise (i.e. the reasons why we should make a change)?
<p>The asset is currently in a state of dis-repair, particularly the two culverts and these should be remediated as they have been identified as cause for concern on the grounds of matters relating to health and safety.</p> <p>However, if this reservoir continues to be treated as a LRR, then other remedial works are also required to satisfy the design flood conditions.</p>
[9] What is the link to the City of London Corporate plan outcomes?
<p>[1] People are safe and feel safe.</p> <p>[2] People enjoy good health and wellbeing.</p> <p>[3] People have equal opportunities to enrich their lives and those of others and reach their full potential.</p> <p>[4] Communities are cohesive and have suitable housing and facilities.</p> <p>[5] Businesses are trusted and socially and environmentally responsible.</p> <p>[6] We have the world's best regulatory framework and access to global markets.</p> <p>[7] We are a global hub for innovation and enterprise.</p> <p>[8] We attract and nurture relevant skills and talent.</p> <p>[9] Our spaces are secure, resilient and well-maintained.</p> <p>[10] Our physical spaces have clean air, land and water and support a thriving and sustainable natural environment.</p> <p>[11] Our spaces are digitally and physically well-connected and responsive.</p> <p>[12] Our spaces inspire excellence, enterprise, creativity and collaboration.</p> <p>[13 COLP] To make the City of London the safest city area in the world.</p> <p>[14 COLP] To deliver a policing service that is valued.</p> <p>[15 COLP] To be a police force with global influence and impact.</p> <p>[16 COLP] To build new ethical economic partnerships.</p> <p>[17 COLP] To have an innovative, skilled and agile workforce in a culture that supports and empowers our people.</p>
[10] What is the link to the departmental business plan objectives?

<Objectives this project is linked to, and a short narrative (max 4 lines) on how will it help us achieve them. > <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving quality and safety of the environment for workers, residents and visitors. • Open spaces, heritage and cultural assets are protected, conserved and enhanced. • Nature, heritage and place are valued and understood. • London's natural capital and heritage assets are enhanced through leadership, influence, investment, collaboration and innovation. 					
[11] Note all which apply:					
Officer: Project developed from Officer initiation	N	Member: Project developed from Member initiation	N	Corporate: Project developed as a large scale Corporate initiative	N
Mandatory: Compliance with legislation, policy and audit	Y	Sustainability: Essential for business continuity	N	Improvement: New opportunity/ idea that leads to improvement	N

Project Benchmarking:
[12] What are the top 3 measures of success which will indicate that the project has achieved its aims? <These should be impacts of the activity to complete the aim/objective, rather than 'finishes on time and on budget'>>
1) Improvement in the interests of safety of both the culverts after remedial works.
2) Removal of Corporate liabilities associated with being a Stakeholder per the Act.
3) Meeting the objectives of the asset owning department and recommendations of the Conservation Statement, which is to preserve the historic landscape in its existing form as far as reasonably practical.
[13] Will this project have any measurable legacy benefits/outcome that we will need to track after the end of the 'delivery' phase? If so, what are they and how will you track them? (E.g. cost savings, quality etc.) Not applicable.
[14] What is the expected delivery cost of this project (range values)[£]? Lower Range estimate: £500,000 Upper Range estimate: £2,500,000 Both above figures exclude any risk monies.
[15] Total anticipated on-going revenue commitment post-delivery (lifecycle costs)[£]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual twice yearly inspections of asset. This does not need to be funded separately as this duty is undertaken as part of an existing term contract, therefore no additional cost as a result of this project. • All other ongoing commitments are staff costs, e.g. attendance at inspections, clearance of vegetation on and around the dam by forest staff.
[16] What are the expected sources of funding for this project? Likely to be from City Cash Reserves. However, this funding source is not confirmed. PLEASE COMPLETE CENTRAL FUNDING APPENDIX attached.
[17] What is the expected delivery timeframe for this project (range values)? Are there any deadlines which must be met (e.g. statutory obligations)?

The critical deadline is completing the work before October 2020. Therefore, commencement of the project should be as soon as practically possible to allow construction works to be completed by the aforementioned date.

Project Impact:

[18] Will this project generate public or media impact and response which the City of London will need to manage? Will this be a high-profile activity with public and media momentum?

No.

[19] Who has been actively consulted to develop this project to this stage?

<(Add additional internal or external stakeholders where required) >

Chamberlains: Finance	Officer Name: Mark Jarvis
Chamberlains: Procurement	Officer Name: TBC
IT	Officer Name: Not Applicable
HR	Officer Name: Not Applicable
Communications	Officer Name: Not Applicable
Corporate Property	Officer Name: Not Applicable
External	Andy Hughes – Appointed Supervising Engineer on behalf of CoLC.

[20] Is this project being delivered internally on behalf of another department? If not ignore this question. If so:

Please note the Client supplier departments.

Who will be the Officer responsible for the designing of the project?

If the supplier department will take over the day-to-day responsibility for the project, when will this occur in its design and delivery?

Client	Department: Open Spaces
Supplier	Department: Built Environment
Supplier	Department:
Project Design Manager	Department: Built Environment
Design/Delivery handover to Supplier	Gateway stage: Post Authority to Start Work.

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

 Project name: *Rookery Wood Reservoir*

 Unique project identifier: *PV12477*

 Total est cost (exc risk) *£2500000*

Corporate Risk Matrix score table

PM's overall risk rating	Medium	Minor impact	Serious impact	Major impact	Extreme impact
Avg risk pre-mitigation	11.0	Likely 4	8	16	32
Avg risk post-mitigation	6.5	Possible 3	6	12	24
Red risks (open)	1	Unlikely 2	4	8	16
Amber risks (open)	1	Rare 1	2	4	8
Green risks (open)	0				

Costed risks identified (All)

£150,000.00	6%	Costed risk as % of total estimated cost of project
-------------	----	-----------------------------------------------------

Costed risk pre-mitigation (open)

£150,000.00	6%	" "
-------------	----	-----

Costed risk post-mitigation (open)

£100,000.00	4%	" "
-------------	----	-----

Costed Risk Provision requested

£0.00	0%	CRP as % of total estimated cost of project
-------	----	---------------------------------------------

- (1) Compliance/Regulatory
- (2) Financial
- (3) Reputation
- (4) Contractual/Partnership
- (5) H&S/Wellbeing
- (6) Safeguarding
- (7) Innovation
- (8) Technology
- (9) Environmental
- (10) Physical

Number of Open Risks	Avg Score	Costed impact	Red	Amber	Green
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
1	6.0	£50,000.00	0	1	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
1	16.0	£100,000.00	1	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0

Issues (open)

0

Open Issues

Extreme	Major	Serious	Minor
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0

All Issues

0

All Issues

 Cost to resolve all issues
(on completion)

£0.00

Total CRP used to date

£0.00

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name: Rookery Wood Reservoir		PM's overall risk rating: Medium	CRP requested this gateway	£ -	Average unmitigated risk	11.0	Open Risks	2
Unique project identifier: PV12477		Total estimated cost (exc risk): £ 2,500,000	Total CRP used to date	£ -	Average mitigated	6.5	Closed Risks	0

General risk classification											Mitigation actions						CRP used to date		Use of CRP		Ownership & Action				Comment(s)
Risk ID	Gateway	Category	Description of the Risk	Risk Impact Description	Likelihood Classification pre-mitigation	Impact Classification pre-mitigation	Risk score	Costed impact pre-mitigation (£)	Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N	Confidence in the estimation	Mitigating actions	Mitigation cost (£)	Likelihood Classification post-mitigation	Impact Classification post-mitigation	Costed Impact post-mitigation (£)	Post-Mitigation risk score	CRP used to date	Use of CRP	Date raised	Named Departmental Risk Manager/ Coordinator	Risk owner (Named Officer or External Party)	Date Closed OR/ Realised & moved to Issues			
R1	2	(2) Financial	Returned fee proposals from consultants to prepare an options study for the culverts being more than anticipated.	Not being able to commission the consultants.	Possible	Serious	6	£50,000.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Until we engage with consultants with a brief and they provide a fee proposal, this risk cannot be mitigated.	£50,000.00	Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00		22/10/2024	Environment Department - Paul Monaghan	Jagdeep Bilkhu		There is no funding available to cover this CRP at the present time.		
R2	2	(9) Environmental	Damage to the dam from Badger Setts	Damage extensive leading to more complicated remedial work to make the dam safe.	Likely	Major	16	£100,000.00	N	D – Very Uncomfortable	Discuss the issue with conservation officers at Epping Forest. Research non-destructive techniques that could be used to map the extent of voidage created by the badger setts in the dam.	£0.00	Possible	Major	£100,000.00	12	£0.00						the pre-mitigation estimate stated is essentially a guess at this stage. No CRP has been requested. An est. of £20,000 has been included in the main budget for surveys/investigations given this is an essential requirement to make the dam safe but this risk item is in the register should the CRP not be sufficient.		
R3								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R4								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R5								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R6								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R7								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R8								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R9								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R10								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R11								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R12								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R13								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R14								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R15								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R16								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R17								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R18								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R19								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R20								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R21								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R22								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R23								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R24								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R25								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R26								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R27								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R28								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R29								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R30								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R31								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R32								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R33								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R34								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R35								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R36								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R37								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R38								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R39								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R40								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R41								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R42								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R43								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R44								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R45								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R46								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R47								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R48								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R49								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R50								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R51								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R52								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R53								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R54								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R55								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R56								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R57								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R58								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R59								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R60								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R61								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R62								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R63								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R64								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R65								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R66								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R67								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R68								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R69								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R70								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R71								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R72								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R73								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								
R74								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								

This page is intentionally left blank



Plate 1 General view along crest of dam, from east end looking northwest, showing trees on dam slopes and in reservoir, which is on left-hand side.



Plate 2 Example of damage to the dam from invasive species, near to one of the culverts.



Plate 3 Headwall of one of the culverts shown sunken with broken headwall.



Plate 4 Headwall of second culvert shown broken, Condition of brickwork inside culvert also very poor.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank