

Rickmansworth Aquadrome NLHF Project

Public Engagement Session

Wednesday 16 September 2026

5pm to 7pm

Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, WD3 1RL

Questions submitted in writing and in person during the session:

Questions submitted in person

Question:

Walking around (*The Aquadrome*) today the water on both the river and lake seems very green with algae. All through the summer it seemed relatively clear and I wondered what that's about and whether the EA have anything to say as it's to do with water quality.

Answer

You're right, the water is rather green at the moment and is a problem we often get with artificial or man-made lakes such as the Aquadrome. It is algae, and you might have noticed that in the lakes at the moment there are pyramids floating in the middle, these are algae monitoring control systems that like many other things on the site are at end of life. So another element of the Aquadrome project is to look at the water quality and our intention is to replace those algae monitoring and management units with better ones that work on a slightly different system and that are able to target a greater breadth of the algae species. We are also looking (Subject to the National Lottery Heritage Fund approving our bid), at a 'Nano bubble' system that dissipates air throughout the water and with the increased oxygenation of the water you get a lot less algae growth. So we are looking at both a preventative measure and a management measure.

EA additional comments:

Across the region we've had very bad algae incidents this summer due to the warm temperatures it's been perfect condition for algae proliferation especially over the last couple of months. Active management of water quality is really important to prevent the worst effects of those algae blooms. Some of the works that will be proposed will be around improving some of the vegetation around the lake margins and that will help to absorb some of those nutrients and reduce the risk of bad algae blooms happening on the lake.

Question:

- a) I access the Aquadrome through what I call 'Carpet shop gate'. Is that outside the scope of this project? And that is related to accessibility.
- b) There used to be a park keeper or warden in a flat in the park, as that is now gone completely as an idea that there would be someone to patrol around or keep an eye on things?
- c) Are electric scooters a problem in the Aquadrome?

- d) Are drought tolerant plants being considered for planting? Kew gardens is a world leading authority and my friend says they are doing research about that.

Answer:

- a) The entrance from the Uxbridge Road that is outside of scope of the Aquadrome as it's not our land and is a public right of way. However, we have been working with our colleagues to improve signage, and I know they are looking at potential improvements to that area.

Reply Question: So the surface of that entrance will not be looked at?

Answer:

No I'm afraid not.

Cllr Lloyd suggests that queries or concerns outside of the Aquadrome project that relate to subjects such as pavements, can be emailed to him at his county council email address: chris.lloyd@hertfordshire.gov.uk

- b) With regards to the park warden as a council we do not have a park warden and there hasn't been a park warden for a very long time at that location. However, there is a member of council staff who lives on site and they are a member of our Grounds maintenance team. So although there is a member of staff on site they do not have the role of park warden but are tied to the site and allows for the gates to be opened and closed outside of normal officer working hours, and there is someone on site in case of emergency. We don't currently have the resource for a dedicated park warden in the kind of old-fashioned sense of that term. As part of this project and part of the training and skills element we are looking at a dedicated grounds maintenance apprentice whose role would be to solely focus on this site, and build their career around some of the works that we are implementing.
- c) E-scooters are a problem everywhere and it is something we are aware of. We are reasonably limited in what we can do about that as to be honest it's quite hard to enforce. But we are aware that they can be an issue but it's not an issue that's specific to this site unfortunately.
- d) Yes, climate resilient planting is something we are very much considering. Our own internal team have much botanical experience and the landscape architect and various different specialists that we've been working alongside will also be looking at this. It's important to remember that yes we are seeing hotter and dryer summers, but equally on this site because it's a flood plain and regularly floods plants need to be able to survive draught and be comfortable with being in water which does cause complications and it's an interesting challenge for the experts in our team and external team.

Question

So in terms of someone patrolling the site if they see a dog in the dog free area for example you are just hoping the public will behave?

Answer

The council does have an animal welfare and licensing officer and as part of our activity programme we will be offering education on dog and animal behaviours. Unfortunately, we are not resourced enough to have officers patrolling 24/7, but we do aim to engage with individuals who are displaying behaviours we wish to discourage. Some of our staff do have enforcement powers and can exercise them, although we prefer to adopt an education first approach as we don't wish to hit people with fines unless it's a repeat offender.

Question

- a) Asbestos must have been in the Aquadrome for the past 50 years, and residents have been using the site for a long period of time without knowledge of it there. Have there been any known cases of Asbestos related illness to residents?
- b) Could you give us an indication of the total cost of these works and will there be an impact on local people specifically in Band D in terms of our council tax.

Answer

- b) We are applying externally for funding from the lottery for £5million, so the impact on people in Band D is minimal.
- a) We will cover the answers to asbestos questions later in the session. ***Please refer to the answer to this question at the end of the live questions section of these notes.***

Question

Referring to the river restoration part of the presentation; point 5 – removal of the weir. I'm sure this has been raised as there are people here who are concerned about the Mill Stream. I'd be interested to know what level of monitoring in terms of the mill stream has been done up until this point because as a resident I can see it has gone down dramatically. And with the removal of the weir and the re-grading will there be continued monitoring (or new monitoring if there hasn't been any thus far) as it would be lovely to have focus on that because we stand at potentially losing a beautiful stream. We've had 5-10 minutes of signs at the Aquadrome which is important but arguably not as important as losing something of significant ecological importance.

Answer

Thank you, you are right – the Mill Stream is incredibly important to the system. To cover off the monitoring aspect, the council can only monitor within their own land, and the Mill Stream falls outside of our jurisdiction. However, there is much wider catchment monitoring which my colleagues at the Environment Agency might be able to provide information on shortly.

The principal point about the weir removal is not an isolated piece of work. If the weir was left as it was and it was to continue to deteriorate that would be significantly worse for the river and the Mill stream than if we were to do work in a controlled and safe manner. With the appropriate regrading of the channel around it, the river system should function much in the way it does now, and it's purely the river bed that would do the diversion rather than the impoundment caused by the weir. We know that by some of the work we have been doing on bathymetry – which is mapping the shape of the bed. This has helped our understanding immensely.

Another way we've been looking at things is through modelling, firstly flood modelling – as we can't do anything that increases flood risk, our colleagues at the EA would not permit it and it is not something we want to do. Now we are also in the process of low flow modelling which takes real life data from catchment scale and considers the impact of our designs through a model to see how that would be impacted. If there was to be a detriment to the Mill stream, the EA would not permit it, secondly we would not put an application in if this was the case. Speaking as an ecologist, the last thing I would ever want to do would be detrimental to any river system. We have a number of safeguards in place that with the weir removal protects the main River Colne and the mill stream next to it.

Environment Agency response:

To confirm, we wouldn't pursue or approve any project action that would risk de-watering the Mill stream. We've had another project in Watford where we are working on a couple of weirs to improve passage and an option to remove them. After a hydrological survey report suggested this work would de-water a nearby side channel in the adjacent part of the river, we decided it wouldn't be a viable project option and we looked at alternative options to improve passage there and decided on a fish pass to ensure that the flows were maintained in that original location. That approach applies in this case, whereby we do not want any negative effects to be caused on the Mill Stream because of the actions taking place at the Aquadrome. The weir itself is in quite a dilapidated structure and is in the process of starting to fall apart, and over the next few winters if we were to have more storm events eventually it will reach a point where that whole structure fails. There is not an option to repair that structure because we have a legal obligation under the water framework directive to improve the ecological status of the river and so that's why we look to remove structures where appropriate rather than repairing some of those structures. If we were to allow the weir to deteriorate by itself that would cause potential risks to the river and extra erosions pressures that could undermine the riverbanks and potentially cause some disturbance to the flow split with the Mill Stream. The safest approach that we have to deal with this structure is to recommend the safe removal of this structure (weir) to make sure the bed is re-graded in a natural way that ensures the Mill Stream interaction is maintained as it is at the moment. There is a new run of hydrological modelling taking place right now to make sure those designs would meet that standard.

Comment reply to EA response:

Honourable words that you're saying about preserving the Mill Stream and ensuring that it's not de-watered. The Mill Stream runs at the back of a lot of people who are here houses, and there are plenty of people who can see that it has already been de-watered, so I don't know what our plans are or how we look at this but it's incredibly important that we don't just go to the future plan that we have is going to continue whatever situation we are in now we don't want this being maintained we want this being fixed.

Environment Agency Reply:

The wider situation within the river this summer is that we have had various points of the upper Colne the past few months start to dry out entirely because we've had such low rain fall and one of the hottest summers on record and places around Colney heath and London Colney have been particularly badly effected and that's been purely driven through climate response over the course of this year. It hasn't been the cause of structures changed in those areas and I think that is also one of the reasons why in the Mill Stream this summer you have seen particularly low levels of water which is something we've seen across the catchment, and

unfortunately with the climate set to continue to be fairly dry and having warm summers that is something we are going to see across the board a bit more. So we are quite clear that what you have observed this year is not a consequence of changes to the weir structure or the self-notching of that structure which took place last year.

Question

- a) I have the same set of concerns around the weir on the Mill Stream, can we see the modelling that you have done and the proof that the Mill Stream is going to be unaffected by these changes?
- b) Can we have some measurement put in such as measuring the relative levels of the Mill Stream and the river to demonstrate that the Mill Stream will be unaffected?
- c) The weir was put in historically to maintain the level of the Mill Stream so can you also elaborate how you are going to grade the river, will you make it less deep, is that the idea?

Reply

- a) Modelling is still ongoing as was mentioned during the presentation and as soon as it is complete it will be on the website. We will most likely use a form of Geo-spatial information systems or mapping systems so that you can see it as they are massive files so pdfs aren't possible but we will find a way so that they can be accessible and we will try to add some annotation around it to explain what is going on.
- b) In terms of monitoring the water levels that's not something the council would be able to undertake as it is outside jurisdiction however as owners of the properties that back on to the Mill Stream you may choose to do that gaging yourself. (The EA confirm there are no gaging stations on the Mill Stream that monitor water levels, the nearest gaging stations are in the lower chess and the Gade and north of Rickmansworth is the nearest one on the Colne itself. There are no actual gaging stations on the Mill Stream to monitor water levels unfortunately).
- c) Regarding the re-grading, yes in a sense the river will be shallower in places as the weir has artificially created a lot of deep water up stream of it. We will re-grade that by adding gravels into the river at appropriate heights again within the detailed design you'll see some of that. There is a helpful diagram which shows the current river bed shape vs the river bed shape that we would aim to achieve, which has the weir removed and the gravels added. That is likely to be developed further as this round of modelling concludes.

Question

As a resident of the River Colne where the Mill Stream comes down, I am a little bit concerned about the impact on my property. After speaking with the hydrologist at the public engagement event on 7th March, I spoke with him for 20 -30 minutes, he told me that the removal of the weir would result in a reduction of flow in the side stream and that is certainly what he said. Looking at Q&A document, the hydrologist seems to have changed his mind so why was that, because it's quite an important point as you heard.

Reply

The gentleman that you spoke with maintains that he did not make that comment and that the weir removal as we've said a few times, would not go ahead if it were to de-water the Mill Stream.

Question

We've had a number of pollution incidents over time in the Chess which feeds down into the Colne, what sort of impacts does this have on the Aquadrome and the flow through the Colne and is this regularly monitored?

Reply

This is something we are limited in ability to impact but we are aware of the pollution incidents and our colleagues at the EA would probably be able to expand on this. In terms of what TRDC can do, through the interventions that we are planning on the river and lakes through the enhancements of the marginal vegetation wetland plants have a fantastic ability of filtering out some quite nasty chemicals so by introducing as much vegetation as we can we will increase water quality. It's not quite as great as not allowing the pollution to take place to begin with though. We are also looking at a citizen science programme where would welcome anyone who has a little bit of time to spare to help us do some of the monitoring and we would be using approved techniques that I know have been recently used at the Chilterns and along the Chess and by our colleagues at the Colne Catchment Network. It's not as much as we'd like to be able to do but we're very limited.

Environment Agency Reply

The last thing to add is a general point that when pollution events take place fish can be particularly susceptible where there are more structures in our water courses. Fish for example are unable to escape to cleaner water upstream as easily, and this can result in more fish deaths. Where we have fewer of those structures all of the aquatic life and ecology there becomes more resilient because they can access safer refuge areas.

River restoration in itself is a very good way to manage the impacts from water quality problems, this doesn't mean we shouldn't fix the water quality problems themselves but in terms of the overall resilience of a catchment using river restoration techniques will support not seeing as much of an impact from these problems as we tackle water quality as a much bigger issue across the country. Using both techniques together is a good way to improve that resilience in terms of a smaller timescale than you would see from longer processes to implement for overall water quality.

Question

There are resident concerns about now that we are going to be encouraging water flow in certain areas at the Aquadrome are we flooding areas that potentially haven't been flooded before and will this expose more asbestos and what would be the management plan for that? It would be helpful if we knew more detail rather than 'the asbestos management plan'.

Reply

The asbestos management plan will be in effect. The increased connectivity of the river to its floodplain will allow more controlled flooding of the site. The more it's controlled the more we know where it is going to go and it won't go with such force.

That in turn will lead to less erosion, less erosion will lead to less uncovering. The reality of the site is that there is a lot of asbestos, it is under the ground and over time more will come to the surface, that is why as part of the management plan all of our grounds

maintenance team are fully trained and qualified to walk and assess the site and they know what they are looking for, what types to identify and they are there every day checking the site in different locations. If/when they find asbestos they act in accordance with the plan so they know how to deal with it, who to contact, whether to block it off, cover it up, or if it needs to be taken away. And that is part of our day-to-day management of the site. After any significant flooding events, we do walks and inspections in those areas when the flood waters recede. We are entering that season now, so that will become part of their regular work. We also commission RSK Asbestos to come in once a year and do a detailed expert site walk-over that does focus on those areas where we either know that there is asbestos coming to the front, or where we have seen erosion but not necessarily spotted asbestos ourselves we ask them to check those areas too. Lastly on significant flood event we ask for their expert view also.

Question

What will the new woodland walk path look like and where will the bridges be?

Reply

This answer refers to RIBA 3 WOODLAND WALK AN PINETUM PATH* Slide shows map image and overall route plan

The detailed maps available on TRDC website will help. Starting at the top where your back would face the water ski club, and coming along the river on the path as it exists now. You then get to the first two connectivity points with the first bridge, this is a slightly lowered section and where we are hoping the river will flow through when water is high flow and when the flow is not high enough it will be dry, and that will allow the connectivity into the wet woodland, the floodplain and into the Pinetum. You can then take a left if you wish, and head down onto the Pinetum. At present there is no formal path in this area so we are looking to put in a raised path from gabions approximately 50cm high and that will be of sufficient width to allow accessibility with ramps either end, and in that section there are two bridged areas to ensure there is the full capacity for water to fall laterally through the two, and then you are back onto Bury Lake. Reversing back to the Woodland Walk at this point where we had turned left, you can also go straight where the path will no longer be surfaced (It will be a natural surface mud/grass), here there are 3 more connectivity points which will not be bridged as they are not canals but a depression or ditch – so you could walk over these or divert around. This will really facilitate the water to get into the wet woodland, which is incredibly special – it's the largest of its kind near to London and we have ability to access it and to educate young people around it, this is a privilege so we do need to look after it. By giving it more privacy and a little less disturbance through lower footfall we can protect the habitats and wildlife there without restraining it.

Question

How would park run fit around the new route, is the above plan suitable for park run?

Reply

The proposals would not be suitable so park run would remain on its current path.

Cllr Lloyd – I'm very passionate the park run route remains. I'm passionate about the leisure use but we must balance it with the nature.

Question

- a) The Aquadrome is certainly the jewel in the crown of Rickmansworth for many of the residents, but what is the risk assessment and contingency plan should further asbestos be uncovered during works which will result in many areas being fenced off for long periods of time?
- b) During asbestos training, source, pathway, and receptor were spoken about and under your legal duty if these three things are hit (At which two points in the Aquadrome currently do) - there is a duty to report it as contaminated land. Has that been done? If not, why not? And how does it affect the whole project?

Reply

It is entirely possible that when we come to do the capital works that we will find more asbestos. Early investigation works gave us a much better indication and understanding of where the asbestos is. So, any capital work that does go ahead does require very specific risk assessments that contractors have to provide to us, along with method statements on how they will manage the discovery of asbestos, and no work can progress until we have those and until we are confident that it poses no risk to the public. That's the same as when we put in the new bridge, the new playground etc, and any pathway repair works as part of the day to day maintenance. Everyone who works on site must have completed the asbestos training. Sometimes the small parts of asbestos can be picked and removed as per the correct way to dispose of asbestos/contaminated waste. There are a number of mitigations for the different types of asbestos and where it's found, how much etc. When it's a large amount or a specific kind of asbestos, that can pause work and we would call in and consult the specialists and make risk based decisions based on their expert opinions. The reason for doing the initial survey work and the 36 trial pits and the 14 different cone penetrations is so that we could build that into the designs to try to the best of our knowledge to avoid that. Because of that we have been able to hone the designs so that we can be 'reasonably' confident that it's not going to get to point where we would find such levels of asbestos that we would have to stop work. Can I 100% guarantee that will be the case? No. We know that the site is littered with asbestos and there is always the chance that whenever we scrape anything off the ground we will find some. We have a much better understanding because the lottery agreed as part of the development phase funding to fund the investigative work and we have a much better idea of where it is, where it's not, and where the really bad stuff is, where the stuff is that's not great but that we can live with. That has also informed for example what types of materials we are looking for when we build certain things, for example we talked earlier about not going ahead with the dog agility area and significant works in that area just off the car park – as you come in to the site. That is because the survey showed us that underneath there is quite a lot of asbestos, and you can't really have dogs loose digging up an area if that's what they are going to dig up, but also that area is fully contained. It's contained underneath the ground, the pathways there we are looking to put down with black top / tarmac, that will encapsulate and therefore keep safe any asbestos that's in there. If we were to go more down the hogging and more natural type of materials is in this area that would wear away gradually and expose the asbestos which is why we are not looking at that in this area. There will be other areas where we can quite easily tarmac over and keep it encapsulated, which will remove the 'pathway' (In asbestos terminology) the pathway to get from the source to the receptor is the air. If we can encapsulate it so that it can't get into the air then that takes away the risk.

Public Reply Response

The second part of the question about the contaminated land issue – until it's encapsulated there is a risk and if you take the woodland path and other area that's currently fenced off it hits the three things that the expert presented so my question is if you haven't designated that as contaminated land why not – what's the thinking behind that?

TRDC Reply

The site is designated as an asbestos containing site and that's why we have the Asbestos Management Plan. We have a live mapped GIS record of everywhere that asbestos is identified and every time we find a new piece then that is added as appropriate to the GOS system so that exists and is part of our council records.

Public Reply Response

So parts of the Aquadrome are now registered as contaminated land?

TRDC Reply

The Aquadrome is not registered as contaminated land, nor is it required to be so. The council does keep a register of asbestos presence across the site.

A site with buried asbestos does not automatically or immediately have to be registered on a formal contaminated land public register unless it meets specific statutory risk criteria and a formal determination process under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Land is only legally classified as "contaminated land" if it poses a significant risk of harm to human health or the environment, or significant pollution of controlled waters based on its current use. As the asbestos contained within the Aquadrome site is managed and controlled under the council's Asbestos Management Plan, there is no immediate risk of a source – pathway – receptor link.

TRDC Reply to earlier question: *'Asbestos must have been in the Aquadrome for the past 50 years, and residents have been using the site for a long period of time without knowledge of it there. Have there been any known cases of Asbestos related illness to residents?'*

Reply

Earlier a gentleman referred to the fact that asbestos had closed the site, it has not – the site remains open and through the Asbestos Management Plan we adopt a pragmatic approach to the management of asbestos, prioritising public safety but at the same time as far as possible keeping the site open and accessible so it's not closed.

The gentleman asked if we were aware of any significant health issues that have been experienced by people locally in Rickmansworth. We are not aware of any particularly different profile in terms of asbestos issues medically in Rickmansworth as opposed to anywhere else nationally. That is partly, I would hope - because we properly manage the site. We undertake regular air monitoring across the site and the levels are safe. If the levels were not safe then that would be a whole other issue, but thankfully

because of the way we manage the site and because we are aware of the asbestos and take the appropriate mitigations there is no need to be concerned about that, it is still safe to use the Aquadrome.

Question

Excellent information and it's been brilliant to see this level of detail. The woodland walk in particular the second half given what you've said about asbestos – I believe the original tarmac that might have been laid there, will that be removed or will it be left as is given the asbestos risk?

Reply

The tarmac of that path is no longer fit for purpose and is at end of life. It's crumbling around the edges because of the flood events that we've had over the last couple of years. The structure of the path has been eroded in several places so it's not currently safe and as part of this project we will be removing that tarmac. We can not replace tarmac in that area because of the proximity of the river and the EA won't allow us to, it's a material that you're not allowed to use now and since the time it was put in things have changed and as we're not allowed to re tarmac we will be taking it up.

Public Reply Response

And is that also expected to flood in the same way as the first half (of the path)?

TRDC Reply

There are some river connections planned for there as you can see along the route. The idea of that is so that we have more controlled flood and more controlled connection, where as at the minute it just over tops and the whole thing is gone. It will slow down the pace at which the flood event happens, so it is likely that in significant flood event yes it will flood. We know because of the levels of the land and the levels of the river in very significant flood events such as the one we had a couple of years ago the water can get up to waist height in that area, so in those types of events yes it will flood. Because of the connectivity along the whole stretch we would hope that it would become more managed and for a greater amount of time you would still be able to access it you'd just need some pretty good boots.

Question

Who put the Asbestos there in the first place and has TRDC always owned the lake? My understanding was Bury Lake was owned by the Walker brothers who dug that out first and used that. From my work with friends of Stockers lake was that was owned by the water company at one stage. Is there some way of tracing back to who's liability it is or are we accepting that we are where we are and we've got to deal with it?

Reply

I think we are where we are with it. There is ongoing work with the museum to look at the history of the site, and there is some stuff we can trace. The reality is we own it now and it's our issue to deal with, and I don't think it is going to be possible to trace back any

form of liability. We don't know who dumped the asbestos here, there are no records of it going back that far. As officers we consider at this point that the most effective thing we can do is properly manage it.

Question

Are we aware of any other asbestos black spots in TRDC?

Cllr Reply

I'm going to close the questions here as we are only talking about the Aquadrome today but am happy to take any further questions outside of this on email.

End of live questions

Questions submitted in writing

Question:

What happens if we don't win the bid?

Answer:

In the first instance, consultation with The National Lottery Heritage Fund will seek to understand what further development or amendment will support the applications progress. Other funding sources are available and if required elements of the programme will be prioritised to ensure essential works, works which are funded separately or are of highest priority take place. Further funding is currently being sought and will continue to be to support the delivery of the Aquadrome Project hopefully alongside The National Lottery Heritage Fund.

Question:

- a) **Is the project sustainable financially?**
- b) **Why don't car park charges be installed?**
- c)

Answer:

- a) Project finances are based on detailed designs taken to RIBA Stage 4, where usually National Lottery Heritage Funded projects would be budgeted against RIBA Stage 3. This additional level of detail reduces risk and increases sustainability of the project. Within the project budget there is contingency and also budgets to ensure the management and maintenance of interventions.
- b) Currently there are no plans to charge for car parking at the Aquadrome

Question:

Will the Aquadrome be closed?

Answer:

Access will be restricted to sections of the Aquadrome as work progresses to ensure the safety of both the visitor and the contractors working on the site. As these sections complete, they will be reopened. The entire Aquadrome will not be closed. Other instances which may require the Aquadrome, or parts of it, to be closed are during significant flood events creating an unsafe environment or during a bird flu outbreak. The project team will ensure there are notices on site and the website will be updated to advice where and when closures will take place. The team will try to ensure minimal disruption, however with any building work there will inevitably be periods of time when this cannot be avoided.

Question:

Will Parkrun be able to continue throughout the works and long -term?

Answer:

Impact to organisations operating within the Aquadrome will be kept to a minimum. Engagement with parkrun organisers will continue to take place to ensure minimal impact to parkrun events.

Question:

During procurement / contract phase please consider risks that affected the play area and make sure that all contractors are responsible for these risks so any settlement can happen quickly. Do you have dedicated people/team, thinking about what could go wrong (with regards contractors) and a dedicated contracts person or team to get the best possible deal/risk?

Answer:

A dedicated Legal Team work within the council who work closely alongside the Procurement Manager and the Leisure & Natural Infrastructure team.

Question:

If the weir will not be removed if it would de-water the Millstream. But you're not modelling and/or monitoring the Millstream because it is out of scope of the works area. How will you know if the levels are decreasing? What would be done about it?

Answer:

For clarity the Mill Stream has been included in the detailed modelling for both flood events and low flow conditions. Officers highlighted during the engagement session that as the mill stream is out of the council's jurisdiction it cannot install gauging boards. However, modelling has and is most definitely taking place on the mill stream and much further beyond.

Asbestos Related Questions:

Question: How much asbestos is there?

Answer: It is unknown as to how much asbestos is present across the Aquadrome. This is why the entire site has been designated a “no dig” zone. The history of the source of the asbestos contamination is unknown; however, it is believed that there are potentially significant quantities of buried asbestos cement, textile, asbestos insulating board and other asbestos materials in the ground at the Aquadrome. For general day-to-day use, the Aquadrome poses no health risks to members of the public or other users.

Question:

How long has TRDC known of Asbestos in the Aquadrome? Is there a timeline on discovery?

Answer:

For information on the Asbestos within the Aquadrome please see the following website and documentation:

<https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/services/leisure-parks-culture/parks-open-spaces/rickmansworth-aquadrome#Asbestos%20management>

Question: Where are the ‘hotspots’ and what about adjacent areas/risk to public?

Answer: Following the investigative work as part of the Aquadrome Project Development Phase, 1 high risk area and 1 medium risk area was identified. The high risk area is adjacent to the Batchworth Lake side of the Woodland Walk and the medium risk area is adjacent to the access point to the canal from the main car park. These areas are due to be remediated in the autumn. Remediation work will be accompanied by air monitoring to ensure the safety of the contractors. The risk to the public is very low as long as they do not access the closed off “high risk” area. For general day-to-day use, the Aquadrome poses no health risks to members of the public or other users.

Question: Have the previous works (before closing the Woodland walk) such as the café, play area or BLYM uncovered asbestos (Preclosing the woodland walk)?

Answer: There have been no reports of asbestos being identified during the capital works for the café, play area or BLYM. However, periodically, particularly after high levels of rainfall or dry spells, asbestos does come to the surface and is subsequently removed by a licenced contractor.

Question: Can the Canal festival ever return?

Answer:

The council made the organisers aware of the changes in May 2023 and met with them in December 2023 to discuss the detail of the plan and what implications that might have for the festival set up and management. Any decision relating to the festival taking place is, and remains, with the festival organisers and not the council.

Question: What are the risks to residents and local houses and gardens from Asbestos?

Answer: For general day to day use, the Aquadrome poses no health risks to members of the public or other users, including local houses and gardens.

Question: Can we assume there will also be asbestos around the Stockers lake nature reserve, but it's not part of TRDC responsibility?

Answer:

The council is not able to comment on land outside of its jurisdiction.

Question: One council officer (2nd from right facing panel) said part of the woodland walk would remain permanently fenced off, but presenter on far left (Ecologist) showed diagrams of how the woodland walk would look. So, will it all eventually open or will an area remain closed?

Answer:

For clarity, the Associate Director commented on the area where high risk asbestos has been discovered and therefore requires permanent exclusion. This is within the woodland area but does not impact the route of the woodland walk. Therefore, the area of high risk asbestos will be permanently fenced and the plans for the woodland walk will proceed as presented. Gates form part of this design to allow the path to be closed in severe flood events where it is unsafe.

Question: For the area that is to be fenced off, will it be enclosed entirely or will it allow movement of wildlife, i.e. muntjac deer?

Answer:

The area of high risk asbestos will be permanently, entirely enclosed with palisade fencing and a locked gate. It is important to note that this area is relatively small compared to the woodland and does not block wildlife from moving around it.

Question: Will the lottery grant (if approved) cover all areas of improvement shown this evening, particularly the areas of improvement shown by panel member on end left (ecologist)?

Answer:

The application to The National Lottery Heritage Fund is supported by match funding, including from organisations such as HS2, Affinity Water and Three Rivers District Council. Together the funding will support the delivery of the Aquadrome Project.

Question: Supposing TRDC aren't successful in the bid?**Answer:**

In the first instance, consultation with The National Lottery Heritage Fund will seek to understand what further development or amendment will support the applications progress. Other funding sources are available and if required elements of the programme will be prioritised to ensure essential works, works which are funded separately or are of highest priority take place. Further funding is currently being sought and will continue to be to support the delivery of the Aquadrome Project hopefully alongside The National Lottery Heritage Fund.

Question: - I am sure the riverside woodland walk will be a topic on the agenda, I'd quite like to understand how the asbestos there is more harmful to the public than the asbestos anywhere else, especially as no one is disturbing it?**Answer:**

Following the investigative work as part of the Aquadrome Project Development Phase, 1 high risk area and 1 medium risk area was identified. The high-risk area is adjacent to the Batchworth Lake side of the Woodland Walk and the medium risk area is adjacent to the access point to the canal from the main car park. These areas are due to be remediated in the autumn. Remediation work will be accompanied by air monitoring to ensure the safety of the contractors. The risk to the public is very low as long as they do not access the closed off "high risk" area. For general day-to-day use, the Aquadrome poses no health risks to members of the public or other users.

The presentation from the evening is saved on the council website and there is further information about the different types of asbestos and why it is more harmful: [The Rickmansworth Aquadrome Project | Three Rivers District Council](#)