

## Review of 8.85 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO COMPULSORY ACQUISITION HEARING 1 ACTIONS 14-17: WIGMORE VALLEY PARK

### 3.4 Experiential Aspects

#### 3.4.1

No mention of the immediate experience of openness when arriving at the park, versus a 1km round trip, with some of the return walk uphill to achieve that same experience. No equality for someone, who is maybe not able to walk very far, or even walk at all.

#### 3.4.2

The spectacular "aviation themed" play area and cafe, that was promised in the consultation and is shown in the Applicants Wigmore Valley Park proposals video, has now been paired up with doing "nothing at all."

The Luton residents have been misled and conned! Respondents to the consultation may have responded in a different way, than they may otherwise have done.



#### 3.44

The equivalence demonstrated in **figure 3.1 & figure 3.2** is misleading. 3.1 demonstrates a walk around the perimeter of the existing park taking in lots of different perspectives, whilst 3.2 demonstrates a walk up and down a narrow strip of the replacement park. The equivalent experience would require a 3.5km walk.

## **4.5 Replacement Open Space**

### **4.51**

The applicant has used the word “envisaged” and has provided itself with a get out clause for the unstructured or natural play, the resurfacing and upgrading of existing PRow and the creation of new surfaced paths.

## **APPENDIX A – PHOTOS PROVIDED IN RESPONSE TO CAH1 ACTION 14**

What safety considerations were born in mind when placing the signs, as signs that are placed too low may present a risk to the general public?

Is the applicant aware of section 27 of the Countryside Act 1968?

Did the Applicant receive consent from the relevant Highway Authority to use their structures?

Is the Applicant aware that interfering with what is classed as a traffic sign can be a criminal offence?

Is the applicant aware that Hertfordshire County Council have a minimum ground clearance of 2.1m to the lower edge of their signs? Luton Borough Council probably have a similar policy, but trying to seek information from LBC is painful.

Is the applicant aware that Hertfordshire County Councils way marking posts are to support nothing other than way mark discs?

How did the applicant decide the locations for the signs? Some are wholly within the boundary of Wigmore Valley Park.(public land)

## **Issues with the signs in the order in which they appear in the document**

### **Picture 1**

Applicants sign placed on the bridleway wholly within the boundary of WVP misleading unfamiliar users.

Applicants sign mounted too low, a fall onto this sign could lead to serious injury, perhaps even decapitation.

### **Picture 2**

Applicants sign placed at the rear entrance to WVP wholly within its boundary, misleading unfamiliar park users.

Bridleway flag on a taller post to avoid conflict with mounted horses. The addition of the applicants sign has compromised safety with the possibility to unseat rider, causing serious injury or death.

Insufficient ground clearance, leading to risk of facial injury and permanent disfigurement.

### **Picture 3**

Insufficient ground clearance leading to risk of facial injury and permanent disfigurement.

### **Picture 4, 5 and 6**

Applicants sign wholly within the County Wildlife Site, misleading unfamiliar users.  
Bridleway flag on a taller post to avoid conflict with mounted horses. The addition of the Applicants sign has compromised safety with the possibility to unseat rider, causing serious injury or death.

Insufficient ground clearance leading to risk of facial injury and permanent disfigurement.

### **Picture 7**

Applicants sign mounted too low, a fall onto this sign could lead to serious injury, perhaps even decapitation.

Possible damage to Hertfordshire County Council structure and removal of wood preservative depending on the manner of affixing.

### **Picture 8, 9, 10 and 11**

Insufficient ground clearance leading to risk of facial injury and permanent disfigurement.