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Executive Summary

Between 21st July and 5th September 2010 the Neighbourhood Regeneration team consulted on the draft Ponders End Central Planning Brief. This was an intensive period of consultation targeting the whole Ponders End community as stakeholders.

The process involved extensive communication, consultation and in-depth engagement and Special Interest Groups were identified to ensure that the response was representative of the community as a whole. Various methods were used, including delivery of materials, press and website materials, presence at community events, outdoor roving exhibitions, public meetings, one-to-one interviews, meetings and focused workshops with particular groups.

In total, over 9000 episodes of communication were delivered, 951 episodes of consultation (fairly brief personal contact and opportunities for discussion) and 384 episodes of engagement (longer/in depth participation, e.g. through a workshop or one-to-one interview).

The demographic information gathered about participants indicates that the consultation was broadly representative of the profile of the ward. It is difficult to ascertain this accurately. The only detailed information is through questionnaire responses, which is only a proportion of those who took part, and a fairly large number of respondents chose not to provide demographic information. This may indicate that in future consultations this element should be scaled down to increase willingness to provide information. Where there were significant gaps in participation through questionnaire completion (for example amongst children and young people) this was for the most part anticipated in planning and mitigated by the arrangement of workshops with Special Interest Groups.

A huge amount of information was gathered from a diverse sample of the community, so responses given were naturally varied. Many respondents chose to answer in their own terms rather than making specific reference to proposals in the Planning Brief.

Priorities for improvement – The highest priorities for improvement identified were improvements to community safety, sensitivity to the environment in new developments and better access to public transport.

High Street – Improvements to the pedestrian environment, in particular crossings, would be welcomed. Most participants support limiting the number of take-aways, with some exceptions amongst children and young people. A greater diversity of shops, improvements to parking and support of non-retail business were also identified as important.

Queensway – Continued and intensified employment use is widely supported on this site. The proposal to reduce the size of the Tesco car park to provide more housing was extremely contentious. Amongst those who supported the reduction of the car park, many considered further employment use and/or leisure use as a greater priority than housing. A larger proportion opposed the reduction in the size of the car park, given the lack of adequate parking on the High Street. Participants suggested the addition of a second entrance to Tesco via Queensway, which received resounding support from all groups.

Queensway Campus – There are serious concerns amongst some in the community about the impact on overcrowding, congestion and the provision of local services that the Queensway Campus development will have, although a number supported the development on account of the need for more and better housing in the area. There was a strong view that priority should be given to local people in the allocation of housing. Most respondents considered that the provision of 0.75 parking spaces is unrealistic.

College Court – There was general support to the moving of a library to a High Street location, and this area is appreciated for its quietness. There were mixed views on the provision of a vehicular access to Queensway Campus at this location, and an alternative was proposed by the former Beef and Barrel pub. Some were extremely concerned about the increase in anti-social behaviour in this area that may result from the addition of a public square. Many supported this improvement, and made a range of suggestions regarding what it could include.
Heritage, Environment and Sustainability – It was generally supported to retain buildings of historic character, as long as they are in a good state of repair and serving a positive purpose. Sensitivity to the environment was one of the main priorities identified.

Community Facilities – There was no clear consensus between the two community facility options presented, although it was indicated that community facilities should not have residential uses above. Additional community facilities, in particular a flexible hall space, are essential to cater for the needs of the community, and a number of quality factors were identified. Swan Annex was specifically referred to by a number of respondents as an ideal location for grouped community uses, and Community House in Edmonton was identified as a model of best practice.

Transport Connections – Traffic congestion is one of the main problems identified by the community in Ponders End, and it has an adverse impact on local business, ability to get around and quality of the environment. This is a fundamental priority for improvement if any major developments are to be considered viable by the local community. Improved train, bus and cycle connections would be supported.

Ponders End Park – Improvements to Ponders end Park are strongly supported, and there is a desire for decent toilet facilities and more activities in this important open space.

Services – The need for additional services to support an increase in population was identified, in particular more nursery, primary and secondary school places, and a police station that is open to the public.
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Introduction

From 20th July until 5th September 2010 the Ponders End Central Planning Brief was released for public consultation, with a view to engage with as broad and diverse a section of the Ponders End community as possible, identifying all stakeholders in the local area and offering them a variety of accessible opportunities to find out about the plans for the area and to give their views. A comprehensive engagement plan was produced to guide activity during this intensive period of just under 7 weeks of consultation and engagement.

The Ponders End Central Planning Brief area includes the High Street, Queensway, Queensway Campus (former Middlesex University Site), College Court and part of Ponders End Park. Given the range of uses, including residential, industrial, retail, community and leisure, transport connections and development sites, this area of Ponders End is strategically important to all who live, work, learn or play in Ponders End. It was therefore important to particularly target stakeholders including Ponders End residents, businesses, shoppers, public transport users, families with school-age children and community organisations.

The Ponders End Central Planning Brief is the first of three Planning Briefs identified in the Ponders End Framework for Change to come forward for consultation and adoption. It is a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and as such, once adopted, it will provide guidelines that will shape all developments within the area. It will therefore have an important impact on the future of Ponders End’s central area, and it is crucial that it is shaped by the community in Ponders End.

This report provides a summary of the outcome of the consultation process in two parts:

Part A explains the Council’s approach to consultation on the Ponders End Central Planning Brief, activities undertaken, the level of participation achieved and demographic information about participants.

Part B gives a summary of the views expressed by participants regarding key areas and topics that the Planning Brief refers to.

It should be noted that, due to the large volume of feedback received through this consultation, this report provides a summing up of the information gathered and is not exhaustive. In the development of projects based on the Planning Brief, it is important to refer directly to the comments made by participants to ensure that the detail is not lost. These can be found listed by theme in the appendices, and constitutes a substantial record of community intelligence and opinion.
PART A – How we consulted

Consultation Approach

As a Supplementary Planning Document, the Planning Brief is subject to statutory consultation requirements, which are outlined in the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). In Enfield’s Place Shaping priority areas, engagement with the community is at the heart of the Council’s approach to regeneration, ensuring that a positive difference is made by working with the community.

The Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation Plan (see appendix E) was developed by the Neighbourhood Regeneration Team with advice from the Ponders End Vision Team, a consultative forum for residents, community organisations and businesses with an interest in Ponders End.

The approach to consultation for the Central Planning Brief was shaped by the principles, stakeholders and levels of engagement outlined in the Consultation Plan:

Principles:
The aim to ensure that every stakeholder is informed about the Ponders End Central Planning Brief and that they are offered a variety of accessible opportunities to be involved and give their views ranging from very brief and convenient interactions to more complex, in-depth and continuous conversations. In order to achieve this we endeavour to ensure that:

- we go to people in their normal environments rather than expecting them to come to us;
- opportunities to engage are interesting, relevant and enjoyable;
- there are multiple opportunities for people to choose how they wish to engage;
- specific approaches are tailored to the needs of special interest groups;
- all opportunities to participate are well communicated.

Stakeholders:
Given the wide impact that the plans in the document will have on the extended community in Ponders End, a broad approach was taken to identifying stakeholders, who were mapped under the categories of residents, businesses, schools, community organisations, leisure users, strategic groups, equality representative groups, strategic groups and special interest groups. This assessment was open to the scrutiny of the Ponders End Vision Team, who made a number of additions.

The stakeholder mapping process also identified a number of special interest groups, who either could be considered to have a particular interest in the Planning Brief, or who would encounter particular barriers to participation that the Council should anticipate and make special effort to overcome.

Levels of Engagement:
It was important that every stakeholder was informed about the Central Planning Brief and able to respond, so thorough communication mechanisms and clear feedback channels were established.

In order to ensure a balance was retained between including a broad base of stakeholders and facilitating opportunities for a range of stakeholders to reflect and respond in depth to the plans, consultation activities were broken down into three categories:

Information – stakeholders know what the Planning Brief is, that it is being consulted on, and how to participate in the consultation.

Consultation – Brief episodes of engagement such as personally giving someone a Planning Brief ‘Light’ summary and explaining what it is, a brief conversation covering a limited selection of topics or completion of a short questionnaire;
Engagement – In-depth and deliberative opportunities, such as lengthier individual or small group conversations, class sessions or workshops, with the opportunity for interaction during the process and gaining an overview of Planning Brief proposals.

Consultation Activities

A wide range of activities was undertaken to ensure that a high degree of stakeholder involvement was achieved at all levels of engagement and representative of the diversity of the community. See appendix A for a full break-down of communication, consultation and engagement activities undertaken.

Extent of Participation

Throughout the consultation records of the number of people participating in different forms have been retained in order to assess the success of the process. Participation is grouped according to level – communication, consultation and engagement – to give a realistic understanding of the depth of involvement. Detailed figures are listed in Appendix A. In some cases figures are approximate (as indicated), for example measurements of the number of people spoken to at community events or exhibitions, where during busy periods estimates in records kept were necessary.

These have been counted in ‘episodes’ rather than in people, as this can be measured reasonably accurately. It is certain that many people will have received information via more than one source – for example the same individual may have received a Planning Brief LITE through their door, read an article in the local press and had a letter with a copy of the Planning Brief LITE home from school. This repetition is valuable to reinforce the message that this is important information that will impact upon the area and those within it, and to offer multiple opportunities to respond. In fewer cases the same individual may have participated in more than one consultation or engagement opportunity – for example one person may have returned a questionnaire and attended a workshop. It is likely that overlap is rarer in more in-depth consultation, as the majority of efforts were targeted at those less likely to respond independently.

In total, the Council delivered 9627 episodes of communication regarding the Ponders End Central Planning Brief into the Ponders End community. This figure excludes consumers of Our Enfield, local and trade press, as we are not able to measure accurately how many people associated with Ponders End received information about the Planning Brief via these sources. It is known nonetheless that the local press continues to be an important source of information in the area, as in consultation it is requested that the Council communicates in this way, and there is a good response to questionnaires published in Our Enfield (27 of the 84 questionnaires returned in this consultation process were through Our Enfield rather than the Planning Brief LITE – about 1 in 3).

In terms of active involvement, there were 951 episodes of consultation and 384 episodes of engagement. This means that within a population estimated at 13,700 (2009 Ward Profile), there were 1335 instances of direct and personal contact (either face-to-face or through return of a questionnaire), which represents around 1 in 10 of the population.

Demographics of Participants

It was the fundamental objective of the consultation that all members of the community would have the opportunity to participate in this consultation process in a format and environment that was accessible for them. For this reason, the approach to consultation was multi-faceted, including questionnaires, attendance at community events, provision of outdoor exhibitions and specific workshops.

Since contact was made with every household, school child and business through the consultation, it is reasonably certain that communication was made with the full cross-section of the Ponders End community. All written communication was in the English language, and featured a contact number to obtain the information in different formats in line with the Enfield Strategic Partnership’s
Communication Strategy. No requests for information in different formats were received, which could indicate that language and literacy presented a barrier to receiving information; however this risk was mitigated by the many and varied opportunities for personal contact and verbal interaction during the consultation period, and the provision of specific workshops with language translation for particular groups, including the Enfield Asian Welfare Association, Enfield Bangladesh Welfare Association, Greek and Greek Cypriot Community of Enfield and Enfield Vision (representing those with visual impairments).

In the consultation plan (appendix E) it was anticipated that although written material would be distributed to every household, not every part of the community would engage with information provided in this format. It was considered that face-to-face contact and the use of existing groups and networks would be important to ensure that the views of people of all backgrounds were represented through the consultation. In order to structure this approach, a list of special interest groups were identified who would need to be proactively approached to ensure engagement from particular groups.

Through this intervention the number of people actively engaged in the process is high, and this group is extremely diverse and reflective of the make-up of the Ponders End community based on the evidence available through the 2009 Ward Profile.

**Sources of Demographic Information**

**Questionnaire responses:**

The most detailed source of information about the demographic balance of respondents is the questionnaires returned that were attached to the Planning Brief LITE documents. These included a detailed section about respondents, including information under categories of equality (gender, age, disability, ethnicity, faith and sexual orientation), address (to ascertain spread of respondents) and contact information. See appendix B for full details of the demographics of respondents.

Of the 57 people who returned questionnaires from the Planning Brief LITE, only 6 chose to give no demographic information whatsoever; however responses were patchy, and between 20 and 45% of respondents chose not to provide information in each category.

**Workshop attendances:**

Information was not gathered systematically at exhibitions, events and workshops, as it was judged that this would be perceived as tedious by participants and may have reduced willingness to participate on this occasion and/or in the future. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify workshops that enables special interest groups to participate, which successfully mitigated gaps in the questionnaire responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Interest Group</th>
<th>Workshop/Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people (under 16)</td>
<td>Alma Primary School Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Matthews Primary School workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ponders End Youth Centre workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults (16-24)</td>
<td>Ponders End Youth Centre workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two E Information and Advice 1-1 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older People</td>
<td>Ruth Winston Centre event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enfield Asian Welfare Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabled</td>
<td>Enfield Mencap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Disabled</td>
<td>Enfield Vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residence of Respondents

In terms of where respondents come from, 35 of the 57 people who returned questionnaires from the Planning Brief LITE gave their address, of whom 31 gave an address in Ponders End. There were 27 people who responded to the questionnaire in Our Enfield, of whom 19 gave their addresses, and only three of these were from Ponders End. This is not surprising as Our Enfield is distributed throughout the borough, and provided an opportunity for Enfield residents as a whole to respond to the plans for Ponders End if they felt that it was applicable to them. As well as residents, the consultation deliberately targeted those who work, learn, shop in or use public transport in Ponders End. Many of the non-Ponders End residents who responded to either questionnaire were from the east of the borough, particularly parts of EN3 to the north of Ponders End, and Edmonton N9 and N18 addresses.

The vast majority of those participating in workshops, attending events or exhibitions either live in, work in or participate in community activities and services in Ponders End.

Gender of Respondents

In terms of gender, 26 questionnaire respondents were male and 17 female. The remaining 15 either left the question blank or indicated that they did not wish to state.

Although this indicates that participation through responding to the questionnaire may have been skewed in favour of men, some workshops included a majority of women, such as Enfield Bangladesh Welfare Association, Enfield Women’s Centre, Enfield Vision and DARMAR, while none had a significant male majority, which provides balance. Engagement with children and young people included roughly equal numbers of male and female participants.

Age of Respondents

The proportion of 25-44 year olds that returned questionnaires was reflective of the population of the ward as a whole, with a disproportionately low number of under 25s and high number of over 45s participating in this way.

This indicates that questionnaires are a more effective approach to consultation with an older age group, which was anticipated in the planning of workshops. Of the 18 workshops held, involving a total of 292 people, two workshops were held specifically with children (aged 9-11 years), involving 112 participants, and two workshops were held specifically with young people (aged 13-20 years), involving 14 participants. It is notable that Ponders End has the highest proportion of 16-24 year olds of all wards within the Borough. In order to ensure that the points of view of older young people were well represented, one-to-one interviews were held with the 8 participants at Two E Information and Advice service leading to in-depth responses from this age group.

Ethnic Background of Respondents

In terms of ethnicity, Ponders End is extremely diverse (even in comparison with the borough as a whole), with particularly large numbers of Turkish, Somali and Bangladeshi residents. The most substantial ethnic group by some distance is nevertheless White British (33%).
Almost a third of respondents to the Planning Brief LITE questionnaire chose not to state their ethnicity, and a number chose to define their ethnicity under different categories to those given, which makes comparison difficult. The percentage of respondents that identified themselves as White British, English, or White English is however similar to the proportion of White British residents in Ponders End, although we must assume a number of those who did not state also fall into this category. There were also slightly higher numbers of Turkish and Indian respondents than the ward as a whole.

In order to ensure that a greater ethnic cross-section of the community was included in the consultation, approaches were made to a variety of community organisations, and workshops held with members of the Bangladeshi, Somali, Greek/Greek Cypriot and Asian communities.

The most significant language group that we were not able to arrange a workshop with language translation for during this process was the Turkish-speaking community. In future consultations it will be important to engage with community organisations such as Enfield Turkish Cypriot Association to ensure that this community has the opportunity to participate in its first language.

Disability of Respondents

Of Planning Brief LITE questionnaire respondents, 7% reported having a disability, with almost a third choosing not to provide this information.

In the 2001 census, 15.3% of Ponders End residents responded positively to the question “Do you have any long-term illness, health problem or disability which limits your daily activities or the work you can do?”. This suggests that the proportion of questionnaire respondents with a disability may have been comparatively lower than in the ward as a whole. To mitigate this likelihood and to diversify points of view represented, specific workshops were held with Enfield Mencap and Enfield Vision which added specific perspectives from community members with learning disabilities and visual impairments.

Sexual Orientation of Respondents

Almost half of questionnaire respondents chose not to provide information regarding sexual orientation, with two commenting, “Why this question?”, and “What difference does it make?” Attendees at one workshop expressed shock that this was being asked, and while they accepted the explanation as to why, they indicated that this would have prevented them from returning the questionnaire at all. It is also noticeable that while between 2% (Office of National Statistics) and 10% (campaigning group Stonewall) of Enfield residents identify themselves as lesbian, bi-sexual, gay or transexual, no respondent identified themselves as such.

Religion of Respondents

Finally, in terms of religion, a similarly large proportion of respondents to the Planning Brief LITE questionnaire chose not to respond to this question, and one person commented “We can’t see the point of these personal questions.”

With a significantly higher proportion of people choosing not to state their religion in the Planning Brief consultation than in Ward Profile data, it is not surprising that participation appears lower for most religions. For the most part trends follow the ward, although there was an absence of Jewish respondents. The number of Muslims who took part slightly exceeds the ward proportion, although it should be noted that since there is a Mosque in Ponders End many non-residents form part of the community through this association. It continues to be important to engage with the Mosque community, as with other religious and community groups who congregate in the area.

Summary

It can be seen therefore that for the most part where there was a gap in responses by questionnaire from a particular equality strand, this was anticipated and provided for through a workshop, leading to a final picture which can be on the whole considered representative of the Ponders End community. Some minor gaps have been noted above, along with learning points for future consultations.

Through discussions at workshops, specific comments on some questionnaires and the choice not to provide information, respondents indicated that they found certain questions intrusive, in
particular with regard to sexual orientation and faith. It remains a priority to ensure that the perspectives of all people are represented in consultation without discrimination, and without monitoring sexual orientation and faith it will not be possible to ensure that the voices of these communities are heard; however the feedback received will be taken into consideration in planning future consultations, and it will be necessary to question whether the risk of excluding people on account of faith and sexual orientation is great enough to justify the risk of offence.
PART B – What people said

Priorities for Improvement

Questionnaire respondents were asked to grade how important they felt a list of key improvements in the Planning Brief are. The 56 people who returned the Planning Brief LITE questionnaire were asked to indicate whether each improvement was very important, important or not important. The 27 Our Enfield respondents were simply asked to tick those that they felt were important, and were invited to indicate an ‘Other’ option. Both questionnaires also asked about opportunities that have been missed.

The responses have been ranked in order of priority by combining those that ranked the improvement as ‘important’ or ‘very important’, and subtracting the number that indicated it was ‘not important’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imp/Very Imp</th>
<th>Not Imp</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improvements to community safety</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developments being sensitive to the environment</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Better access to public transport</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Redevelopment of the Queensway Campus site</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More open spaces</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Creating new cycle and pedestrian routes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Retaining the character of Ponders End</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A new community square</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Creative arts hub in Ponders End</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Improving the area around the Mosque</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Proposals to build new homes on the High Street</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart demonstrates the balance of opinion, with the ‘Our Enfield’ respondents included in the category ‘important’.
A variety of other suggestions were made as priorities for improvement by respondents to the Our Enfield questionnaire:

In terms of the environment, a number of people commented on the need for greater cleanliness and for fly tipping to be tackled. An increase in green areas was also suggested. There was some resistance to new homes being added, particularly near the High Street. People felt that new housing should be predominantly houses rather than flats, and there should be no high rise flats (although high rise was not necessarily defined). There was a particular mention of the importance of suitable accommodation for disabled people and for more key worker accommodation.

Better routes for cyclists, more trains to London and a tube connection in Enfield were identified as priorities. It was particularly noted that public transport and pedestrian routes should be designed to be suitable for all users, including those who are sensory impaired, disabled or in need of mobility assistance.

Finally, the importance of improving community safety was reiterated by a number of people, in particular a greater police presence on the street and a police station that is accessible to the public. One person suggested more play opportunities for young children would be beneficial, and it was noted that community facilities should be designed with the community so that people respect them. Enfield Women’s Centre was particularly mentioned as a highly valued service that Ponders End is lucky to have.

There was a similarly broad range of responses to the question, “Are there any issues/opportunities that we have missed?”

The quality of the street environment featured highly, including references to problems with litter, fly tipping, street cleanliness, dog fouling and people who are drunk or begging on the High Street. Road signs could be neater and clearer, and the “dull green” signage was identified as “ugly.” Positive suggestions included increasing the amount of green space, plants and trees, carefully thought-out landscaping and adding good quality art work. It was suggested that a more “rural” feel should be fostered, and that new developments should be sympathetic to their surroundings.

The road layout and ease of traffic flow were key priorities, and there were concerns about congestion and pollution, particularly along the High Street, Southbury Road and Nags Head Road. The Southbury/Nags Head junction was identified as a particular issue, and it was suggested that laybys should be added for buses along the High Street so that they do not hold up the traffic.

Parking was considered important to encourage shoppers, and the absence of enough parking was held responsible for the decline in the local centre. Support for small businesses and entrepreneurship are important, as is the availability of all kinds of jobs, including part time opportunities suitable for the elderly, mums and teenagers.

There were numerous references to the need for community, social and leisure activities. Maintaining the library and having a community centre suitable for young people, over 50s, elderly and disabled people is important. People are keen to see more organised activities, in particular youth activities, green activities (e.g. gardening/allotment clubs), societies, adult training and education and community activities that integrate different cultures.

**High Street**

The proposals for the regeneration of Ponders End High Street would require the redevelopment of a number of properties in front of the Queensway Campus Site (numbers 188-216 High Street). Because of the potential impact on these businesses, businesses have been kept up to date throughout the entire process of planning and consultation via the Ponders End Business Forum, coordinated by Enfield Business Retailers Association; through 1-1 discussions; and through the offer of Business Support by Enterprise Enfield. Copes if the Planning Brief Lite were hand delivered to each premises affected by the proposals and leaseholders were written to. A strong
relationship has been forged with the affected businesses and will continue to develop as the plans move forward.

In general, there was widespread support for the key plans to improve the High Street. The view was supported that improving crossings is a high priority. Cars are perceived as taking over, and it is unclear where pedestrians should go. This is considered a serious safety issue for older people and those with physical disabilities or sensory impairments, as well as creating an unpleasant environment. Primary school children also commented on finding this intimidating. Particular points where there are safety issues crossing the road were identified at the junction of Queensway and the High Street (by the slip road), the junction of Lincoln Road, South Street and the High Street, and by Barclays, where buses obscure the view up the street. Additional crossings and a more pedestrian-orientated environment would be welcomed. Businesses opposite the Park commented that flooding is common on this stretch of the High Street, which means customers are splashed during wet weather.

Decluttering pavements was perceived as a desirable improvement. The main sources of clutter were identified as shops’ goods spilling out onto the pavements, unnecessary street furniture (in particular signs/posts) and litter. Wider and more even pavements with clear routes through were identified as important. Street furniture should be aligned where it is necessary and removed where it is not. One respondent commented specifically on the need for benches to have backs to make them useable for older people, and it is important for those with visual impairments that they go down to the ground so they can be navigated by those using a stick. It is also helpful to have a line of tactile paving to guide the visually impaired along the main routes.

The majority of participants at workshops agreed vehemently that there are too many take-aways at present, which were held responsible for much of the litter on the High Street, for the lack of diversity amongst the shops and for encouraging groups of young people to congregate. The only exception was amongst primary school children and young people at Two E, who were roughly equally split on this issue. Some enjoy the choice of take-aways and feel that it’s important to have these locally; others agreed with the objections above and specifically commented on the desire to have more healthy food options. Many felt that the problem of litter is exacerbated not only by the actions of customers throwing rubbish on the floor, but by business owners themselves who in some cases are not disposing of commercial waste in the appropriate manner.

The diversity of shops was a key issue, with many people feeling that the High Street does not cater for their needs. One person commented that Tesco is the only place you can do a full shop, and the quantity of small supermarkets was generally reflected on negatively. Language was identified by some groups as a barrier to personal service in local shops, which poses particular practical difficulties for people with visual impairments. There was a general desire to use shops locally rather than travelling to Enfield Town; however there would need to be a greater range to make this possible. In particular clothes and shoe shops, butchers, bakers, greengrocers, fishmongers and florists were identified as desirable, and any steps the Council can take to encourage these types of business would be welcomed. Young people felt that a shopping centre would be an attraction.

Improving parking was identified by residents and businesses as crucial to making Ponders End a successful town centre. It was generally agreed that there is not enough parking, and what is there is too expensive. Four workshop groups independently suggested that providing 15-20 minutes of free parking (e.g. through meters) would encourage people to stop and use local businesses and services. It was suggested that this would be a “quick win” action that would inspire confidence among local people. Some suggested the addition of a multi-storey car park would be beneficial.

The look of the buildings on the High Street was picked up on, with comments that it looks drab, dirty and commonplace. Children at Alma Primary school suggested that it could be made brighter by adding more lights and making it more colourful. A number of people suggested that the look of shops should be standardised and of a traditional design, which would celebrate the local heritage and make it an attractive parade. It was commented that planners need to be equipped to make these kinds of rulings. The shops to the East of the High Street between the Recreation Ground and the junction with South Street were identified as an attractive design, that could be refurbished and replicated.
Some respondents commented on the opportunity to encourage non-retail businesses and employment on the High Street, such as office-based business. Parking restrictions would need to be reviewed to accommodate the kinds of meetings these businesses would hold.

Some anti-social behaviour on the High Street was raised as a problem, in particular begging, prostitution, gangs of young people, litter dropping, drunkenness, fighting and toileting. This has a serious affect on people’s sense of safety and pride in the High Street.

Queensway

There was a great deal of support for the continued industrial use of Queensway and the concentration of employment there. The urgent need for a range of jobs in the local area was referenced by a wide range of participants, notably young people at Two E, EBWA, Creative Ponders End workshop and visitors to Enfield Autumn Show. In particular, Enterprise Enfield noted support for opportunities for greater employment intensity, although reservations were expressed about raising the capital for a creative hub in the present economic marketplace, and for the revenue implications of sustaining it.

Respondents to questionnaires in the Planning Brief LITE and Our Enfield were asked what kind of employment they would like to see on Queensway. There was widespread support for light industrial use and studios on this site, and a number of other options featured strongly:

- Small shops (e.g. butchers, bakers) and other local/family businesses to encourage local trade – this was the strongest alternative suggestion;
- Leisure facilities were another popular option, with examples including gym, community space, space for young people, ice skating, boxing and snooker;
- A market place was also mentioned by several people.

Alternative employment options included:

- Manufacturing;
- Larger shops (e.g. small Marks and Spencer, WH Smiths) such as you might find in Enfield Town or Edmonton;
- Art galleries;
- Engineering;
- Trades (e.g. electricians, plumbers);
- High tech industries/IT;
- Professional (e.g. doctors, lawyers, accountants).

A large number of respondents to the questionnaires were more concerned with quality factors rather than what type of jobs should be available. The following criteria were all suggested independently by more than one respondent:

- Jobs that are suitable for and will attract young people, with an emphasis on training and skills development;
- Jobs that provide vocational training and career development;
- It doesn’t matter what the jobs are, as long as there are lots of them;
- Jobs need to be permanent/secure;
- Quality jobs, not all low-grade/unkilled;
- There should be a range of full and part time jobs to suit different people;
- It is important that childcare is available/provided to enable young mums to go to work.
The area was considered for the most part suitable for studios and light industrial uses, due to its access restrictions. A couple of young people commented that the buildings could be improved, saying that they look disused and should be made to look more like studios rather than factories.

The Creative Ponders End workshop noted that there is a real absence of night time economy in Ponders End, which would usually be an outlet for creativity. They identified the need for a context for live music in the locality, although noted that the conflict with residential areas would need to be considered. The kinds of creative use that are envisaged on Queensway will need to be thought through carefully.

Residents and businesses on Queensway referred to the difficulties parking in this street, particularly with competing demands of residents, industrial uses, shoppers and religious buildings (in particular visitors to the Mosque and Mountain of Fire and Ministries Church). It was suggested that there is a need for additional parking to meet these needs.

There was a great deal of strong feeling and difference of opinion regarding the proposal that the area of the Tesco car park that is closest to Queensway should be used for housing. Of participants in workshops, some groups agreed that the car park is too big, in particular EAWA and Enfield Mencap service users. Primary school children and young people were fairly evenly split on this issue. Supporters of an alternative use for the site said that the section near Queensway is rarely full. There were mixed views on what the best alternative use of this site should be. Some children and young people were particular supportive of the need for more homes, and considered this would be a convenient location. Others, such as EAWA, DARMAR and those at the transport workshop thought this would be unsuitable because it is located next to an industrial area and very close to the Queensway Campus site. A more popular suggestion was to have more employment space on this area, and others considered that open spaces, leisure uses, children's play or community uses would be preferable.

A greater number of respondents expressed strong opposition to the car park being reduced in size. This included the majority of participants at EBWA, Enfield Vision, GGCCE, around half of the children and young people consulted and a number of individual respondents. They were concerned that Tesco is very busy at certain times of day and around important celebrations, and cars are essential because people use it to do a weekly shop. The lack of alternative places to park in Ponders End was cited by a number of respondents, who are concerned that if the Tesco car park was full this would aggravate the existing congestion at its entrance and there is a lack of alternative places to park. In weighing up this proposal it is important to consider the impact on the rest of Ponders End: the local concern about inadequate levels of parking around the local centre and the impact that a reduction would have on local businesses.

G L Hearn (on behalf of Tesco) observed a contradiction between the importance of Tesco and its car park in drawing people to the High Street and enabling them to park there free of charge in order to use goods and services, and the plan to use part of the car park for housing. They consider the car park to make a significant contribution to the viability of the High Street, and question how the Council intends to realise this redevelopment.

Several workshops independently came up with the proposal that a second entrance to Tesco should be added on Queensway. This suggestion received unanimous and enthusiastic support at all workshops, as it would improve access to the site from the south of Ponders End and alleviate congestion on the High Street and Southbury Road, where there are frequently significant queues. This is one of the most thoroughly supported proposals for the area, with the only caveat that the need to adapt the junction of Queensway and the High Street to cater for the additional throughput should be considered.

**Queensway Campus**

The importance of the Queensway Campus site in the area was noted by a number of respondents, who were concerned about the blight that the vacant site brings to the area; the wasted space; and the need to bring it back into productive use in order to rejuvenate Ponders End.
Many respondents, both individuals and workshop attendees, expressed serious concerns about overcrowding in Ponders End, and the impact of a development of this size. This is closely associated with comments regarding traffic congestion, community facilities and other services (see relevant sections), as well as the need for more open space, parking, and cleanliness. Many residents held that Ponders End is overcrowded, already exceeds its capacity in terms of population density, and an increase will exacerbate the issues that affect their quality of life already. Reference was made by some groups and individuals to the flats recently built by Southbury Station. Their perception that these flats are not being sold calls into question the need for further flats, as if the amount of flats exceeds the need by owner-occupiers, this will exacerbate the buy-to-let problem. The design of the flats was also reflected negatively upon.

Some groups made particular comments about the need for more housing in the area. Children and young people unanimously supported this, with a number making reference to their own situations involving under-accommodation and homelessness as evidence. EAWA and DARMAR also supported the need for more housing and reflected positively on this use for the Queensway Campus site. There were a number of comments that 350-450 homes seemed a good amount for the capacity of the site. Four people sleeping rough in Ponders End were reported.

Many respondents were interested in the allocation of the new homes. There were several comments indicating that priority should be given to Ponders End residents and people who have been in the area for a long time, so that local people receive the benefits of improvements. Families that are inadequately accommodated and older people were also identified as priority groups. Some respondents expressed concerns that the new housing would all go to people from outside the area, and they would be left as the “poor relative” in their neighbourhood. There were some comments on the balance of social housing and private housing, including querying the economic viability of this mix and some questions regarding the social implications of this, although in the main the need for affordable housing was recognised and endorsed.

The height of buildings was an important consideration. Many groups in workshops responded positively to the suggestion that the height of buildings should respect the height of the listed Broadbent building. There was strong resistance to high rise flats, which could create a “ghetto” (although the heights in mind were not defined), and GGCCE specified that anything higher than three storeys is too high. Others conceded that the existing height of the Roberts Building would provide an acceptable benchmark for future heights of the tallest buildings on the Queensway Campus site. Some individual respondents commented on the height of buildings proposed at the High Street, stating that 5-6 storeys is not in keeping with the surroundings. Children in Alma and St Matthews primary schools were particularly concerned that in any buildings with lifts, these should be kept in good order and preferably there should be two, in case one breaks down.

There was a great deal of support for favouring family housing, which was recognised as a need in the area. Some groups specified that family housing should have at least 4 bedrooms to cater for larger families, which are particularly common in certain ethnic communities. Others commented specifically that the size of rooms is important in the quality of new homes, and it is important that rooms are of a good size. The provision of housing for disabled people was viewed positively, with particular concern from school children that there should be ramps and adaptations, such as stair lifts, to make accommodation suitable for disabled people. One respondent warned of the importance of consulting with disabled people in order to be clear what their needs are and avoid design flaws.

The risk of increased congestion around access points to the site was raised. It is important that there are enough vehicular entrances and those suitable for pedestrians/cyclists. One resident of Derby road expressed particular concern that the pedestrian/cycle access indicated from Derby road should not exacerbate problems of anti-social behaviour and drug use already experienced in that area. It should be a wide, green and well-lit route. For more discussion on vehicular access see section on College Court.

Open spaces were considered to be particularly important in maintaining a good quality environment and the measures to encourage wildlife received positive comments. In particular, having private gardens where children can play safety in view of their parents/carers was identified
as important. Children at primary schools also suggested shared spaces where families can play together, play areas and space for outdoor activities like playing football.

The amount of parking space allocated was a cause for concern for many respondents. Some supported the limiting of spaces to 0.75 per household with the view that this will encourage people to walk, particularly given the good local public transport links, and that this will ease congestion. Many however were concerned that this is an unrealistic expectation, particularly given the provision of housing for families, who often have two or more cars, and may impact adversely on surrounding areas. Some observed that public transport needs to improve a lot before expecting people to walk rather than owning cars will be reasonable. The majority did not consider 0.75 spaces per household to be enough.

The London Planning Practice (responding on behalf of land owners Inpath) indicated their support of the aspirations to “architectural excellence” and creating a “vibrant town centre”. They agree that it is crucial that buildings are of the right size and height, and contend this should be based on achieving a viable development that will move forward regeneration in the area, which may require flexibility in the standards laid out in the planning brief.

The GLA particularly supports the strong frontage to the development on the High Street and the provision of clear routes through the site.

**College Court**

The principle proposals for College Court that were subject to comment were the relocation of the library to the High Street, the proposed vehicular access route to the Queensway Campus site and the provision of a new public square.

There was widespread support for the relocation of the library, as this is a valuable local amenity. It was considered that the library would be more visible and accessible in a High Street location, and that it would benefit from a new building and being grouped with other local services. A few respondents would prefer to keep the current location because it is quiet and the existing building is suitable.

Residents in College Court expressed serious concerns about the addition of a vehicular access route to Queensway Campus through College Court, which were shared by some groups and individuals that commented on this. Their view is that the area is quiet at the moment, and introducing an access route will make it noisy and unsafe. Other groups considered this to be a good place for a vehicular access route. Residents of College Court constructively presented some alternative schemes, in particular through making the access route one-way, or through making it for pedestrians and cycles only, providing a second vehicular access instead by the former Beef and Barrel pub. This alternative route was also preferred by some other groups in the community, including Alma primary school children, GGCCE and attendees at the Transport workshop.

There was some anxiety that the provision of a public square would result in the loss of parking spaces, but this is not the case. There are severe problems for residents in parking at the moment as spaces are used by shoppers and local businesses. They are keen to have some specific parking provision, and some other groups in the community echoed the importance of residents being provided for. In particular, pupils at St Matthews and a representative of the United Reformed Church indicated that a scheme such as permit parking or a designated area should be established for residents.

The proposal for a new public square received mixed responses. Residents of College Court are fearful that this would exacerbate the already serious problems with anti-social behaviour that they encounter, including street drinking and drug use, verbal abuse, urination, litter and fly tipping. Some other groups shared their concerns that this is a quiet area and should not be spoilt. It was suggested that the provision of benches would particularly aggravate the issue.

Many other groups including EBWA, EAWA, primary school pupils, young people and Enfield Mencap were enthusiastic about this proposal, which would provide a quiet alternative to the busyness of the High Street. It was suggested that there could be flowers, seats, a fountain or
paddling pool or a children’s play area here, and that this would be a good site for ad hoc stalls or a market, like in Enfield Town, or selling local produce.

Respondents to the questionnaire particularly mentioned that this could be a good place for a market, for the arts to exhibit, seating suitable for the elderly, trees and shrubs, good quality paving, a fountain or a monument. Concerns were raised by a number that this should be a family area, and that it may be vandalised or attract negative use. Some were explicitly opposed for this reason. The addition of CCTV, a good design and lighting were identified as important to mitigate this risk. Members of Enfield Vision commented how a wide open space is difficult to navigate, and suggested that they would need something to hold on to or follow. They are strongly opposed to any suggestion of a shared space for pedestrians and vehicles, as this is reliant on eye contact between drivers and pedestrians and a serious danger to visually impaired people.

**Heritage, Environment and Sustainability**

The retention of buildings with heritage value was considered important, as long as they are in a good state of repair and they serve a purpose. Buildings that demonstrate a bit of history and traditional local culture, or those that are in an “older style” were reflected positively upon.

Questionnaire respondents responded as following regarding whether they thought particular buildings should be kept, although it was not made clear in the questionnaire that this could mean just the frontages as opposed to the entire buildings, or the existing usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tara Kindergarten</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Building</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Annex</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The White Hart</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, positive comments were made regarding improving the setting of the United Reformed Church and the Mosque, with comments indicating that religious buildings are important within the community. Some expressed the view that all communities should be treated equally. In hindsight, it was not clear in the Planning Brief that the improvements to the Mosque and URC were as much about creating safe, pleasant and open access routes into the Queensway Campus site as improving these buildings in their own right. A number of respondents spoke about the need for the Mosque to have more space because of how busy it gets at times, making the pavement crowded, and the parking needs of this busy religious centre.

**Community Facilities**

*Three options* were presented in the Planning Brief regarding community facilities: Option 1 indicated one building on the West of the High Street; Option 2 presented community uses spread across both sides of the High Street; and option 3 asked people to put forward other suggestions. Questionnaire respondents were asked to consider which they would prefer. There were no suggestions for option 3, and there was an even split between the first two options, with 26 favouring each option.

Significantly, rather than stating a preferred option (or in addition to stating option 1) several respondents commented on how important it is for residential and community uses to be separate, and that there should not be residential use above community space, which would be a deciding factor on the location of facilities for many respondents. This point was also stressed by the Ponders End Community Development Trust, a key local umbrella organisation for community
groups which manages community rooms at Vincent House. Some respondents specifically noted that it is best to provide a variety of community facilities and services grouped on one site.

Some questionnaire respondents chose to list the sorts of facilities that are needed in addition to or instead of indicating an option. Several respondents referred to the need for a community hall, with others mentioning the library, a theatre, a nursing home or GP practice. The need for community facilities to have plenty of parking was also identified.

Community facilities were a priority issue for many workshop groups, many of whom raised this without prompting. Several groups, including the Ponders End Community Development Trust, EAWA, Enfield Women's Centre and the Ponders End Vision Team, specifically identified the Swan Annex as an ideal location to convert into a multi-use, dedicated community hub. Community House in Edmonton was referred to as a model of best practice, and the co-location of services in one building was viewed positively, so that this serves as a ‘one stop shop’ for information, advice, services and activities.

In order for a community building to be fit for purpose, the following quality factors were identified in workshops:

- A large hall;
- A range of smaller meeting rooms;
- A contemporary building;
- A space that can be flexible/sub-divided;
- Dedicated parking space;
- On public transport routes and within easy access of local shops;
- DDA compliant and tailored to the needs of all members of the community, including elderly;
- Affordable to use.

The GLA supports the option to focus the new (relocated) community centre fronting the High Street.

**Transport Connections**

*Road transport* is a major concern for businesses, residents, shoppers and community organisations in Ponders End. When the Planning Brief was approved for consultation by Cabinet Subcommittee, it was agreed that a bespoke Transport Workshop be set up to address this very issue.

One respondent summarised, “Parking and traffic flow … (are) the main problem(s) for Ponders End. Traffic is seen to prevent people from stopping in Ponders End to use shops and services, isolate people within Ponders End by limiting their mobility and causes a serious adverse impact on the quality of the environment. Congestion is an issue on all major routes, including the High Street, Southbury Road, Nags Head Road, South Street and Lincoln Road, blocking both north-south and east-west routes. Particular hotspots centre on the major junctions between these routes.” Respondents also commented on the common instance of rat-running and the use of local routes for industrial transport.

The issues of traffic flow and congestion are amongst the most significant barriers to public confidence in and acceptance of developments in Ponders End, and improvements in these areas would go a long way towards building local support. There was a clear sense in discussions with the community on these issues that they wish to receive more information and be fully involved in a dialogue regarding these issues. As major factors affecting quality of life in Ponders End Central at present, the desire was expressed for further information, consultation and engagement on potential changes and improvements to traffic flow.
There are opportunities for immediate improvement in addressing issues of **flooding**, particularly along the High Street and South Street in front of numbers 188-216. This was presented by the Transport Workshop as a potential 'quick win' which would establish some goodwill in the community.

With regards to **public transport**, there were mixed views regarding how effective connections are, with some respondents praising Ponders End’s train and bus links, and others describing the system as a major local issue. Improved access to Southbury Station was supported (with a suggestion to create an access via Emilia Close), and improvements to the station itself, in particular disabled access, were also requested. An increase in frequency of trains from Southbury and Ponders End stations was raised as a significant improvement to the transport connections in the area. Bus connections in the area are subject to significant delays due to traffic congestion, which needs to be resolved, and the lack of a bus route to central London is a frustration for some respondents.

In terms of **cycle connections**, it was generally accepted that improved routes would be beneficial, although some were concerned that cyclists and pedestrians may come into conflict on shared routes. Sustrans’ priority in the area is to provide a greenway link along South Street that links into the Lea Valley (as part of the Greenways project). They also support additional links to Southbury Station and through the Queensway Campus site. Whilst acknowledging that Ponders End does not lend itself to extensive Greenway development, it is suggested that greening streets and slowing traffic speeds would contribute to a safer and more appealing cycling environment.

### Ponders End Park

The new pedestrian and cycle route received widespread support as an improvement to the open space and the final design is being worked through with users of the Park and other residents. For more information on public opinion regarding the route, see Central Avenue Consultation Report.

The proposals to improve the park met a warm response in workshops. The Adizone and improvements to play facilities have been particularly popular improvements to date, and participants indicated enthusiasm for further improvements. In particular, the addition of suitable (disabled accessible) toilets is a priority, and the desire for there to be more to do in the park was raised. Improvements to the entrance to draw people into the park were identified as specifically important by some members of the community.

### Services

Many respondents indicated concerns regarding the adequate provision of local services to support the increase in population. Many of these services are perceived to be inadequate to present needs.

The availability of enough nursery, primary and secondary **school places** was a particular concern, particularly if there is an increase in affordable housing. The need to safeguard existing facilities was stressed. The need for a **Police Station** that is open to the public was lamented by many, and relates to the high priority set on improved community safety in the area. Additional **community facilities** will be needed, and a second **Post Office** towards the top of the High Street was identified. There were mixed views on the provision of **GP**s, with some individuals stating that you cannot get an appointment, and others suggesting that there are plenty already.

Improved enforcement relating to **street cleanliness** (i.e. litter and fly tipping) was suggested in order to mitigate the aggravation of this problem likely as a result of Ponders End becoming a busier town centre.
## Summary of Consultation Activities and Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Numbers Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION</strong> – The foundation of engagement, ensuring that every resident, business or school attendee has the opportunity to learn about the Ponders End Central Planning Brief and why it is important, the essential elements of the Brief, how to find out more information and how to respond and give their views.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential distribution</td>
<td>Planning Brief ‘LITE’ summary document delivered by the Ponders End Community Development Trust (PECDT) to every home in Ponders End with their quarterly newsletter, the Ponders End Newsletter (PEN).</td>
<td>6000 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business distribution</td>
<td>Planning Brief ‘LITE’ summary document delivered to every business and community venue in Ponders End.</td>
<td>488 business and community addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local contact points</td>
<td>Distribution and collection points for questionnaires established at Ponders End Library, Tesco, Ponders End Post Office and Cottage Cleaners on the High Street.</td>
<td>4 contact points delivered around 500 summaries*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools distribution</td>
<td>Planning Brief ‘LITE’ summary documents with explanatory letter went home with every school child in their book bags.</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; equality umbrella organisation distribution</td>
<td>Planning Brief ‘LITE’ summary documents with explanatory letter sent to every community/faith group the Place Shaping team has a record of, borough-wide equalities umbrella organisations and to the PECDT for circulation around their networks.</td>
<td>66 (plus PECDT contacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Shaping contacts</td>
<td>Contacts informed and invited to participate by letter and email:</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Distribution | Vision Team – 69  
|             | Statutory Consultees – 57  
|             | Community groups – 42  
|             | Residents and other interested individuals - 108 |
| Website | Web pages launched with comprehensive information and documents to download |
| Press | 19th July consultation releases to local papers and trade press  
|       | 3rd Sept Green and Healthy Living Day pre event release to local papers  
|       | 16th Sept Green and Healthy Living Day post event release & photos to local papers.  
|       | 3 Page Ponders End regeneration pullout / questionnaire in August edition of Our Enfield distributed to 120,000 households |
| Ponders End CAPE | Brief presentation and information available. |
| Ponders End, Jubilee & Lower Edmonton Area Forum | Brief presentation and information available. |
| Fairshare Trust Board | Brief presentation and information available. |

**Total episodes of communication:** 9627
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuters distribution</td>
<td>Distributing Planning Brief ‘LITE’ summary documents and occasional explanation/discussion outside Southbury and Ponders End stations in morning and evening rush hour periods. Thursday 5th August - 7.00 – 9.00am, Tuesday 17th August - 4.30-6.30pm</td>
<td>05/08/10 Ponders End – 170 Southbury – 111 17/08/10 Ponders End – 55 Southbury – 99 = 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roving outdoor exhibitions</td>
<td>Members of the team set up outdoor exhibitions giving out helium balloons, offering a lucky dip and providing information about the Planning Brief in various locations around Ponders End – this took the form of a fixed point or detached work as appropriate. Tuesday 20th July High Street by access to Tesco 4.30-6.30pm, Tuesday 27th July Tesco foyer 3.00 – 6.30pm, Monday 2nd August Welsh Estate 3.30-6.30pm (detached work), Thursday 5th August Ponders End Library (with ‘Space Kids’ session) 10.00am – 1.00pm, Wednesday 11th August Durants Park (with ‘Reach Out and Play’ session) 3.30 – 6.30pm, Thursday 19th August High Street (College Court) 3.30 – 6.30pm, Tuesday 24th August Ponders End Park (with ‘Reach Out and Play’ session) 12.30 – 3.00pm</td>
<td>High Street – 90 Tesco Foyer - 170 Welsh Estate - 30 Library - 12 Durants Park - 35 College Court – 40 Ponders End Park – 43 = 420*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community events</td>
<td>Presence at community events organised by the Council or by community organisations in Ponders End. <strong>Sunday 25th July</strong> Bangla Mela Multicultural Festival &amp; Faith Exhibition</td>
<td>Mela – 50* POS Launch – 12 Autumn Show – 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Spaces Strategy Launch event</td>
<td>Pymmes Park 10.00am – 4.00pm</td>
<td>Thursday 29th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Autumn Show</td>
<td>Town Park 10.30-6.00pm</td>
<td>Saturday 4th – Sunday 5th September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total episodes of consultation | 951 |

= 94
### Engagement

In-depth and deliberative opportunities, such as lengthier individual or small group conversations, class sessions or workshops, with the opportunity for interaction during the process and gaining an overview of Planning Brief proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires returned</td>
<td>Planning Brief ‘LITE’ included a response questionnaire, which the team encouraged people to fill in and return to our freepost address or any of the local contact points. There was also a questionnaire included in Our Enfield article distributed during the period.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online comments received</td>
<td>Opportunity for people to submit comments online or via email through the website.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Court residents</td>
<td>Initial outdoor scoping workshop with residents of College Court to discuss current issues and concerns regarding anti-social behaviour and the impact of the Planning Brief proposals; Follow-up round-table discussion with residents, ward members, Council Officers, Safer Neighbourhood Team and Enfield Homes to discuss how issues experienced can be addressed.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Road Community Association</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion at Community Association meeting.</td>
<td>17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponders End High Street Business Forum</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion at Business Forum meeting</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponders End Vision Team</td>
<td>Deliberative workshop for members of the Ponders End Vision Team and others that have participated in consultation in the past to look in detail at the Planning Brief proposals.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Workshop</td>
<td>Special public workshop focusing on transport issues in Ponders End Central.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Workshop</td>
<td>Special public workshop focusing on opportunities for developing creative industries in Ponders End.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponders End Youth Centre</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion with Youth Centre Panel members.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Episodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two E Information and Advice</td>
<td>One-to-one interviews with young people attending drop-in session.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Winston Centre</td>
<td>Presentation and one-to-one discussions at the centre’s open day.</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Women’s Centre</td>
<td>Meeting with staff to discuss implications of Planning Brief and opportunities for the Women’s Centre.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Asian Welfare Association</td>
<td>Presentation, discussion and focus groups at one of the group’s regular sessions, with Gujerati interpreter.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Bangladesh Welfare Association</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion at group’s weekly lunchtime club, with Bengali interpreter.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Primary School</td>
<td>Small group sessions with year 5 pupils</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Matthews Primary School</td>
<td>Class sessions with year 5 and 6 pupils</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Mencap</td>
<td>Focus group with adults with learning disabilities and staff representing Mencap’s service uses.</td>
<td>13 (8 service users, 5 staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Vision</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion with members and volunteers at Enfield Vision’s monthly meeting for people with visual impairments</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali community reps</td>
<td>Interview with two representatives of Somali women’s community groups.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek &amp; Greek Cypriot Community of Enfield</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion with members and staff of the Greek and Greek Cypriot Community of Enfield.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total episodes of Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All figures are exact except where estimates are indicated with an asterisk (*)*.
**APPENDIX B**

**Questionnaire Response Analysis**

**Detailed comments**

**Contents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Vision and Principles</td>
<td>3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Priority Improvements</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jobs on Queensway</td>
<td>11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Issues or Opportunities Missed</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. High Street Options</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Buildings to be Kept</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public Square</td>
<td>18-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Traffic Hotspots</td>
<td>22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How did you find out …</td>
<td>24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Demographics of Respondents</td>
<td>26-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Information extracted from the Planning Brief and questionnaires were distributed to Ponders residents, businesses and other community members during July-September 2010 by:

- Delivery of Planning Brief LITE document to every home, business and community building;
- Letter and Planning Brief LITE document sent home with every school child;
- Planning Brief LITE document available from local venues Tesco, Ponders End Library and Cottage Cleaners, and for download from the Council’s website;
- Article and questionnaire in Our Enfield magazine, delivered to every resident.

In total, 87 responses were received, including 56 Planning Brief LITE questionnaires and 27 Our Enfield questionnaires. The information gathered through this response should be viewed alongside those expressed in workshops and letters from residents and other stakeholders.

Here is a summary of the views expressed through response to the questionnaire, which included the following questions (where there is variation in the wording of questions this is indicated in grey):

1. Do you have any comments on the Vision and Principles for Ponders End Central? Have we missed out anything or is there anything you don’t agree with? Please write in the boxes below. (Our Enfield – As Planning Brief LITE, but requests information on the Vision only)

2. Which of the suggested improvements do you think are most important? (Tick list given)

3. What kinds of jobs would you like to see on the Queensway Site? Do you like the suggestion that we could encourage more studios and light industrial uses? (Our Enfield – What kinds of jobs and businesses would you like to see on the Queensway Site?)

4. Are there any issues or opportunities that we have missed? If you have any ideas please write them in the box.

5. Which Option do you prefer for the High Street opposite the Park: Option 1 (one single building for community and retail uses with flats above) or Option 2 (community and commercial uses split across two sites)? If you have another suggestion please write it in the box.

6. Would you like the following buildings to be kept? Tara Kindergarten; Roberts Building; Swan Annex; The White Hart

7. What would you like to see in a new public square?

8. Where do you think are the worst traffic hotspots in the area?

9. How did you find out about the Central Planning Brief Consultation? (Question not asked in Our Enfield questionnaire)

10. Demographic information (Question not asked in Our Enfield questionnaire)

This document details the responses received to these questions.
1. Vision and Principles – comments

Comments made were varied, and did not always relate to the Vision and Principles as described in the consultation documents. For ease of reference have been grouped under some headings which seemed to fit the concerns raised. In some cases where a response highlighted a number of separate issues they have been broken down into separate comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As far as I can see the plan for Ponders End area is wonderful. I hope the plans go ahead since the new government is doing some cuts to public spending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as Ponders End becomes a nicer place to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What character?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the reputation of Ponders End. Currently seen as a poor and unattractive area in the borough of Enfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think your vision is too radical and ambitious. I agree with extra housing on the Queensway Campus Site, but the High St should be retail + community facilities. I don't want anymore eateries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want to Ponders End will become an important place and an interesting place too. We need something new in Ponders End to go shopping / to spend time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It all sounds very grand and I hope it succeeds. Does improve the area around the mosque mean it will be made larger? If so a big 'NO'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This attempt to turn an urban area into a rural one and will not work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed vision is EXTREMELY ambitious. Ponders End is currently far from prosperous, inclusive, clean, green and stable. I think it is commendable to lay out this vision but practically I think it will be impossible to achieve since the community has changed so radically and those who remain have less ties to the area and prosperous middle class families will always want to move out of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall - a pleasant area. How to encourage diverse business to the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I totally support the vision of the proposed development of this area as long as these activities create new jobs for us and our youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There more emphasis on new housing than employment places. Where will people work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have completely ignored the demographic make-up of Ponders End, which is now mainly Muslim religion and people from Somalia and poorer countries. I have never seen any Muslim lady in a Burkha on a bicycle, so some of your visions don't address the requirements of people living there. I am attaching a point by point critique of faults in this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to see a few English shops and less food takeaways and café's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More nice shops rather than kebab and chicken joints!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleanliness and environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve on the sanitation of the area and alley ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Spaces and Greenway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The park feels quite hemmed in and needs a facelift. Some good facilities at the front of the park but lacking in any nice features at the back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the character of Ponders End with BRICK façade buildings (not all glass and hideous colour paint) with attic style flats on the top in keep with Tara Building and the shops near the Park. The rainwater runs off the sloping roofs for recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Ponders End free of litter - music confined to their own homes not for other people to listen to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link the green areas (spaces) together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
less surveillance, cleaner streets
Also any original buildings in High Street should be retained or new building should be done in traditional style.

Community Safety
Need more help to tackle anti-social behaviour, more safety around park areas where children and vulnerable people are.
Better facilities at the Police Station.
Get rid of Ponders End Police Station - not open to the public. Paradoxial, we need more Police/Enforcing bodies, i.e. Environmental
More CCTV camerasto stop vandalism. Also Police Park patrol.

College Court
Very nice. Like the idea of a new square for Ponders End
It is a pity the College Court couldn't be developed into a new College with grounds as it was during the 60's and 70's. It has been left to run down.
One issue I do have is for a new square - this I feel would encourage even more undesireables to the area in question.

Housing and population
Building more social housing flats, to low income peoples. Now is recession and hard to buy flat or house. There is 10000 peoples council's waiting lists. Most of them are low income peoples. Enfield is one of Shelter's bad housing list. East Enfield really needs more help to housing. That will reduced anti-social behaviour and burglarys
To improve the residents in the area to more owner occupied would increase how people care for there area. Too many rented properties and tenants with no respect for the area is the biggest problem
Yes Ponders End is already becoming the biggest dustbin. Something needs to be done before it is too late. This has long been my vision and sadly its coming true. We seem to gain everyone else's cast outs, not just Enfield.
Ponders End has become a total dump due to the influx of scummy people in the area that Enfield Council seems to like junkies, muggers and the like
Need to ensure with all the new homes being built that all residents have access to facilities and amenities, standard of life does not diminish for some and improve for the few
Enfield Council needs to provide more homes for local people, both homes and small units for single people, bed sits etc, and bed sits etc for people 60+
More thought for people already living in the area. Now new street parallel to Derby Road with mins/terraced houses, Long & Sommerville site mk II. Foot and cycle connection not needed. Not healthy and welcoming at all.
There are too many flats - It will make it overcrowded. Keep the High Street for shops
Houses should be built away from High Street,

Overcrowding, congestion and transport
Nags Head Road has traffic 24/7… The road is used by lorries, cars for links to M25, Brimsdown Industrial Estate, Chingford, Tottenham… Its dangerous for residents, not a nice road to live
Ponders End is not suitable for capacity building. The roads or transport system are clogged and full to capacity. We do not need more cars, homes or chicken shops.
I have concerns about traffic in this area, it's atrocious. Coming out of side roads is, most times brutal. My concern therefore is that the more homes become available, the more people, which will generate much more traffic.
Nags Head Road needs to be improved. Traffic congestion is 24/7 with lorries, cars, buses, vans. Pollution must be at its highest. The road is dangerous and not nice for people to live. Expand the
road at the eagleclose end, as traffic builds up mostly in this area. Four lanes could be created, e.g. bus lane plus left, right turn lane. Resident at this end of Nags Head would be willing to exchange for new homes you build.

If possible more cycle paths. Deal with traffic hotspots - especially at the Junction with South Street and Church Road. Banning Parking close to the Junction (Double yellowlines) might help. There is often a log jam here at busy times, leading to much bad behaviour.

Its such a nuisance to be so close to work in East London (Leyton) but the only tube access that’s to get there is OAKWARD - WHY!

Are we sure we need more new homes? There are already developments near the old post office, Southbury Station and it all adds up to more traffic, both people and cars and its unpleasant

I agree with the vision but am concerned that more housing will create more cars and traffic in the area which is already a nightmare

1) No one uses bike lanes, 2) Intersection between Southbury Road/Hertford Road needs sorting, 3) Transport links already good,

There is no motorcycle parking bay in Ponders End High Street. The nearest is Church Street Enfield Town.

**PRINCIPLES**

**General**

That the younger generation need hopes of a future not the prospects of hanging about in the park all night now they are left unlocked and a high street full of cafes, take aways and off licenses. What is the White Hart going to make way for? A building that has been here long before us all that live here now, what ever. Its bound to be something that will not benefit any of us. I live right opposite.

Remove them and we might have a chance

**Good**

As long as Ponders End becomes a nicer place to live

Seems to be well thought out

To be treated like West Enfield.

Ok - but very generic

**Specific principles**

Principle 3 - should be more for teens to do. I am unaware of youth club or community centres in the area. The high street requires more grassy areas. Ponders End lacks a heart, should more than just fast food shops and supermarkets. Local business should be encouraged in terms of diversity (range of different shops).

I agree with most of the principles especially 1,3,4 and 5. I think a huge issue that has been missed is how to improve cleanliness of the area. This issue should be addressed. Location of recycling banks/bins, mending broken pavements and developing new tidy businesses and other similar activities in the area.

3.4 be careful re: "de-cluttering". Railings are there for a reason = (Health + Safety)? The more red + cycle routes the better (not cars)

**Housing and environment**

Very good initially. Agree with providing a mixture of homes including family

Spread the tenants over the whole Enfield area. If you continue to allow every home in Ponders End, Edmonton to be rented you will create a ghetto. No more takeaway, an area needs to attract shopper, takeaways do not do this

Plan for homes v.good

Higher percentage of private housing preferable. Attract "quality" retail units to the area. Avoid "overcrowding in the area"
The footpaths in many areas of Ponders End need repair. The number of pigeons needs to be reduced. Also, in Ponders End as many as 20 people from overseas live in a 3-bed house. Can Enfield Council help in this matter?

Ideally I would like the housing to be quality housing with minimum social housing.
Building more homes and putting more people in the area will not make it easier to move around. This area will become a ghetto - tomorrow's slum with shoe box shaped buildings. We need nice character buildings with traditional shaped roofs.

Flood areas of litter ban / and advertising / keep Ponders End clean.

Traffic and transport
Please do something about the traffic on Nags Head Road, its not safe for residents. Pollution has increased 100%.
Infrastructure i.e. road improvement should be made to High Street/Southbury Road before anything else - improve traffic flow - less cars parked on High Street is excellent as large vehicles cannot pass on these roads!
Transport - the trains are very unfrequently and poor. The Roads are not wide enough for the increase of motor vehicles in the area.
Extra road provision must be carefully considered to ease present congestion. I don't want to attract more cars.
Too many walk ways will make rat runs for anti social behaviour. It will be like broadwater farm, too many people in a small area - congests the roads and hard to police.
Diagonal parking outside shops on the left hand side of the High Street.

High Street
More nicer shops instead of takeaways, foodstores and people displaying their goods on public paths.
No more A3-A5 in the areas. We need different kind of shop activities in the area.
No more Cafes please! Or community markets. "Lively Evening Economy"? No more roof terraces as these create lots of noise i.e. take a look at the roof terrace over the rear of Kays hairdressers in High Street! No community market or roof top growing thank you.
Also important is to not only "de-clutter" the High Street but to insist that shops can't use the pavements. For example near Tesco the shops selling re-conditioned white goods, fridges etc… which are an eyesore, the charity shop near Swan Annexe which has furniture all over the pavement.

College Court
Is this consultation! When you ask if we would like to see the brief when it is "adopted"… can it not be rejected? Listen to the residents, NOT the planners. They do not live here. A square would be a place for more beggars and vandals to gather.
I'm only in favour of a lively new square if adequately policed.

Youth, Community and Park
Ensure that there are enough things to develop the skills of young people from all backgrounds such as community centres, youth centres, etc.
Small friendly centres set up for people to go to with issues of concern. Tends to be more friendly than police stations.
And to move the mosque to some where like industrial areas - not in the high street - and every Friday/special day they block whole high street.
The redevelopment of Ryans Park, what you call the "Rec" - look at what has been at Edmonton, (near Sainsbury's)
Ryan's Park could be upgraded. You have started a walk way which is left half finished. Lots could be done to restore this recreational park area.
Enterprise and Employment
There is too much emphasis on 'arty crafty' stuff, which in the end doesn't pay the rent. Why don't you concentrate on making Ponders End a working centre, so that even these people who have little English language can get a job where academic qualifications don't matter, but will pull them out of poverty. That is what is most important.
Supporting Entrepreneurship in Ponders End
2. Priority Improvements

Participants completed a tick list of suggestions. In the Planning Brief LITE they were asked to state whether they felt each improvement was very important, important, or not important. In the Our Enfield questionnaire improvements were grouped into categories (Environment, Housing, Transport and Community), and respondents were simply asked to tick those that they considered a priority. These have been grouped as ‘important’ in the graph below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Improvements</th>
<th>LITE &gt;</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>Our Enfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developments being sensitive to the environment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More open spaces</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining the character of Ponders End</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the area around the Mosque</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment of the Queensway Campus site</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals to build new homes on the High Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to public transport</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating new cycle and pedestrian routes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to community safety</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new community square</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts hub in Ponders End</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Our Enfield questionnaire specifically offered respondents the opportunity to identify ‘other’ improvements that they consider to be important under each of the headings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other (Our Enfield questionnaire)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets are dirty – so a cleaner, peaceful environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan looks a lot better!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassland area around Mosque and a central rose garden/fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Nags Head Road no. 43 side to High Street or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less chicken shops and pound shops, more places to eat in Ponders End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing stock before peripheral issues above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment - as every culture, religion consulted not just ones new to area in last 20 years. Respect given to everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish the mosque its unsightly + spoils the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more green areas &amp; planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve level crossing ref recent accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get rid of rubbish / fly tipping / general rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already too densely populated area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Queensway Campus for the young to expend and expand their energies and capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New homes, Nags Head Road EN3 7AA, replace No.43 to High Street add bus lane and widen road to improve congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new housing on the High Street please?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more key worker accommodation away from High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are new housing being built for all, disabled housing I live in a flat meant for disabled obviously disabled not consulted when built - there are many problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more flats please already overcrowded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not high rise flats (Low level houses with gardens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses to be built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the homes are flats, they need to have a softer feel, less like a tower block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many houses already, too poor housing stock NO MORE HOUSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen High Street between Southbury Road and Nightingale Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be cyclist friendly! More cycle lanes everywhere in Enfield. LESS barriers that stop us cyclists using quiet, green, peaceful routes i.e. lanes + paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists and pedestrians must be obliged – bells on all cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For pensioners and disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent trains to central London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one uses cycle lanes, waste of time; ban cyclists from pavements!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedestrian routes for all include blind, disabled, using electric wheelchairs and scooters, disabled with dog, hearing dogs, guide dogs
The area is serviced with excellent public transport provisions
Coach trip for the long term residents to other countries
Bus Station Area - precinct type areas, terminal improvement
Tube link is a must for East Enfield, trains too crowded

COMMUNITY
Safer streets
Playground area with swings, slides etc for children + mothers to chat. More financial assistance for Enfield Womens Centre - an excellent resource + support for single women / mothers + immigrants + the abused. Aren't we lucky to have it here in our town!
Situate (community facilities) alongside Library and Church area – drinking fountains!
More real police, not ineffective PCSO's, on foot - not in cars
I would never go out alone after dark in this area, especially the park or shops / tower block area south street
Any new community features must be developed with the community to ensure they use + respect it
Could this (creative hub) be developed at the library?
No wheelie bins on show
More exchange with other community's that are on the other side of the country for AIR to breathe
New Police Station 24/7 open. More Police on beat.
3. Kinds of jobs (or businesses) on Queensway

The following comments were made by people in relation to jobs on Queensway. In some cases people chose to refer to the sorts of profession, trade or industry that should be attracted; in others they preferred to talk about the qualities of jobs that are needed, e.g. secure, training positions etc. These have been broadly grouped into categories for ease of reference based on the trends that came through in responses. In some cases individual responses have been split where more than one suggestion was made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Jobs or Industries</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chain stores Shopping centre Market</td>
<td>big shops, shops like Edmonton Green shopping centre More markets and make Ponders End like Enfield Town not Edmonton Market, e.g. Enfield Town Market place to avoid the monopoly that Tesco store has. Light Industries, retail shops Market e.g. Enfield Town Small Marks and Spencers Maybe shop that the town has ie Bodyshop, Next, maybe M/S food store, WH Smith, there has never been those kind of shops there, and just not too many kebab shops that cause rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Jobs Manufacturing</td>
<td>more manual jobs to engage and train young workers manufacturing needs to return to Enfield. We have enough service sector, we need manufacturing / low skilled jobs also. Asda open on Southbury Road, great but think of traffic congestion Studio's are really useless - proper jobs or training e.g. electricians / plumbers, training shops, no new houses 1) manufacturing: Enfield has lost its manufacturing base with retail parks. 2) Low skilled, mixture of full + part time for students etc…. + local workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light industrial and studio (as Planning Brief)</td>
<td>Like the suggestions Artist jobs, gallerys I agree with light industrial, too many shops of the same kind, i.e. food and takeaways Studios and light industrial uses Studios and light industrial uses suggestions are good Yes Yes More studios, to further the arts. Also light industries should be encouraged for employment. like suggestions Absolutely. I think there's lots of room for creative and artistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development that this part of North London lacks
Yes
I like the suggestion of studios + light industry
Not too much heavy duty industrial uses, just stick to very light uses
New houses and light industrial but no anymore shops because we have too many small shops already
Yes Queensway does need a facelift. Some buildings are quite tidy but others are awful. More studios and very light industry would be ok
Encourage light industrial use
This would seem to be a sensible suggestion to encourage more studios/light industrial / creative uses.
I agree with this suggestion but please don't encourage more than traffic!
More studios and light industrial
Light Industries, retail shops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small businesses</th>
<th>Community Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small local shops</td>
<td>Sport and leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family businesses</td>
<td>Community groups, a gym with basic equipment for exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR THE YOUNG PERSONS. TABLE TENNIS - SNOOKER ROOM. BOXING ACADEMY. TOILETS, SHOWERS , CANTEEN FACILITIES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities of Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training/skills development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| emphasis usage | Studio's are really useless - proper jobs or training e.g. electricians / plumbers, training
With training for any age to receive qualifications and apprenticeships not just school leavers up to 19. Also all abilities.
Something to attract and retain young people with opportunities for training or apprenticeships for example. Try approaching employers with CSR reputations such as BT |
|---|---|
| Jobs for young people | more manual jobs to engage and train young workers
Jobs for young people
Music, arts, stalls, anything that attracts young people
Something to attract and retain young people with opportunities for training or apprenticeships for example. Try approaching employers with CSR reputations such as BT |
| Not low grade | No more low paid low skilled jobs. |
| Secure jobs | Ponders End needs more secure jobs for people who live in the area
Secure jobs
good quality permanent jobs including trades & IT |
| More jobs of any kind | As long as people do get jobs I do not mind what type of work it is
Any
Any sort of industry that creates jobs is good |
| A variety | A good mix
Mixture as before, small businesses
Yes - A
good mixture of different businesses
Varied jobs, varied shops, varied everything for everyone |
| Focus on tackling unemployment | Employ out of work people to maintain/clean/tidy the area so that locals take pride in Ponders End
Have facilities for childcare so mothers may return to work. |
| Other comments | Studios don't create wealth. They simply take people off the street. Light industrial use, e.g. factory work should be encouraged, and indeed Queensway was a hub of industry in the 1950's and 60's. Whatever happened to "Made in Britain" goods.
I think it would be very beneficial to our community if there were more police officers in the area.
Where is it? More cafes on the high street |
4. Issues or opportunities that we have missed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Brief LITE questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school, more guard… my mum wants me to be safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many children are involved in the Place Shaping process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning the area around Tesco, ie rubbish and shopping trolleys. Also making sure the car park at tesco is not used as a recreation ground and a place for drunks and beggars to hang around, and the benches to be put elsewhere. Tesco and the takeaways should be held responsible for the mess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty pavements, litter everywhere. Don’t worry about a Mosque.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Nags Head Road wider. Houses on the Eagle Close side can be used. The road is not safe for families, children or the elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to get it right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring you maintain Ponders End library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less letting of property, people don’t look after it. if rubbish dumped outside bad for the environment and people who care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in Sedcote Road (Since 1983) yet people are constantly dropping litter and dogs fouling the pavements. Nothing is done to stop this, behind my house and other rubbish is being dumped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponders End is a dump since I lived here 40 years now. Improve Council stock before anything else people will be proud to live here and not treat it like a sink estate`</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The junction at Nags Head Road/High Street needs to be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Allens Rd no entry at High Street End to stop traffic light cut through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More trains to Ponders End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays of good quality art work. Trees and plants where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is being developed where the White Hart pub was? It looks like more flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The shops, mention create jobs for young teens who want weekend work and elderly or mums wanting part time work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area needs to be kept clean, street scene important. Landscaping etc. Traffic needs to be managed effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As before, more priority given to businesses that are different to supermarkets, fast food joints and mini-marts. The High Street is overwhelmed with these! If you are going to have more homes, there must be more parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Lincoln and Southbury Road there are 25 places selling food - cooked/fresh. Variety needed. WHERE HAS THE LIBRARY GONE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road layout in the area is of major importance. Easy flow of traffic is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the shop keepers responsible for keeping the rear of their premises tidy with adequate bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green spaces would be nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve more the small businesses which the council make mistake to give to many opportunity to big supermarket and killing small shops in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know you have a very difficult task ahead. Ponders End has deteriorated so much over the last 10 years or so and I do hope you are able to improve the area for its residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow should be a high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to develop better quality shops. Development of existing Ponders End social club facility. More adult education opportunities, e.g. clubs/societies. I would also welcome a more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
local, rural feel and would not welcome unsympathetic development.

More family units – could be a need for more educational sites.

What has happened to the building next to the co-op chemist - work started, now stopped? Also the old pub next to the Mosque, dreadful.

You should cut a bus lay by into the pavement area - to free up the traffic lanes in the High Rd Southbury Road Station entrance from Enfield Chase

Where is the Roberts Building?

More youth club opportunities, green opportunity garden etc / garden clubs / allotment club

Entrepreneurship? Small businesses?

As far as I can see everything is being considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our Enfield questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More community activities to integrate the cultures, support the elderly + disabled. More community police, on foot/bikes, esp in park (as near here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring young people together – suitable minders and carers (ex-police? Or other capable older person!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Nags Head Road EN3 7AA. Congestion 24/7 Nags Head Road bus lane Nags Head Road replace No.43 to high Street with affordable housing to widened Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You seem to have covered everything well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something 4 kids to Community centre &amp; this can be used for the over 50's too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This scheme must not be focused on one religion or community. It must encourage 1 whole community + sustainable modes of travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More greenery, less housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tin Tabernacle (corregated iron structure) should be restored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking – plenty of it and free!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Parking, if you discourage shoppers, the area will decline very quickly (see 1 above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dull green signage for Ponders End looks ugly. Please make road signs neater and clearer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. High Street Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Comments**

to do a library
Do not waste any money…. Current landlord must improve their own building
More scum and dirty immigrants to spit and trash this area!!
One single building for all the community
Option 2 - green area reflecting Park across road
Option 2 or top end of PE Recreational Ground
Dread a community centre next to St James's Church. No flats/houses on High Street please.
How about a Theatre, similar to Millfield? And maybe a nursing home for elderly residents
Leave it open. No tall buildings.
For safety reasons I don't favour two sites on either side of the High Street
I think housing should be separate from community / commercial. One site for each.
it will be better if there is no residence above
To change Ponders End to a nice looking area and to build interesting places/shopping mall
Community building with NO residential above ONLY, e.g. library, GP practice, hall
No restaurants at all
No preference - but it's a good idea to have a community building on the High Street.
High Street should be for shops
there is a great need for a community hall etc
Forget the café. There is a glut of cafes all along the High Street. Most people on benefits don't have the spare cash for coffee in cafes. Ask the owners of cafes already there.
COMMUNITY CENTRES ARE ALL IMPORTANT - OPEN SWIMMING / PADDLING POOL
Far too many flats being built in them
As long as its away from the High Street; affordable 'social housing'; not enough single flats / large houses for families
Option 1 one doesn't include disabled. Option 2 would need to see plan - has safety - noise, parking taken into consideration
The given design must not be an eyesore - as many new builds in Enfield are.
Car Parking Improved - more use of solar power in buildings
Option 1 + 2 - An estate with shops around and bus garage next to library where books can be returned easily
Please make the building look beautiful, and encourage neighbouring buildings to keep the streets clean.
6. Buildings to be kept

Respondents were asked to identify specifically which buildings they would like to be kept, i.e. those of heritage significance. Some respondents indicated that it was not clear whether this meant the whole building, just the frontage, or both the building and the existing use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tara Kindergarten</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Building</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Annex</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The White Hart</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you consider the balance of opinion regarding each building by subtracting the ‘no’ figures from the ‘yes’ figures, the relative popularity of the buildings appears as follows:
# 7. Public Square

Suggested features of a public square have been broadly grouped into categories for ease of reference based on the trends that came through in responses. In some cases individual responses have been split where more than one suggestion was made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No public square</th>
<th>Nothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We don’t need one, it'll only end up like Tesco car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No it will attract drop outs etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Public Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We do not want a Public Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Concern about attraction anti-social behaviour | No drug dealer, users |
|------------------------------------------------| Until you remove the scummy people there is no point |
|                                                | Do not want a square, it will attract gangs of teenagers after dark |
|                                                | Why have a new public square. The bandstand area in the park is a perfect focus for a community event |
|                                                | What public square? Are you already going to do this? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Arts</th>
<th>Market stalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market like Enfield Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acts similar to Covent Garden piazza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>make it like Covent Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flea market, farmers market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market e.g. Enfield Town, Waltham Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat surfaces no kerbs, any shops, accessible by all including room inside. Market stalls for local talent i.e. jewellery - clothing, handmade post office - chemist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florist - Fashion - Market stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>market, water feature, sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ponders End does not have enough room for a public square. If you have one get local acts like jugglers, etc..... To showcase their talent - make it interesting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seating</th>
<th>Seating for the elderly, it will be vandalised, a waste of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plenty of seats for the elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seating and plants. As much as possible, a limit on noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public seating and landscaping. Well lit area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area to sit and perhaps a nice small café, entertainment in the summer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clean Light</th>
<th>Proper lighting, security, clean and family friendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security / Family Friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secure
I agree with principle! But think that lighting is important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractive landscape</th>
<th>Artwork, statues, flowers - anything to cheer the place up.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Just open space and trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain/monument</td>
<td>Sitting areas, maybe coffee bars. Bit of grass area, monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fountain overlooked by CCTV with seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More flowers, more cleaning on the high street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good quality paving stones / sundial/fountain type feature similar to Park outside Enfield Town library. Seating, good quality benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benches, toilets, evergreen, low maintenance garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fountain, properly maintained trees, flower beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CUT THE CONCRETED PROPOSAL! Benches for people to sit and chat, connect + rest. A fountain in a pond with flower beds + hanging baskets. Grass square + paved walk round. Signposts to key features and areas, rubbish bins, bird feeders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An area with maybe trees and flowers and more sits around them for us to enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everything clean and tidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respected area designed for all, to include cycle provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A clock tower and seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seating &amp; some main central point feature, e.g. fountain, statue - that will celebrate Ponders End Benches, bins, flowers, a well maintained lawn, a piece of sculpture, something about the history of Ponders End, a working clock, an alley of trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More history of Ponders End (Local) (Royal Enfield Rifle) etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes. Make the area more greener with wide open spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation space</th>
<th>Recreational Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafes, terraces</td>
<td>Trees, shrubs, French style cafes, (No Piped music) (?!?!?!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play space</td>
<td>Something usefull for public. Specially young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Meeting Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new well branded shops, bowling, more activities for young teens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean Streets, Ethnic Cuisine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Air cafes, definitely expensive 'public art' council vanity projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Café, seating area, nice shops / patisserie, farmers market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWINGS, SLIDES. A CENTRAL FOUNTAIN + LOTS + LOTS OF SEATS + PICNIC TABLES (LIKE USA + CANADA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to compare the strength of different responses, they have been further grouped and counted. Please note that some people made more than one suggestion – the number counts the number of suggestions rather than the number of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail and culinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market stalls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café, restaurants, coffee bar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, live performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird feeders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green space, plants, flowers, trees, landscaping</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water feature, fountain, pond</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture, art work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument, local history, local heritage, signposts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock tower, sundial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle provisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation spaces, young people's activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family friendly, play equipment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social space, community meeting point</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean, rubbish bins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe, secure, CCTV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit noise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about the level of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not want a public square</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What would you like to see in a new community square?

![Bar chart showing community square features](chart.png)
8. Traffic Hotspots

67 respondents identified one or more traffic hotspots, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotspot</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street (all)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nags Head Road</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbury Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco (including traffic lights on Southbury Road)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carterhatch Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Junctions**                                |        |    |      |
| Southbury Road/High Street/Nags Head Road/Hertford Road Junction | 21  | 31 | 2    |
| Lincoln Road/High Street/South Street/Derby Road Junction        | 12  | 18 | 3    |
| High Street/Garfield Road Junction                      | 4    | 6  | 8    |
| South Street/Church Road Junction                      | 1    | 1.5| 11   |
| Alma Road/Durants Road Junction                       | 1    | 1.5| 11   |
| A10/Southbury Road junction                            | 1    | 1.5| 11   |

| **General**                                  |        |    |      |
| Everywhere                                   | 4      | 6  | 8    |
| At all traffic signals                       | 1      | 1.5| 11   |
| Roadworks (e.g. Lincoln Road/South Street junction) | 1      | 1.5| 11   |
| Around bus lanes                             | 1      | 1.5| 11   |
Where do you think are the worst traffic hotspots in the area?
9. How did you find out about the Central Planning Brief consultation?

In total, 56 people returned questionnaires from the Planning Brief LITE, and 27 returned them from Our Enfield:

Sources of questionnaire responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of questionnaire responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Enfield Magazine (LITE Questionnaire)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary delivered to door</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Council website</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Team</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponders End Newsletter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter distribution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local papers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Planning Brief LITE respondents heard about the consultation

Source:

- Summary delivered to door
- Our Enfield Magazine
- Vision Team Newsletter
- Enfield Council website
- Tesco
- School
- Commuter distribution
- Meetings
- Poster
- Post Office
- Event
- Local papers
- Business Card

%
10. Demographics of Respondents

Please note: this demographic information only applies to respondents to the Planning Brief LITE questionnaire, which is a sample of 56 people. Of the 56 people who returned questionnaires from the Planning Brief LITE, only 6 chose to give no demographic information whatsoever; however responses were patchy, and between 20% and 45% of respondents chose not to provide information in each category.

It is important to note that around 384 people took part in engagement activities which also included returning the Our Enfield questionnaire, commenting online or attending one of 18 workshops held. This demographic breakdown therefore only applies to about 15% of those who engaged with the consultation, and to those that responded to a particular approach. A variety of approaches were taken to tailor the consultation to the particular needs of different demographic groups. For a full analysis of the equality of the consultation which takes this into account, read main consultation report.

**RESIDENCE**

In terms of where respondents come from, 35 of the 57 people who returned questionnaires from the Planning Brief LITE gave their address, of whom 31 gave an address in Ponders End. There were 27 people who responded to the questionnaire in Our Enfield, of whom 19 gave their addresses, and only three of these were from Ponders End.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where Respondents Come From</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ponders End</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Enfield</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Enfield</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENDER**

In terms of gender, 26 questionnaire respondents were male and 17 female. The remaining 15 either left the question blank or indicated that they did not wish to state.
**AGE**

The proportion of 25-44 year olds that returned questionnaires was reflective of the population of the ward as a whole, with a disproportionately low number of under 25s and high number of over 45s participating in this way.

**ETHNIC BACKGROUND**

In terms of ethnicity, Ponders End is extremely diverse (even in comparison with the borough as a whole), with particularly large numbers of Turkish, Somali and Bangladeshi residents. The most substantial ethnic group by some distance is nevertheless White British (33%).
Almost a third of respondents chose not to state their ethnicity, and a number chose to define their ethnicity under different categories to those given, which makes comparison difficult. We can see, however, that the percentage of respondents that identified themselves as White British, English, or White English is similar to the proportion of White British residents in Ponders End, although we must assume a number of those who did not state also fall into this category. We can also see that there are slightly higher numbers of Turkish and Indian respondents.

**DISABILITY**

Of respondents, 7% reported having a disability, with almost a third choosing not to provide this information.
In the 2001 census, 15.3% of Ponders End residents responded positively to the question “Do you have any long-term illness, health problem or disability which limits your daily activities or the work you can do?”. This suggests that the proportion of questionnaire respondents with a disability may have been comparatively lower than in the ward as a whole.

**SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

Almost half of questionnaire respondents chose not to provide information regarding sexual orientation, with two commenting, “Why this question?”, and “What difference does it make?” Attendees at one workshop expressed shock that this was being asked, and while they accepted the explanation as to why, they indicated that this would have prevented them from returning the questionnaire at all. It is also noticeable that while between 2% (Office of National Statistics) and 10% (campaigning group Stonewall) of Enfield residents identify themselves as lesbian, bi-sexual, gay or transexual, no respondent identified themselves as such.

**RELIGION**

Finally, in terms of religion, a similarly large proportion of respondents chose not to respond to this question, and one person commented “We can’t see the point of these personal questions.”

With a significantly higher proportion of people choosing not to state their religion in the Planning Brief consultation than in Ward Profile data, it is not surprising that participation appears lower for
most religions. For the most part trends follow the ward, although there was an absence of Jewish respondents.
APPENDIX C

Workshops, Exhibitions, Events and Meetings
Detailed Notes

CONTENTS

Alma Primary School Year 5 2-5
Alma Road Community Association 6
Bangla Mela 7
Business Forum 8-9
College Court residents 10-11
Creative Ponders End workshop 12-14
Enfield Asian Welfare Association 15-17
Enfield Autumn Show 18-19
Enfield Bangladesh Welfare Association 20-21
Enfield Mencap 22-24
Enfield Vision 25-26
Enfield Women’s Centre 27
Greek and Greek Cypriot Community of Enfield 28-29
High Street (College Court) Exhibition 30-31
Library Exhibition 32
Parks and Open Spaces Strategy Launch 33
Ponders End CAPE Meeting 34
Ponders End High Street (Tesco cut-through) Exhibition 35
Ponders End Youth Centre 36-37
Ruth Winston Centre Open Day 38
Somali Women’s Group - DARMAR 39-40
St Matthews Primary School year 5 41-43
St Matthews Primary School year 6 44-46
Tesco Foyer Exhibition 47-48
Transport Workshop 49-51
Two E Information and Advice 52-56
Vision Team 57-59
Participants
52 year 5 pupils (aged 9-10 years) and 2 staff members.

Activity
In half-class sized groups (12-15 children) looked at presentation of main proposals and discussed as we went along.

Comments
Group 1 (15 children)
High St
It’s a bit Dirty
It’s boring
It feels nice
Want more crossings – zebra or signal crossings.
Make it brighter, better lights.
More colourful.

Queensway
Mixed views on the Tesco car park:
- Some think there’s too much space there and it could be used for houses;
- Others think when it gets busy, especially at certain times of the day and year, you need all the space, or people will have nowhere to park their cars.

Many thought adding another entrance to Tesco would be a good idea

Queensway Campus
People need homes.
Don’t like Roberts buildings, it’s too wide – it should be taller so that it’s more square
Less square shapes, more straight lines.

College Court
Most in the group use the library.
Some thought it might be a problem if you move it from where it is as it would be too far to get to - it would have to be nearby.

Most thought the building is old and it needs a newer, more modern building and that the High Street would be more convenient.

The car park isn’t always busy, but it’s important there is the same number of spaces.
There’s an area of grass that isn’t used for anything – its just blank….put something there.
This would be a good place for an entrance to Campus as the little road is not busy.
What would happen to the current library building if the site was moved?
It would be good to have a place for people to come together and sit

**Historic buildings**
It’s good to keep older buildings but as long as they’re in a good state of repair.

**Alma year 5 – group 2 – (13 children)**
*All from PE except one from Enfield Lock – but she uses Tesco. All very familiar with the area*

**High Street**
A few said they think its quite nice now.
I don’t like the way its set out – there are cars everywhere, it’s confusing where to walk and not very safe
There’s nowhere you can buy clothes, except Tesco, no shoe shops – would like more choice.
Don’t like the take-aways, there are too many so they wont all get the customers - also they make a lot of litter.

**Queensway**
All use Tesco, 2/3 usually drive there, some walk, one takes the bus.
Quasar is popular
People use this as a shortcut into Tesco
Leave Queensway as it is.
Tesco – all thought that the car park is too big, it could be reduced by up to half.
Like the idea of putting new homes on it, very positive.
Other ideas: site for library, arcade, market.

**Campus**
It’s good to have open spaces for everyone and also people to have their own private spaces.
Some buildings should be tall, but not too tall – limiting it to the height of the Broadbent building is good.
We like space to play football and other games outdoors.
It’s good to protect wildlife.

**College Court**
Library – all felt a High St location would be better – easier to find, more people would use it.
Some worried if it moved, people wouldn’t be able to find it – it would need to be really clearly signed and in paper.
Not a popular place for a route through to Campus – its nice and quiet at the moment, would spoil it. Couldn’t think of a better place independently, but liked Beef and Barell suggestion.
At weekends the parking gets busy, its important there is no loss of space.
Like the idea of having a nice open space area where people can sit and eat their lunch with fountains and maybe a paddling pool.

**Alma Year 5, group 3 (12 children)**
*All from PE except 2 from Edmonton. Fairly good knowledge of the local area.*
*All have seen Planning Brief through doors, through school, flats, notices in the Park.*
High Street
Not much choice for shops.
Too many places men go – betting shops, smoky, makes me feel uncomfortable.
It’s alright.
It’s not that nice.
Further down that road (towards South Street) makes me scared - the cars whizz past so fast I’m afraid they’ll knock me down.
Don’t like closed shops.
We need better crossings.
There’s a lot of traffic – it’s always in a jam.

Queensway
It’s good to have jobs there.
All but one think the car park is too big – he though it gets busy at weekends
Most said it would be good to put new homes there, some thought it would be better to use it for more employment space.
Some thought a bit of both. Other suggestions – a swimming pool!

Queensway Campus
Won’t there be plenty of houses?
It’s good for people to have their own gardens.
Make buildings colourful.
Play areas should be included
It’s a good idea to put housing on Middx Uni – some thought 350-450 sounds a lot – but accepted it’s a big area and this is less than some developers might want.

College Court
Library – mixed views, most want it to stay where it is, one-two think a new building on the High Street would be better.
Some thought this would be a good place to put a route - some think Library in the way.
A public square would be good – with flowers and nice paving, play spaces for children.

Alma Year 5 - Group 4, (12 children)
High Street
There are problems with people getting drunk on the streets – needs to be less pubs, or to make sure people are ID-ed – there should be security on the door.
There is a lot of traffic.
The roads aren’t safe – people get knocked down.
There is lots of litter – glass is dropped, not safe – it looks messy.
Most popular proposals – decluttering pavements and improving junctions and crossings.

Queensway
It’s good that this area is used mainly for jobs.
Liked to know there are recording studios.
Tesco – most agree that the car park is too big, happy that there would be new homes there – it would look nicer and it would be convenient for the people living there. One girl concerned about the number of parent / child parking spaces.

Also like the idea of a new entrance to Tesco there.

**Queensway Campus**

If there are buildings with lifts it’s important that they are waiting or that there’s more than 2 because if it breaks people have to climb lots of stairs.

There’s a need for more family housing, some of this group’s parents want to move somewhere big because they’re too crowded – want to have gardens, want to have space to grow flowers etc.

**College Court**

Mixed views on relocating the library - some like it where it is because it’s familiar, most think it would be better on the High St as people would know its there and it’s easier to get to.

The car park gets full – would need to have good parking at a new library.

This is a good place for an access road to Middlesex University, as there’s already a road there.

The idea of a public square is good – it’s nice to have somewhere people can sit and have their lunch.

**Park**

There are too many paths!

Very excited about the Adizone, and that the playground has been repainted.

We like the bandstand.

Pleased with the new path.
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

Alma Road Community Association

17th August 2010

Participants
Approximately 17 residents of the Alma Road estate area.
Chaired by David South.

Activity
Presentation of plans for Ponders End including South Street Campus, Recreation Ground and current Central Planning Brief consultation, including question and answer session.

Comments
Concern was raised that a new road would be put between the tower blocks, and that residents would lose the small park that is there. The group was reassured that improved routes through would not include through road.

The group felt that the space at the bases of the tower blocks is being wasted, they should be invested in and made suitable for use now. Community Aid and the Alma Road Community Association want to use these spaces and feel that they are meeting obstacles. The rent is too high for existing community uses there (i.e. the nursery).

It was acknowledged that parking is really difficult with the current layout in the space between the blocks, and it is important that no parking spaces are lost.

There was concern about the location of the nursery given the anti-social behaviour that is experienced in the area – it is not the best environment for children.

When the area around the tower blocks is reconfigured, it is important that it does not set it up so children are likely to run out into the road – cars travel very fast around this area.

Some were worried that more planting around the blocks would encourage more rats.

One person suggested turfing over the parking in front of Merlin and others so that there is some usable open space.

This area is disconnected from the Park and needs a direct, safe connection.
Participants
Successful event with several hundred visitors during the course of the day, of mixed ethnic origins, and particularly Bangladeshi and Turkish.

Activity
Ran a stand at the event, including lucky dip, giving out balloons, conversations regarding the Planning Brief and promoting participation through verbal comments and completing the questionnaire.

Comments
Edmonton is in desperate need of help – all Council money goes to NW Enfield – Hadley Wood etc. If people want a good quality of life they move out of Edmonton. It has the 4th highest rate of unemployment in the UK.

There is a desperate need for English language teaching in the East of Enfield – especially for mothers. People can't become part of the community without it, or access services. How much money the Council would save by offering language classes and childcare – when translators cost £80/hr ?!

There need to be more activities for young people – in the summer especially there is nothing for them to do, which is why some start to cause trouble. It would be good if there were groups with older people teaching young people new things.

More seating needed for Mums around kids play area in the park.
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

**Business Forum Meeting**

29<sup>th</sup> July 2010

---

**Participants**

15 representatives (owners/managers) of local businesses on or near the Hight Street.

---

**Activity**

Presentation of the Planning Brief, and ‘Q&A’ style discussion with Officers and Ward Members.

---

**Comments**

**Ponders End Central Planning Brief**

**Q:** Parking is a problem on the High Street because there are not enough spaces and some companies use these for commercial needs. Can we consider introducing more parking bays or identify spaces for the companies using existing spaces for commercial uses?

**A:** Where bays are being abused, the best solution would probably be to up the levels of enforcement. Introducing more parking bays / operational times could be looked at.

**Q:** Is there scope for Business Rate reductions when works are being carried out to roads which then deters customers from going to the shops in the High Street?

**A:** Look at the Valuation Office website for advice on this, as that government department is responsible for setting the rates.

**Q:** Why not remove the time restrictions on the High Street parking bays?

**A:** Enfield to look at why these restrictions have been put in place

**Q:** How is the council going to support small businesses?

**A:** The council is working with EBRA on promotional schemes (a business directory and promotional campaign) to encourage people to shop locally across the borough. Details of this will be made available in August.

**Q:** Rents seem to have risen very quickly. Why has this happened because it is damaging for businesses?

**A:** Rents were reviewed in accordance with market demand. Individual cases should be referred to the Council Property Services department.

**Q:** If I have to move my business because of the proposals, will I be compensated?

**A:** We hope we will be able to reach agreement with all affected individuals, and that people will choose, and will have the means to stay. But yes, if an agreement cannot be reached, there are a variety of ways you could be compensated.

**Q:** What happens if we cannot agree with landowners/tenants?

**A:** Compulsory purchase would be an option for the Council but in most cases agreement can be reached.

**Q:** Tara Kindergarten building is shown as retained on the plans. Does that mean that the building or business is retained?

**A:** It means that the building is retained because it is a “character” building.
South Street Campus

Q: Are there plans to improve South Street?

Q: What would be the impact of the Academy and how can businesses prepare for that?

Q: Will there be improvements to the Council owned parade of shops on South Street?

Q: How will Ponders End station be improved?

A: There are early plans to improve South Street within the context of the wider works planned for the new Academy and improvements to the Alma Towers themselves. Enfield is currently reviewing plans to improve the Alma Estate and is awaiting the decision from central Government regarding the Academy. When progress has been made with these two major projects we will hold a Business Forum focusing on the High Street area.

Additional Notes:

Councillor Surgeries: Cllr Ayfer Orhan reminded attendees that ward councillors hold weekly surgeries where members of the public can discuss problems. Every Saturday either Cllr Orhan, Anwar or Taylor will be in the Library between 10.30-11.30.

Enterprise Enfield: provides a range of business support and advice to businesses.

Future of the Group: Members were asked to consider how they would like the Business Forum to develop in future.
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

College Court Residents’ Meeting

11th August 2010

Background
Residents of College Court and the flats above the shops between College Court and Derby Road met with Daisy Johnson and Rachel Smith on Wednesday 11th August by the car park outside the flats. They raised a number of issues which related mainly to the Ponders End Central Planning Brief, currently out for consultation, parking issues, crime/antisocial behaviour and housing.

The comments relating to the Planning Brief will be incorporated into the feedback from the consultation. It was also agreed that a further meeting would be set up involving relevant officers and inviting local Councillors to discuss the concerns that residents have and to seek solutions.

Present
11 Residents of College Court and the High Street (adjacent)
Daisy Johnson
Rachel Smith

Planning Brief
There were concerns that the Planning Brief suggests removing parking. Daisy explained that there should be no loss of parking, it would just be reconfigured to create a nicer public space.

The proposal to improve the area around the Mosque was questioned. There is a desire to improve the setting of the United Reformed Church.

There is a strong worry that creating a public square will increase the serious problems that there already are with anti-social behaviour in College Court – in particular if benches are included in the plans. Residents feel that this will increase the noise and trouble that they already experience.

There was resistance to the routing of a through road across College Court. Two alternative options were presented marked up on plans for consideration. It was suggested that the road should be kept to the north of the car park (away from the flats) and that it should be one-way.

Residents were interested into whether the library was going to move. It was commented that moving library to the High Street would be beneficial and more people would use it, although it was stressed that it will still need parking.

There were concerns about the quantity of secondary school places and affordable pre-school options, particularly if more affordable housing is added in the area.

Some were concerned about the quantity of new flats in the area – 650 are reported to have been added by Southbury station.

Residents were concerned that if more homes were put on part of the Tesco car park they would be right next to an industrial area.

It was suggested that resources would be better invested rejuvenating the High Street, rather than adding new shops (e.g. on Queensway Campus). There are too many take-away food outlets and 24 hour supermarkets already.

Adding access to Queensway Campus from the High Street and near Southbury station would aggravate the traffic congestion that is already a problem.

Crime & Anti-Social behaviour
There are consistent problems with drug use and street drinking on the benches at College Court. There are a number of families with young children living above the shops, and this creates a threatening and unsafe environment. One mother found a needle when out with her children.

It is common to witness people who are drunk or have taken drugs driving to and from the car park. Local drunks often put spirits in fruit juice cans to disguise it and prevent confiscation.

People hang out in the car park and make a great deal of noise late at night. A number of residents work shifts and this is a significant disturbance to them.

Many reported having been verbally abused and/or threatened by people either hanging out or parking inconsiderately. This has included threatening to stab them or to slash their tyres.

Residents reported that CCTV is needed in the area, as there was a rape a few weeks ago (related to Recreation Ground) and a stabbing a few months back.

The container on College Court and walls around the area are used as toilets. This is unpleasant for residents and particularly concerning given the nursery entrance opening on to College Court.

Parking & Traffic

There was some question regarding who owns the car park on College Court. Daisy confirmed that it is owned by the Council.

Residents believed that the land of College Court belonged to the Church, and that the car park used to be an orchard. Because it was arable land, residents reported that dogs have died on account of tetanus and adders.

Residents have tremendous trouble parking their cars. They would like a section of the car park to be dedicated to residents, or for an additional area to be added for residents only by reinforcing the grass to the west of the car park.

Residents wish for the car park to be better maintained, and reported that it used to be cleaned during the night three times a week, but this no longer happens. They would like non-residents to pay to park, which would support additional upkeep costs.

A wall of the car park was knocked down and it took a long time for there to be a response from the Council.

It was reported that the garage uses the car park to leave cars between working on them, which adds additional pressure to the spaces available.

There is no hand rail by the steps from the car park to the path by the United Reformed Church. This is a serious hazard, and a number of people have already suffered falls. Residents said that it is an EU regulation that there should be a rail there for safety.

There is the need for lighting in the car park – it was put in but has never worked since.

The area is very congested – something needs to be done to ease the traffic problems.

Housing & Planning issues

A number of residents complained of noise and smells from takeaway businesses on the High Street. There have been particular problems from the café that has put decking out at the front, which results in noise late at night, and the same business installed a flue which produces odours. Planning Enforcement are currently investigating this matter.

Some flats are suffering from damp, and some have broken windows, which is a serious safety concern as it prevents them from being used as fire escapes.

Residents reported that this area is overcrowded with overflow of people from Hackney and Haringey needing accommodation.

College Court is key locked, residents agree that they need fobs for entry to the block.
Notes of Creative Ponders End Workshop
14th September 2010
6-9pm Ponders End Youth Centre

Attendees:

1. Natasha Graham
2. Emmanuel Ahanonu, Ponders End Community Development Trust
3. Emmanuel, resident
4. John Salmon
5. Martine Drake, Ponders End Community Development Trust
6. Sue Jane O’Keefe, resident
7. Gary, resident
8. Ros West, resident
9. John Marange
10. Lorraine Cox
11. Daisy Johnson

Creative Enfield – How does Ponders End fit in?

Lorraine Cox talked about Creative Enfield, the arts and creativity strategy for Enfield which is about improving venues and increasing the number of venues. She flagged in particular the North London Arts Map. She asked the group to think about how Ponders End could get onto the map as part of London’s cultural offer.

Questions and comments in response to Creative Enfield:

Q: How can we ensure people contribute to this work?
A: We can promote in the PEN, online and speak to people/spread the word. This is a long process not a simple quick decision.

Q: We need to think about the kinds of creative uses that are envisaged in Queensway. Jobs are needed.
A: You can make a good freelance living as a creative person but you have to be a self starter.

Ponders End Strengths:

- There are three recording studios in Ponders End
- There’s lots of art in Ponders End but no venue.
- Ponders End is a village
- Festivals play an important role.

Ponders End Weaknesses and Issues:

- At the moment families with money are leaving the area.
- The A10 is a major divide.
- There is no night life. Pubs are suffering because Mdx Uni closed down.
Transport is a problem. Dalston has taken off because of its links to the City.
Concern about house price increases
We need more places to eat and go out. Look at Broxbourne where there’s a really lively music scene. There’s no live music at the moment.
Ponders End is at a crossroads, there is no reason to stop.
There could be a clash between residential and music venue uses. This needs to be thought through.
There is a need for a building like Howard Hall

What makes some places like Dalston and Brick Lane successful? Has there been research done?

Whilst no one really knows what the tipping points was in Stoke Newington, students and artists are key.

A good example is Coin Street. Artists moved into the area because of cheap rents and will probably stay. Coin Street will probably survive because of the way in which the area has developed. An example of an area that is unlikely to be able to sustain creative industries in the long term is Hoxton where real estate prices are driving artists out.

People go to comedy clubs in Stratford and people go because they have a good reputation.

Opportunities:

Whilst funding is tight and any new ventures would need to be carefully packaged and developed in partnership, a number of ideas came forward:

- **Festivals**: Plan festivals together. How can we tie in with local bands? How about a mini music festival / battle of the bands working with the local young groups? Would need a variety of music types. Opportunity for Arts Council Bid. Street fest - group of people who hold street festivals, take over a car park for a day, skateboards, controlled graffiti etc
- **Develop a venue**: A part bar, part music venue would attract new people with higher incomes to the area. Need community building that looks contemporary and enticing, not a traditional community building.
- **Theatre pubs** are great – is there scope in Ponders End?
- **Live Music**: Look at providing live music on the High Street and propose to the business forum that they work with us.
- **Pop up Gallery**: Instead of window dressing why not use vacant shops as a gallery space?
- **Branding**: Learn from places like Southwold where Adnams has been a huge success and presents an identity for the town. Could Wrights Flour Mill; have the same role in Ponders End?
- **Processes**: Need to loosen up processes at the Council as at the moment pop up shops etc would be difficult to arrange.
- **Public Art**: Create public murals to reflect the local area’s heritage and social history
- **Market**: A pop up market would be great.
- **Mini conference**: as part of wider communications to get people on board, a mini conference would bring people together to plan in a meaningful way.
Immediate Actions:

1. Email address to share ideas (placeshaping@enfield.gov.uk) (Daisy)
2. Scope mini conference and connections to Arts Weeks (Lorraine)
3. Set up online forum (eg Facebook) (Daisy)
4. Scope HLF bid for arts and events (including market) (Lorraine/Daisy)
5. Audit of pubs and venues (Lorraine)
6. Develop ideas to share with the group re gallery space etc (Lorraine/Daisy)
Participants

20 Asian elders at the Enfield Asian Welfare Association's day care session at Wheatsheaf Hall, Bush Hill Park (note: this group was based in Ponders End Youth Centre for many years until a recent change of venue).

Activity

Presentation with images explaining the main elements of the Planning Brief, followed by open group discussion, then small group feedback sessions.

Comments

General
We were in Ponders End for 16 years – we want to see proper facilities there

Community Buildings
Swan Annexe is perfect for a community building – its big, and has good parking, and close to Tesco and other shops.
- Community centres need to be
  - halls of a good size
  - a specific centre for elderly people
  - plenty of parking space
  - on a bus route
  - close to local shops
  - especially space for community transport or similar to load/unload elderly people safely off main road
  - suitable for older people – DDA, no stairs etc
  - Community House is an excellent example – we need something like that in Ponders End
  - This is the most important thing for elderly people
Swan Annexe could be converted into a wonderful hall, which could be sub divided, a flexible space with plenty of parking.

High Street
It is important to make changes to road junctions and pedestrian crossings.
There are very uneven pavements, so they should have even pavements to people can walk properly.
There should be not many take aways on high street, why, because people take take away, eat and throw the packets there only
There should be some small plants and hanging baskets so the place looks decent.
There should be good parking facilities on the High Street.
It is a good idea to make the pavements less cluttered.
There should be less takeaways and more different shops
Some of the trees are too large.
Nice idea to improve the High Street, especially crossings.
People don’t stop in Ponders End – they just pass through.
Parking costs are very high – it’s difficult to park in Ponders End especially for older people.
Build a multi-storey car park!

Queensway
The Tesco parking is too big, it would be best to use the space to have some community halls where elderly people have recreations and enjoy the life. There should be nearby shopping centre public transport links to community hall to make it easier for elderly people to manage.
Get rid of the industrial area – don’t put more homes on Queensway, if flats are being built at Middlesex University, opposite there should be a recreation area, e.g. swimming pool, children’s play area etc.
The car park is too big, but if you are putting homes on the Middlesex University site there would be too many for them to be on Queensway too. The space would be better used for crèche facilities or other shops – but would Tesco allow this?
Tesco car park should not have homes on it – they build homes much too small now, like cages, they are not big enough for human beings to live in! keep open space on the car park, don’t build houses on it. If anything, put a community centre there.

Queensway Campus
Good idea to have new homes, especially family homes. Our idea is to have large sized rooms in new homes and proper facilities for elderly people.
It is okay to add new housing but there need to be recreation facilities to go with it.
The housing should be 60% affordable.
When you build houses there you will need security at night – it’s not safe, there are lots of hooligans
Would like priority for elderly people in new homes on Middlesex Uni site.

College Court
Library should be on high street, so people can see and visit the library when ever they are free.
Plans to make a public square, add an access route to Queensway Campus and move the library are all fine.
Okay to have library on High Street – good for elderly people – much better accessible, especially for people with disabilities

Recreation Ground
The park should be nice. It should have cycle path as well as pedestrian path so people can walk and enjoy the fresh air.
Concerned about shared path – cyclists disturb people walking, it could be dangerous.

**Heritage Buildings**
It is good to improve the settings of the Mosque and Church.
Newer buildings are better than old ones as you can create better spaces and use more of the land for better use.
The nice buildings should be there because they are Victorian buildings.
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

Enfield Autumn Show

4-5th September 2010

Participants

Flagship borough event of the year, the Autumn Show attracts thousands of visitors from Enfield and beyond.

In addition to materials distributed, conversations were held with 35 individuals over the two days, which is the basis of these notes.

Activity

Stall at event with information, displays and an activity/competition to attract involvement, with the opportunity for detailed discussion with Planning and Regeneration Officer responsible for Ponders End.

Comments

We don’t go to the Lee Valley.
I don’t go to Ponders End.
I live in Enfield Wash and visit Ponders End on the bus to use the shops. I quite like it but there needs to be more car parking.

I love the Lee Valley – I went there this week!
I sometimes go to Ponders End to use the bank – I use the Lee Valley, there should be more stuff for kids to do – cycling/cycle hire would be good, there are age limits associated with urban farms – they only suit young kids really. Tree walks or adventure activities would be a good idea.
I’d like a playground in the Lee Valley (girl, aged 5-10 years).

There are problems with kids in the area, because there’s nothing for them to do. Kids have been asking for money. We need a 24 hour concierge. Kids hang out at the entrance to my block (Merlin House). My flat is okay to live in, I use the fire escape to avoid children. The 191 bus has a poor service. You could demolish the tower blocks so that people feel less isolated. There is better transport at Enfield Wash, but Ponders End stations are quite good. (Resident of Merlin House, Pete Charles)

Ponders End is rubbish! Its dirty – we visit to go to Tesco and the GP (Eagle House). It needs cleaning up, and more diverse shops. The ethnic mix in the area is wrong – people feel alienated. We’re very keen on the plans for Colombia Wharf. (Couple from Enfield Highway)

Ponders End and Edmonton are a mess. There is no sense of community, no sense of pride, and a lot of litter, even chicken bones! I commute to London, Ponders End station is grim. They planted some trees in the park, and some died. Finish the path in the park! There is already free bandstand organisation (Edwina) – (Ponders End resident).

The people in Ponders End have changed – there are a lot of young people hanging around now, and they’re noisy. The proposals for the park are very very good. The orchard is good, we like the plans for the park very much. Litter will need to be dealt with – Darren (the gardener) does his best. (Barry & Maureen – residents of Ponders End for 35 years)

If the flats are regenerated then Ponders End might improve. The tower blocks are a visual problem – they are dark, dingy and kids hang around. It is unsafe along South Street at night too – I wouldn’t walk along it. (Former policeman in Ponders End, Enfield Lock resident)
I wouldn’t choose to live in Ponders End because of the crime and drugs. (Female, Enfield Lock resident)

I use the Lee Valley, opposite south island marina, to go fishing – you can catch perch, bream and roach there, as well as mitten crab and Chinese species. There are water voles, adders and grass snakes in the Lee Valley, and have sighted ospreys in the reservoirs - it’s really important that it’s protected. I’m concerned about increasing housing numbers in Ponders End – the area can’t handle more people. The plans for Ponders End are good in one way, but how many flats can we take? Ponders End library had no money spent on it. South Street seems forgotten. Tesco needs to be restricted. (male, Ponders End resident)

Raze Ponders End to the ground and start again! (male, non-resident)

There is not enough diversity of shops in Ponders End – how can they survive? Are they all lawful businesses or is there under the counter trade? I use the Lee Valley at Waltham Abbey or Enfield Lock. (male, Carterhatch)

I like the idea of homes and landscaping on the Middlesex University site, although I’m concerned about the impact on my home. Southbury Station is worse than Edmonton, it’s horrible! The station needs improvements, including lighting. I agree with the concentration of employment uses at Queensway. There should be no shops on the Queensway campus site, although I support community uses situated there. I would hate to see any more than 450 homes on the site. (Resident of Kingsway, backing on to Middlesex University site)

More attention needs to be given to non-retail business. Parking restrictions are too short for businesses that need to hold meetings. (Male and female running software business in Lincoln House)

I don’t like Ponders End much – there’s not enough green space, it looks neglected and dirty, not a place to visit.

My main interests in Ponders End are the retail offer, what is available for older people and making sure that there are enough school places – that is, the right social infrastructure for the area. The lack of a police station is a problem – the nearest is in Edmonton Green. (Resident of Enfield Highway)

I used to walk down from Galliard Road/Southbury Road to the water – it was a country walk, with little shops, like tackle shops, it was like another world.

We would like there to be an entrance at the east of the Park – as soon as the fence is repaired people take bits out. We didn’t know about the academy until the Place Shaping consultation, and we’re aware of plans for a Pupil Referral Unit. (Couple and child, resident of Ponders End east of Park)

Where is the library on the Masterplan layout? It’s important for the area, but seems to be missing.

I saw posters in the Post Office and the Library, but haven’t received information directly. The Pondercabin was only open for a few weeks – it’s difficult for people who work to be involved.
Participants
15 Bengali women and 1 male worker at weekly lunchtime club (some left part way through to collect children from school).

Activity
Interactive presentation and open discussion with group members.

Comments

High Street
Very noisy and full of traffic – on Nags Head Road my house shakes with traffic. So many police sirens. I feel fed up and want to move.
Lots of people’s gardens are fly tipped, and a lot of rats.
Southbury Road is very busy, what improvements will there be to Lincoln Road?
Agree that there should be less take-aways – that’s why there’s so much clutter

Queensway
Local people don’t have enough job opportunities – it’s good to keep industrial use.
It’s true that Tesco car park is too big (one person).
No, we need the car park, put a multi storey on this space if anything (several others).
Very keen to add entrance for Tesco from Queensway.

Queensway Campus
People need jobs and industry, not more houses.
Fill vacant houses before you build new ones.
Ponders End is overcrowded already.
This will make transport problems worse.
Can’t you make it into a Park for the community?
Enfield Town park is huge, why not put more flats there instead ?!
Open Spaces are very important.
Agree with limiting height of buildings to Broadbent.

Library
Library is for studying, it should be in a quiet place – nothing wrong with current library (one person).
Just sound proof the new building! I didn’t know the library was there, it would be better on the High Street (several others).

**College Court**
Access Rd for Queensway Campus will be okay in College Court
Public Square is fine.

**Park**
It is good to add a path, we are happy.
Why would a path get in the way of events if it’s flat?
I want to leave the park as it is.
Participants
8 Service Users and 5 staff members at Mencap day group for adults with learning disabilities.

Activity
Talked about plans for Ponders End and members of the group said what they think.

Comments
General
Are there any places planned especially for people with learning disabilities?
It’s important that there are automatic doors on new buildings.
We’d like a proper college that caters for people with learning disabilities. Enfield College used to do some activities but not now.
There’s a lack of things for us to do – here is a list of activities that we would enjoy:

- Cycling
- Making cake
- Swimming
- Cinema
- Internet
- Climbing
- Library
- Tennis
- Badminton (indoor)
- Football
- Yoga
- Exercise
- Textiles
- Gym (with instructor)
- Dancing
- Drama
- Working with animals
- Basketball
- Cooking
- Working in community house
High Street
So busy round here – traffic, road works, it's not safe.
Need more crossings.
Get rats round there.
Agree it needs brightening up.
So filthy.
Need Police Station.
We would like some more shops.
Move the Post Office (or add a new one) – it's too far down the High Street.

Tesco
The car park needs more disabled bays
The car park is too big – make it easier for cars to get in and room for minibuses to get in.

Queensway Campus
Good to have bigger homes for families – we all live with our families.
Need plenty of wheelchair space.

Library
Would like the library on the High Street.
We use the Library to get books, go on computer.
Have lifts if there are 2 floors.

College Court
All like the idea of a new public square.
Needs to be cleaned – have more dustmen.
More benches and a fountain

Heritage buildings
Some buildings in the area are nice:
  • Tara Kindergarten (4)
  • Goat (3)
  • White Hart (3)
  • Broadbent (1)
  • Swan Annex (1)
One person said she doesn't like the Broadbent Building or the White Hart.

Park
It's important that the path is good for people in wheelchairs.
Need proper toilets in the Park, especially disabled.
Café in park would draw more people in, would be good.
The park is nice, we like the Adizone.
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

Enfield Vision

6th September 2010

Participants

17 group members (13 female, 4 male) and 2 volunteers
Chaired by Diane De Jersey (Enfield Vision Chair)

Activity

Verbal presentation at group’s monthly meeting of main plans as contained in Planning Brief LITE, with questions and discussion following each section.

Comments

The area is run-down and needs improving.

High Street

There are too many posts for signs on the High Street at the moment, and they are put in the narrowest places.
There are too many take-aways – we don’t need any more!
Hanging baskets are too low – one group member is 6’ 6” and he keeps hitting his head on them. This can also be a problem with trees, when branches are left too low.
It is important that benches go down to the ground, as otherwise they are a hazard to people using a cane – furniture needs to be carefully designed.
It is difficult to navigate the High Street – we need nice clear lines to walk in, preferably marked by a line of tactile paving, like at the station.
Road safety is a big problem – at many crossings e.g. near the chemist/Barclays, tactiles are worn down, railings have been taken away and/or there is no bleeper. These are all essential safety features for people with visual impairments.
The junction of Queensway and the High Street is particularly dangerous to cross with the slip road on the High Street and no clear route.
It is important to maintain white lines on steps to aid the visually impaired – often these are left to wear away.
Fly-tipping needs tackling.

We would prefer not to have to go to Enfield Town for shops – but we need a wider range of shops locally to make that possible. We would prefer to have lots of small local shops, as in order to do one big shop you need to have a car. The sorts of shops we need are:

- Butchers
- Fishmongers
- Green grocers
• Shoe shops
• Clothes shops
• Florists
• Bakers

Initiatives to encourage desirable shops to come to Ponders End such as lower rents should be considered.

The lack of a police station is “a disgrace”/

Queensway

Opposed to removal of Tesco car parking – parking is needed in Ponders End, where else are the cars going to go? It’s already hard to get in to Tesco at times.

There’s nowhere else to do a full shop in Ponders End. There is a language barrier that prevents people with visual impairments using many of the shops in Ponders End, as they are reliant on advice from staff.

Although we don’t drive cars, we are reliant on people who do, and need to be able to park near the shops we use.

Queensway Campus

Concerned about issues of overcrowding.

Worried about there being enough school places (particularly primary), doctors and other services to support the increased population.

One well-equipped community centre would be better than two poorly-equipped centres.

With 0.75 parking spaces, they won’t be family homes! In practice families often have 2 or more vehicles. If this kind of approach will ever be viable it will rely on a much improved public transport system, which is cheaper, less crowded and more efficient.

College Court

Big wide spaces look nice but are difficult for blind people to navigate – they need things to hold and follow.

Is College Court big enough for a public square?

Don’t attempt to put shared spaces in! It is incredibly dangerous for blind and disabled people, and for children – it relies on having eye contact with drivers.

Kensington and Chelsea have been taken to court by the RNIB over this issue. We would not dare to go out – there must be delineation between traffic and people. Many people have deteriorating sight, which makes these systems increasingly dangerous.

Ponders End Park

When trees are not cut back they cause obstructions – they need to be planted so that they do not overhang paths.
Enfield Women’s Centre Consultation – 10th Aug 2010

Venue:
Enfield Women’s Centre, 31a Derby Road, Ponders End

Present:
Women’s Centre: Three representatives of EWC
Enfield Council Daisy Johnson, Joanna Lyons

- Queensway Campus site
  - Concern over density of housing on the site
  - Courtyard design – gardens may suffer problems of light
  - Foxes currently inhabiting the site
- Vincent house
  - Negative responses on its role as a community centre
  - “Don’t want a duplicate this mistake”
- Glyn Road Carpark
  - Car park nearby well used and parking an issue in the area
  - Don’t remove any more spaces
- Mixed use with industrial – positive responses
- Cafes in area already struggling in area from closure of the uni so introduction of more would make them struggle further
- Tesco car park – dual access at both ends would ease congestion
- Community want more schools and community facilities with existing population
- White Hart – rumours to be a drive through McDonald’s
- Swan Annex
  - Character of the building makes it worth keeping
  - Could be a good place for community market
  - Women’s Centre would be interested in moving to Swan Annex as one of a number of organisations working in partnership
- Traffic calming near recreation ground
  - Traffic islands act well to slow traffic in current position and moving them could impact upon this
- Enfield Women’s centre - Requirements
  - Right of way alongside the existing centre
  - Need more space, want to deliver same service in better accommodation
  - Ofstead inspector (2007) gave them an “outstanding”
  - For any new facility/accommodation they will require
    - Separate entrance
    - Self containment due to the nature of services
    - Concerns over a mixed gender building
    - Happy to work in partnership in Swan Annex
  - Already using other spaces for services as not enough space
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

Greek and Greek Cypriot Community of Enfield

21st September 2010

Participants
14 adult staff and members of the Greek and Greek Cypriot Community of Enfield.

Activity
Presentation of main Planning Brief proposals with integrated discussion of views.

Comments

High Street
Since Tesco was built, traffic has been horrendous in the area.
It is impossible to cross the road at Lincoln Road, and by Netto, this is particularly dangerous for pensioners.
There need to be more crossings.
Traffic queues at Tesco car park are awful.
Second hand shops spill onto the pavement – it looks horrible.
Pavements are too narrow.
Would be nice to have more outdoor eating, as long as it doesn’t encroach on the pavement.
Needs to be brightened up – shops need to modernise.
Take-away rubbish is everywhere – there should be less takeaways, and perhaps also more bins available near to the shops.
Gangs of young people congregate – congregation of people outside shops and can seem intimidating. They are attracted by the take-aways.

Queensway
Junction of Queensway/Hertford Road needs a crossing – my Father was knocked down there in 2009 on Queensway.
It would be a good idea to add an entrance to Tesco on Queensway, although this may aggravate traffic on Hertford Road.
What about a crèche or play area for children at Tesco?
Keep the car park at Tesco – there are enough homes already!

Queensway Campus
If you start building high rise, its not going to work, you’re building another estate.
Anymore than 3 floors is too high.
Where are all these people going to go? If half of these people have a car the congestion will be horrendous.

Priority in allocating new homes should be given to older people, who have been in the area a long time and wanted homes all their lives - homes should go to the local community.

**College Court**

It is a shame to create another junction on Hertford Road to make access to the Queensway Campus – careful not to create a rat-run.

College Court is a pleasant, quiet area, putting an entrance to Queensway Campus there will spoil it – access by the former Beef & Barrel pub is a good potential alternative.

Worried about kids playing outside College Court – cars may knock them down.

College Court is a nice place for the library – it’s quiet.

Why not use the Broadbent building as a library?

A public square creates more room for ASB

Concern about licensing and the sale of alcohol in the area.

It would be nice to have an allotment summer market for local produce.

**Heritage buildings**

Needs a clean up, it’s too cluttered on the pavements around Swan annex and the library.

The Mosque needs a car park – it’s packed on Fridays and they have nowhere to go.

We agree with improving the setting around the United Reformed Church and Mosque – it’s nice to have religious buildings if they are kept nicely.

**Park**

Concerned that older people/dogs running will conflict with cyclists on a shared path.

Will older people be intimidated by young people on bikes?
Participants
Approximately 40 passers-by of a broad range of nationalities and ages (in some cases limited English)

Activity
Outdoor exhibition distributing Planning Brief ‘LITE’ documents and inviting discussions with individuals.

Comments
I work as a street cleaner 1pm-9pm in Ponders End. I need support because I can’t clean quickly enough. The businesses are the worst offenders. There needs to be a campaign to promote keeping Ponders End tidy.

I am worried about the new access proposed to Queensway Campus – it’s important that it’s not an alleyway as there are a lot of druggies in the area already and it will attract them. If it was a more open route, with a path and grassed space alongside (like the front of College Court), that would be all right. (Derby Road resident)

Local jobs should be a big priority - I’m finding it hard to find work in the area after leaving jail last year – it’s hard to get back into society.

“It’s good isn’t it, all this you’re doing – the area looks old and untidy. This will make it much better”.

This area needs improving! Developing Middlesex University will be good for the area. More schools are needed.

Middlesex University should be housing for people who are homeless, especially those who were born here!

Daisy Johnson also took the opportunity to drop into the shops in the block most affected by the Planning Brief proposals (188-196 High Street). The outcome of that visit is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comments/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Ali – very supportive. Thinks it will be great for the area. Maybe he will have the opportunity to use one of the new units, or maybe not. He completely understands why we want to make the change though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Left a copy of the plans with a woman who was not the shop owner but was in charge at the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Hairdressers shutters down – 6.10pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internet café – Mr Ali – “I already have one. I will respond”

Millenium Café. Mr Ali. “I have one and I will respond”
## Participants
12 parents at ‘Space Kids’ holiday activity session, and adult visitors to the library.

## Activity
Conversation with parents and visitors explaining what the Planning Brief is and why it's important, distributing summaries, answering questions, distributing balloons.

## Comments
The population has changed on Nightingale Road in recent years – there is more crime now.

We need more jobs in the local area.

South Street is quite narrow – traffic is bad.

There are lots of Turkish minimarkets

I mainly shop at Tesco and Sainsburys, I only use the High Street shops if I've forgotten something.

Library is good being off the main road. It is better for older people because it is closer to bus routes.
Participants
Twelve visitors to event organised in Pymmes Park, some Ponders End residents and others from surrounding areas of Enfield.

Activity
Stall with balloons, lucky dip, information and the opportunity for discussion.

Comments
There are too many businesses with goods taking up space on the pavement in Ponders End High Street.
There's nothing going on in Freezy Water – what about activities or improvements in our parks?
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

CAPE Meeting

29th July 2010

Participants
Members of the Ponders End CAPE panel, including residents, representatives of community organisations, Police, Enfield Homes and Housing Associations – approximately 10.

Activity
Brief explanation of what the Planning Brief is and how to respond, and distribution of ‘LITE’ documents, followed by short discussion.

Comments
Whatever happens on the Queensway Campus site, you must think about parking – it’s a real issue on the High Street. It’s a fallacy that people won’t use their cars.

What about introducing a free 30 minute parking ticket from machines to encourage using local shops?

People won’t use the shops because it’s all take-aways.

If we could get the traffic right now, before introducing all of this new stuff, people would have the belief that it will improve the area.
## Participants

Approximately 90 people, mainly visiting Tesco or other shops, or waiting for buses.

## Activity

Distributing business cards and explaining what the consultation is about, some brief discussions with people using the High Street.

## Comments

We need more police on the streets, there are lots of fights and incidents. Something needs to be done.

There is lots of begging in the area.

Jobs for undergraduates and recent graduates is an urgent need - I’m at university and I can’t find a job, and I’m worried that I won’t when I graduate either.

The plans for the area are good, especially for green spaces.

The improvements to the park are good but there needs to be more to keep people occupied – tennis court / pieces of gym equipment are not enough – when it gets hot, fights break out.

What’s happening with the former Beef and Barrel pub?
Participants

Six members of the Youth Centre’s members’ panel, aged 13 – 17 years, five female and one male.

Activity

Presentation and group discussion

Comments

High Street
There are a lot of prostitutes on the High Street.
There are too many supermarkets and chicken shops.
There needs to be more diversity of foods available to buy, like salads and healthier foods.
There are too many beggars.
People come out of pubs drunk and cause trouble.
Even the pavement out – we need a better walkway, like Enfield Town.
Mosque’s very busy – it needs more space as people overflow onto the pavements and it is crowded.
Clean the High Street up – it stinks.
We need more shops, we’d like to see:
  • Primark
  • Armani
  • A shopping centre

Queensway
Mixed views on Tesco car park – some think it’s too big, others say the space is needed and shouldn’t be lost.
Why do you need more houses?
No one parks at the bit near Quasar.
There is a need for more stuff to do.
Make it a public car park.
Queensway Campus
Public transport not good enough to make people use it, it needs to be improved a lot before people will go without a car. As things are, people need cars, so 0.75 parking spaces per unit is not enough.

College Court
People don’t use libraries much.
I go to Edmonton because it has better books on things I’m interested in, like Black History.
Internet access is the only good thing.

Historic buildings
Buildings that have a purpose should be kept, they shouldn’t be kept just for the sake of it.

Other Comments
We should have market like Enfield town but not on schooldays as it’s too crowded around the bus stops, there are crowds of school children.
Participants
Volunteers, staff, trustees, users of and visitors to the Ruth Winston Centre’s open day

Activity
Provided information and had one-to-one discussions with approximately 10 older people.

Comments
It’s a good idea to improve access to Southbury Station. The plan looks really good! The Park is being used more for festivals now, which is really good as there’s lots of space there.

It’s really important that you are specific about the design schemes that are acceptable so that it keeps the local character and you don’t get generic monstrosities like the corner of Green Lanes at Palmers Green. You need to give planners detailed guidance to ensure appropriate design is allowed. This is particularly relevant to shop frontages, which can be made to be of uniform character, which substantially improves the look of the area.
Participants
Two representatives of DARMAR (based in Edmonton), one is a Ponders End resident with extensive networks amongst the local Somali community.

Activity
Informal discussion of plans in one lady’s home.

Comments

General
Big problem with pirate landlords – they won’t do repairs
Our children have no culture – they are neither Somali nor English – work needs to be done in schools to bridge the divide and make children familiar with both cultures, so that they don’t become restless and badly behaved later on.

High Street
There are too many take-aways, especially chicken shops, which causes litter – they don’t sell healthy food either.
It is messy on the pavements.
The Post Office is not big enough – there is often a queue there, there is only space for separate Post Office and shop.

Queensway
Approve of creative suggestions.
We are looking for somewhere to do fitness for women – our own exercise place in Ponders End – there is a real lack of suitable venue or affordable activities.
We agree that the Tesco car park is too big.
Everywhere is homes, adding more on Tesco site would make it more crowded – more employment and things to do would be better.

Campus
350 homes is enough.
At least 4 bedroom homes (preferably 5 bedrooms, with 2 toilets) would be suitable for families – we have large families in our community with 5, 6 or 7 children. Rooms need to be a decent size - often one bedroom in a house is too small, even for a bed to fit in.
People who live in Ponders End should get priority for new affordable homes.
It is good to have private play space outdoors for children e.g. gardens.
It is good that the Broadbent building is the tallest on the site.
Small local shops should be incorporated into the development.

**College Court**
The library is hidden away, people don’t know where it is. Things like library, bank, PO, should have big, attractive frontage and prominent locations.

You could create a big space there – a nice space with flowers, open space, seats to enjoy the surroundings. This could be a quiet, less busy space – everywhere else is shops.

This area is never clean!

Where you are changing the car park at College Court, it will make the church more attractive

**Heritage buildings**
It is important to keep heritage like Swan Annexe

**Park**
We like this park a lot – it’s much cleaner than before, and the Adizone is used all the time.

**Community Facilities**
If you have one space for communities, you can get all the information you need in one place – it is good to group community uses together.

If new community facilities include a hall, you can make money too.
Office space for community groups would be useful.
There is a desperate need girls/women only sport and exercise for women only.
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

St Matthew's Primary School – Year 5

21st September 2010

Participants
29 year five children (aged 9-10 years) and two staff members.

Activity
Presentation of Planning Brief proposals and discussion.

Comments
High Street
Things we like at the moment:
  • Gregs
  • Where Tesco is – the food you buy
  • Chicken and chips
  • Quasar
  • Dentist
  • The escalator in Tesco
  • KFC
Things we don't like at the moment:
  • Traffic lights – it takes so long to get anywhere on the bus.
  • When cars can't turn right until the traffic has finished coming – it holds things up.
  • The school shop
  • There are lots of cars and they don't stop.
  • The pollution – it gets smelly.

I like the ideas for the High Street.
These are really good ideas – but why do you have to pay for parking?
You should get the first 15 minutes free so that you can nip into the shops.
There should be more litter enforcement – a camera on the wall or something to catch people.
There are too many lamp posts and other obstacles on the pavement – it's too cluttered.
Why are there so many chicken and chips shops? They cause litter. Most agree there are too many.
Some think that chicken and chips shops are popular so there’s demand for them – but they should be more spread out, rather than being grouped together.

Queensway

There were mixed views on the Tesco car park site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is too big</th>
<th>Leave it as it is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are loads of spaces, even at the weekends, you could put something else there.</td>
<td>Tesco is a popular shop – when it’s busy a lot of people drive there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a waste of space – you could put something else there so that you could go to both things at the same time.</td>
<td>It’s busy at weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is not enough parking elsewhere to take it away here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There need to be more family spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Chirstmas and Easter you can hardly get in there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The car park should be limited to only people who shop at Tesco.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the car park space was used for something else, it could be:

- Another entrance from Queensway to the store;
- A park or bike ramp or cycling route;
- Space for a taxi rank – it can be hard for them to stop;
- A park for little children;
- Motorbike parking – they park in spaces that are meant for cars and need their own space.

Queensway Campus

The ideas for the new houses are really good.

If you join gardens together there will be a big space where all families can play together.

I agree with the plans – and there should also be a nursery.

There should be some bungalows for people who can’t use stairs.

It’s alright to have some taller buildings to fit more flats in.

There will need to be more schools for all these families.

People in poor quality housing or who are living in too small a space for their families should be the first to get new homes.

Even though some houses are small, they are expensive and people can’t afford them.

There should be suitable homes for older/retired people, with the right equipment e.g. chair lifts.
College Court

There were mixed views on relocating the library:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave it where it is</th>
<th>New library on the High Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You shouldn’t move the library, put more signs so people know where it is instead.</td>
<td>They should move it because it’s quite hidden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the library is on the High Street it would be too noisy.</td>
<td>It would be easier to see it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the road to the library straighter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea of the public square is a good one – somewhere for people to rest. People could do business in a public square, like a market or stalls. It’s right to renew the area around College Court – not a lot of people know the library and nursery are there.
Participants
30 year six children (aged 10-11 years) and two staff members.

Activity
Presentation of Planning Brief proposals and discussion.

Comments
High Street
Things we like at the moment:
• Loads of shops
• Places to eat
• Easy to get trains
• Places to sit if my leg aches
• Library

Things we don’t like at the moment:
• Rubbish on the floor
• Dogs off the lead – this makes us feel scared
• Bird poo on benches
• Rubbish thrown on ground
• People smoking – it’s unhealthy
• Crowded
• Hard to cross the road
• Gangs hanging around
• Buses full on school days
• Dog poo – owners don’t clear it up

It’s good to improve traffic and crossings – on zebra crossings cars don’t always stop when they should.

It’s a good idea to change the way you cross the road – at the moment the crossing is at the bus stop and you can’t see if anything’s coming past the buses.

There’s a lot of stuff on the pavement that doesn’t need to be there.

Sometimes paint comes off signs and they get graffiti.

Dog bins are overflowing.
There were mixed views on take-aways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are too many</th>
<th>We’d like to keep the take-aways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because the food is not good for you</td>
<td>Everyone lives in a different area and you need one close to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut it down because it makes you really fat</td>
<td>If you have nothing in the house its convenient to get take-away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s already enough – there would be more space for other shops if there weren’t so many.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Queensway**

There were mixed views on the Tesco car park:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is too big</th>
<th>Leave it as it is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more people to walk.</td>
<td>Car park space is needed – loads of people go to Tesco because its 24 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are always spaces round the back – not a lot of people use the section of the car park by Queensway.</td>
<td>People take cars to do a big weekly shop – its heavy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If we only had less car park and it was full, would have to go somewhere else and there’s not a lot of alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternative suggestions to housing on the Tesco car park were discussed:

- A new entrance would be good – a quicker way to get in.
- Southbury Road entrance is controlled by traffic lights which is slow – if an entrance was added at Queensway you could just drive in.
- It would be useful if there was somewhere to pull in and use takeaways.
- It sometimes takes ½ hour to get in and out of Tesco because of congestion getting into the car park!

**Queensway Campus**

The company’s logo should go on the new development so we know who did it – if something ‘s wrong with it you know who to tell.

The new area should be maintained, e.g. cleaning graffiti.

There should be a good cleaner in flats to make sure shared areas are nice.

Make sure its stable – good quality building.

Homes should be big enough for a bigger family, even if that means having less flats.

4 bedrooms is a good family size, not 2 or 3 – it’s important for families to have space.

It is important to have ramps for people with wheelchairs.

We don’t want there to be too many car parking spaces – families may have 1-2 cars, but they don’t need space for more than that.
Houses must have good emergency exits.
Homes for people in wheelchairs may need chair lifts if there are stairs.
Make sure that there are good lifts in flats – at busy times they get full, and the lifts are always breaking in our flats.
350-450 doesn’t sound like too many homes.

**College Court**
You could have trees and other nature in the public square – some benches and shade.
You don’t have to pay for the parking in College Court at the moment – if you move the spaces it should still be free to park in them.
It’s a good idea to have some parking especially for residents in College Court, so they can get a permit.

**Park**
It would be good to have a pond for ducks in the park.
There are no nets in the football goals – makes it difficult to use them.
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

TESCO Foyer Exhibition

27th July 2010

Participants

Approximately 170 Tesco shoppers during a 3.5 hour period.

Activity

Stand distributing balloons, copies of the Planning Brief LITE and/or business cards distributed with explanation, discussions with individuals.

Comments

General

We need more things for 12-18 year olds to do.

Great consultation! The new coalition wants us to engage but it’s hard to do so because information’s not accessible. People need to stop being apathetic and what you’re doing helps them.

Teenagers need things to do – for example trampolening stops at 12 years. There is lots of stuff to do in the summer holidays, but not much year round.

Put some donkeys around the place, that will give people something to look at!

Ponders End could be improved by an outdoor swimming pool.

Blow it up!

What’s happening with Alma Towers? They should be pulled down!

Make sure developers contribute to improving the area!

Does Enfield have any plans for the 2012 Olympics? This could attract funding, e.g. Broxbourne/John Warner.

High Street

The High Street needs a lift – it looks very drab. It would be better if the look of the shops was standardised. I love being in a multi-cultural area, but it should reflect English culture as well. Shops should look the same and be smartened up, it aggravates tension between cultures if people don’t feel at home.

Can we resist take-aways and fast food shops? There is too much litter.

The Goat pub was going to be closed, I’ve been brought in to turn it around (Deputy Manager). It’s going well – different groups are coming in for lunch, dinner etc.

No more takeaways!

There are too many bookies.

There needs to be enough parking for the shops.
Queensway
There need to be more jobs on Queensway, not housing.

Community Facilities
There aren’t enough community halls for hire, and they’re too expensive.

Park
I really like the plans for the orchard, jogging track and the Avenue in the Recreation Ground.
The Adizone needs maintaining – the gym equipment gets stuck.
Concerned that leaving the park open at night might attract anti-social behaviour.

Transport
The area around Ponders End Station is unsafe.
What will happen about traffic? It’s awful, especially around South Street – the bus routes will never cope with the new school either.

Services
There are not enough schools. There needs to be infrastructure to support new housing.
There are enough GPs already, we don’t need another surgery.
Ponders End Central Planning Brief - Transport Workshop – 7th September 2010, Ponders End Youth Centre

Attendees – Barrie Sheppard (Halcrow), John Lawrence, David Taylor, Terry Guy, Neil Cameron, Martin Stock, Steve Jaggard, Margaret, Andrea, Ros, Liz, Daisy, Rachel

JL - concern that ‘B’ – decluttering – should apply to the whole High Street, not just the section highlighted

NC – Public realm improvements:
• Improve footfall
• Safer
• Our space – where we spend time

Declutter – remove unnecessary street furniture, align
What is needed
• Improve crossings – stop roads being barriers to people
• Main constraint – junctions slow traffic a bit at crossing points

MG – Traffic already going at 1mph – when its not busy, speeding better
Repainting road markings needed, e.g. at junction near Goat.
Friend killed at Nags Head Rd ages ago

BS – controlled crossing points at the right location better than lots of uncontrolled ones

NC – Outside Rec – need to make pedestrian space as nice as possible, coming at that point

MG/H/Ros – always flooded where the island is!

NC – Need to change driver attitude through changing materials and the look of the area – they will act differently if it seems more pedestrian orientated – e.g. market towns, shared space with other users.
Need connections into new development site so it doesn’t become segregated.

Mrs Crossman – not much space at College Court unless you move the library – the road would need to be widened on library/nursery side. Maybe better as cycle and pedestrian.

Mr Crossman – vehicular access at Beef & Barrell

Barrie
• Wider issues – Carterhatch Road -> Nightingale Road – pinch in Ponders End linked with wider picture

• Traffic flows – patterns at peak/off peak not much difference ! Just direction
• Accident records are 5 years
• Bus patronage – limited date
• Pedestrian environment – footways etc.

Identified items outside this area that impact on Ponders End.

Uncontrolled crossing points = zebra / island – cause increased delays – signal crossings at night maintain better flow

Nags head Road – problems caused by how its used, buses use stops if more than one, a real problem
Tesco junction doesn’t work well with signals at Nags Head Road.
Problems at Nightingale Road causes queue in both directions including at South Street

Cluster of accidents at Nags Head / South Street / Nightingale

Pedestrian environment – only major problems at South Street – informal crossings and narrow pavements

Solutions being engineered along the corridor

MG – as a driver, PE is really hard to get around

South Street – bottleneck constriction at the corridor, competing directions

South Street Ladies – VERY dangerous to cars at South Street, especially if a secondary school is coming in.

Barrie – pull people away from South Street Junction

S.S. Ladies – at Nightingale Road, lights lead off from A406 to Tottenham to M25 – problems in any of these places lead to issues at Ponders End. Kingsway was made one-way, good for people who live there BUT makes traffic worse on High Street – no alternative

John Lawrence – any way of discouraging heavy goods vehicles? Nags Head only crossing of Lea from Edmonton to M25! PE used as a shortcut.

Barrie – Plans to improve signal timings to make East-West flow on Nags Head Road better, more attractive option, but yes, rat-running is a problem.

SSL – Deliveries at night to supermarkets etc

MG – 1000 homes built, 0.75 car spaces, if a few of them have cars will make things worse.

SS- shops dying because too hard for people to stop because its so busy
Can’t there be some cheap interventions that are more short term to help people – you’re talking long term – show change happening e.g. 10/20 mins free parking – something in the meantime. If you do something now, people will get with this.

SSC – what is the timescale on this?
DJ – Middx University – couple to 4 years for development. Need that to happen as High Street is suffering. Risk that they’ll shelve it.

SSC – Need to give businesses something to stay for in the meantime, agree with MG.

DJ – Yes, also work with focus forum.

Mrs Crossman – people need to be aware

MG – Changing a problem

Public Transport

- Are more frequent trains warranted? Public transport is really good! We have 2 railway lines with good, regular services.

Brick wall flooding
- Scotland Green Road – wall side of SSC
- South Street outside shops
- At junction of Lincoln Road / High Street on Derby Rd side, opposite pub – no drain
  Quick win – contact Highways

Bus – PE well served – can get anywhere locally.
- improving train services from Southbury
- Bush Hill Park residents association trying to get 10 min service Town -> Edmonton, and Seven Sisters. BUT National Express plans focus on routes North to Cambridge etc.

SJ – Franchise was going back BUT government asked them to keep it.
- difficult to balance long distance trains and local services, need to leave appropriate gaps.

Decluttering – worst part at White Hart, worse now that its fenced off.
LSJ footway to narrow – L Bus stop shelters needed
Buses line up (279/491) opposite White Hart to change driver – causes a tail back towards Eagle, surgery.

SJ

Buses on South Street catch each other up and run in pairs.
Participants
Eight young people aged 15-20 years, 7 male and 1 female – all seeking employment or related advice.

Activity
Set up a stand during afternoon drop-in session, and invited young people attending to take part in a brief interview to say what they think of plans for Ponders End, with a prize draw of £10 iTunes vouchers.

Comments

Chakadi, 19
High Street
“Looks really dry and dull”
All chicken and chip shops, fridge shops, there’s not really much here. There’s no Iceland or Boots, which would be useful.
I agree there are too many takeaways.

Queensway
“looks abandoned”
Likes idea of more creative activities.
Tesco Car Park is definitely too big, should put more homes there.

Queensway Campus
“definitely need more houses, wherever they can put them they should”

College Court
Good place for access to Middlesex Uni – they need a way to get through.
Pleased to see religious buildings improved – “my Gran goes to that Church”.
Library is hidden away – it needs to move.

Buildings
Good to keep buildings that have some character – although none of them are all that nice!

Valentino, 15
High Street
I like the suggestion of improving the road junctions – that’s important.
I like the takeaways!

Queensway
There should be more employment space – car park is too big

Queensway Campus
Good to have wheelchair access.
Agree with need for new homes.

College Court
The ideas are all good.
Library needs to be more prominent.

Buildings
Good to improve settings of church / mosque.

Hamzah, 16
High Street
It's pretty messy on the floor.
I like the take away shops to be honest!
There is too much traffic – it's congested, could do with quite a few more crossings.

Queensway
Make it look more like studios – it just looks like factories.
You should leave the Tesco car park as it is.

Queensway Campus
It's important there is enough parking in the new housing – what if they have visitors?
They will need more than 0.75 spaces.

College Court
This is a good place for an access route to Middlesex University – it's all good.

Buildings
It's good to keep older, nice buildings.

Hussein, 16
High Street
Keep the take-aways.
Add more crossings
Brighten it up – it looks dirty, the buildings are scruffy – it looks dull.

Queensway
The area looks like an old factory – like it's not really used.
Leave the Tesco car park.

Queensway Campus
You should take away permit parking.
College Court
All good
Buildings
Fine to keep historic buildings.

Sonny, 20
High Street
It’s good to improve junction and crossings.
There’s too much signs and stuff.
Fewer takeaways would be good.
Maybe add more offices – it’s good to support businesses

Queensway
Very good ideas – people need to get into jobs and improve their talents.
Tesco car park – need to cut it down a bit, people need places to stay, there’s not enough homes.

Queensway Campus
Agree with everything, including the amount of parking and the height of buildings.

College Court
It’s a good place for Middlesex Uni entrance.
The library would be better on the main road – I didn’t even know it was there!
Like public square idea.
Buildings
Older/historic buildings look nice, they just need to be there

Priscilla, 19
High Street
There are too many cars – improve it for pedestrians.
It looks messy, it’s good to declutter.
Agree with all the suggestions.

Queensway
I think more creative industry would be good.
The car park is far too big – put more homes there.

Queensway Campus
It’s good to build more homes.
Good suggestions – what you’re saying is right

College Court
Good to move library and have square
Buildings
Important to keep the older style buildings “it looks like its got a history”

Terry, 18
High Street
I like having a choice of takeaways.
Hanging baskets don’t make a difference.
The pavements need more space
Roads are alright already, crossings are fine.

Queensway
Not into creative staff – paintballing would be really popular instead.
Tesco car park is not too big, its always busy, its fully packed.

Queensway Campus
There needs to be more housing, I’m homeless myself.
Put a hostel there as well as housing.

College Court
Library would be better on the High Street – more people would see it.

Buildings
White Hart is a crap pub – upstairs is falling apart.
Not bothered about buildings, esp. Church / Mosque.

Other
You want to sort out near Carterhatch Lane, Lytchet Estate- this areas okay – Lytchet is awful.

Abdul, 19
High Street
Way too many take-aways, the chicken shops cause rat problems in the whole area.
I agree there are too many cars, I don’t drive. There is a lot of traffic, its true, crossings would be better.

Queensway
Not that into music, but maybe there’s people with talent in Ponders End
Car park is extreme compared with others – Morrisons for example – it’s definitely too big. Maybe add other stores, not sure about housing.

Queensway Campus
This is good, having new buildings and it’s good to encourage cycling - make people healthier

College Court
Moving the library is a very good idea – it’s not very visible to people, its hidden from the community.
A public square would be nice – put something there for the community, a playground or something.

**Buildings**

Good to have a bit of history, they’re worth keeping.
Ponders End Central Planning Brief Consultation

Vision Team Meeting

1st September 2010

Attendance
Chetna Shah – Enfield Asian Welfare Association
Margaret Greengrass - Resident
Doug Taylor – Ward Member/Leader
Daisy Johnson – Neighbourhood Regeneration
Sharon Strutt – Neighbourhood Regeneration
Rachel Smith – Neighbourhood Regeneration
Simon Gardner – Leisure and Culture
Terry Guy - Resident
John Lawrence - Resident
Jane Richards – Resident/CAPE chair
Sandra Skipp – Resident (South Street)
Mo Valentine – Resident (South Street)

General
• Real issue – how do we change people’s perception of Ponders End? It doesn’t matter how much money is spent there if people don’t respect it.
• Bring things people like to P.E. and it will attract them – classical music etc.
• Need to please young children so they like the area and respect it – have self worth, something they can build on while we’re regenerating the area.
• At the moment PE is a mish-mash, no uniformity, its higgledy piggledy – what will the new buildings be like?
• Properties on old Summerville site sold or rented out? If housing is for sale, not being sold, what’s the need for more housing?
• Want more enforcement for people dropping litter – redirect more resources over this side of the A10 rather than all in Enfield Town!
• Don’t want low cost (affordable) housing being bought to let, making a profit by renting it out at high prices.
• I don’t want to be the “poor relative” in Ponders End, where everything else is regenerated and ‘super duper’ and I’m left on the fringes, my property remains unchanged, and that’s still what people think about when they think of Ponders End.

High Street
• Concern regarding clutter on public street, signs and cafes spilling on to street – causes noise problems
• View that there are too many ethnic specific shops that do not offer personal service – English as a 1st language
• What can the council do to diversify the shops on the High Street? Too many food shops. Can you control it?
• What about repairing / renovating existing character buildings like the corner of South Street / High Street.
• Too many takeaways – not picking up their rubbish, in days gone by the police would tell them.
• Tesco takes away business from local businesses – if you do a good job on this market square idea it could draw people to this end of the High Street and away from Tesco.
• What impact will businesses in High St have on residents on High Street? E.g. dance venues playing music etc? This will create a lot of noise.
• Could have a Sunday market selling produce from allotments – things that make it a real family area.
• There’s nothing that attracts you to spend time at the High Street at the moment.

Queensway
• Consensus that another entrance to Tesco could alleviate congestion – much better than adding 60-90 homes. Concern that the Planning Brief covers Central – what about traffic problems either side? (SS referred to corridor study).

Queensway Campus
• Restriction on heights of flats? (5-6 on High Street, down towards listed buildings, more height towards Roberts building)
• Would the car park be kept? How much parking will there be?
• Mews houses – is that going to be another Lawrence site?
• Concern it will look like a concrete jungle as there are so many flats built on High Street e.g. P.O.
• What sort of people are you envisaging living in this accommodation with only 0.75 parking spaces?
• Maybe there would be less congestion if there were less parking? Don’t give them spaces and they will walk! BUT families – cars essential, then kids grow up and will want them.
• If developer can’t sell properties they will be rented out – not good for the area.
• Want good quality build, environmentally friendly quality of build will dictate who is attracted there.
• What about facilities for residential – community space for people to get together, feel they own it and can come out of their houses, come together for both place and activities – people getting to know each other as a community

College Court
• Surely adding an exit road from Middx Uni on to High Street would cause even more chaos than there is now?! – (DJ confirmed that only access for residents)
• Concern about late night use of College Court – creating a hot spot – street drinking, drugs etc. Seats encourage this behaviour - needs to be very carefully done, maybe limiting opening times of shops? How big could a community space here be? Could it cater for salsa dancing / keep fit etc.

Park
• Park needs to be lit, opened up at entrance – feel safe and have a purpose to go through
• Get rid of toilets at the entrance.
• Park needs to have something done at the top, i.e. on High Street so people know there is something there for them – something that can draw them there – a café on Park??

Services
• Difficulty in getting a Dr. appointment already – will impact on services like Dr’s and schools be considered
• There’s a relationship between increased population / town centre businesses and having a Police Station – with this happening people need to feel safe. Want the station to be more community facing.
Community Buildings
• Would the studios be for community use or commercial? (Simon Gardner – prob both… want open/used by a variety of users)
• Lovely if Swan Annexe could be used to bring some revenue into the area.
• Creative hub could be good for younger generation – no dance school, ballet school, dance nights for adults…… would be good.
• What about somewhere for a community film night – e.g. a community space -> High Street best location.
• Howard Hall was ideal – didn’t make money but didn’t lose money – what about a Dugdale centre style place – with museum at front, space/studio further back.
• Swan Annexe would be a good venue for short courses etc – could tie in with creative uses e.g. glass blowing, flower arranging, candle making etc
• What about conservative hall on Derby Road… on market at too high price

Transport
• One way system in Kingsway/Queensway will aggregate congestion on the High Street.
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Good morning,

I am having trouble logging in to the formal consultation website so I thought that it might be easier if I contacted you directly.

I am responding on behalf of Arriva London. We operate the bus garage at Ponders End and the majority of bus services in the area, so we have a keen interest in the development plans. I shall confine my comments to matters directly related to these bus services, so our main interest is in Ponders End High Street, Southbury Road and Nags Head Road. Our interest in the heart of the development is primarily in its impacts on the main bus corridors.

The bus garage operates 120 buses and employs 440 people, making it a significant local employer. The bus garage is full to capacity and we would be interested to explore options for expanding the garage should the opportunity arise as part of the bigger plan.

As one of the partners, we would be very interested to learn more about how the Council intends to deliver policy 26, improving public transport. The report states that the development may generate the need for increased bus services. Planning for this needs to identify where the extra bus services will terminate as space at bus terminals is barely adequate for current levels of service.

Congestion is stated as "a notable concern among residents", and is a major issue for bus operations. It leads to unattractive journey times, makes it difficult to provide reliable bus services, and directly threatens the economic viability of our operations.

Bus services experience significant delay along the full length of Southbury Road and in the High Street, in particular at the Southbury Road/ Nags Head Road junction which does not work at all well. The development report describes the junction as impermeable for pedestrians, so it does not work well for any group of users. Ironically, it worked better during the recent roadworks with four-way temporary traffic signals, we believe because this phasing allowed each arm to clear before opposing traffic started to move. The conflict between the traffic signals at this junction and those at Tesco impacts badly on Southbury Road and Ponders End High Street, and we would suggest that consideration be given to replacing the Tesco lights with a mini roundabout.

Traffic conditions at the Ponders End end of Southbury Road were made much worse by the closure of local rat-runs. We can well understand the reasons for doing this but there is a pressing need to resolve the impact on the main roads, especially if the redevelopment achieves the Council's aims of re-invigorating the area, thus generating more traffic. Vehicular access to the Queensway Campus site is restricted; this will become more important as the development generates more traffic onto the High Street and Southbury Road, and we would wish to see how this traffic will be accommodated.

If Ponders End High Street is narrowed, and the service roads closed, we need to understand what will happen to the displaced parking and loading & unloading.

I would be pleased to discuss this further.

Yours sincerely

Bob Pennyfather
Commercial Manager
Arriva London
Improving transport conditions in Ponders End - brief comments on the draft Ponders End Planning Brief

General Comments

1. Planning for reducing carbon emissions should be a central objective of the planning brief.

2. The planning brief should also be consistent with National Planning Guidance, the London Plan and the draft replacement London Plan, in that it should make reducing the need to travel a core principle of redevelopment plans.

Specific recommendations to promote low carbon transport, increase access to amenities and improve quality of life and the quality of the public realm.

1. Increase residential densities particularly around the railway station and existing town centre.

2. Assess the availability of commonly needed facilities and amenities, retail, social (such as schools, doctors' surgeries, libraries, community facilities) and leisure/sports/open space. Carry out accessibility audits and produce plans to make good any deficiencies.

3. Consider the balance of homes and jobs and what measures might encourage the employment of a local labour force by local employers. Plan for new employment to be able to source staff from within a local catchment area.

4. Remove the proposal to provide integrated car parking in residential developments.

5. Build a high proportion of residential development with parking for essential car-users only, such as people with disabilities, but with, for example, more shared and/or private open space. Set a maximum parking standard of less than 0.5 spaces per unit for other developments. Where parking is provided, segregate it from residential space to discourage car use for short local journeys. Charge residents the full cost of parking provision.

6. Reduce the amount of existing on and off street parking space as a means of reducing traffic volume. Introduce a workplace and retail parking levy.

7. Provide only limited parking at local shops and facilities, all with a fee except for essential car users.

8. Create a network of safe walking and cycling routes. Redesign the streets to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists and reduce vehicle speeds. Install crossing places, street trees, benches, social areas, cycle parking.

9. Introduce an area-wide 20 mph speed limit.

10. Make the local centre largely car-free.
11. Make car access to the local centre and to employment sites more expensive, less convenient and less rapid than access by public transport, bike or walking.

12. Create additional pedestrian and cycle routes to busy destinations such as shopping areas, community facilities, schools and bus stops/rail station.

13. Create ‘filtered permeability’ areas, where it is quicker and more convenient to travel on foot or by bicycle than by car, for example by closing junctions to cars but not to pedestrians or cyclists.

14. Produce and implement a station travel plan to improve facilities for travellers and access for pedestrians, cyclists and bus-users and to discourage car use. Provide more cycle parking and less car parking at the station.

15. Introduce smart travel behaviour programmes for the area including residential, school and workplace travel plans, personalised travel planning, promotional campaigns, support for car-clubs and employment of a travel plan co-ordinator.

Richard Bourn
London Campaigner
Campaign for Better Transport

richard.bourn@bettertransport.org.uk

27 July 2010
Resident, Durants Park Avenue

By Email

I received the above publication the other day and note with concern the following items:

On page 5: "Ponders End has the potential to provide... 60-90 homes on the Tesco site"

And on page 6: "Re-use existing buildings... This could include... The Goat"

The Goat pub means a lot to many people from Ponders End and beyond and provides an ideal meeting place for a drink and perhaps a meal. We have already recently lost The White Hart (which is also referred to in the publication), The Beef and Barrel (formerly The Swan) and many other public houses in the vicinity. It is vital The Goat remains.

As for Tesco, this supermarket is simply the main hub of Ponders End. I know several people who live miles from the area who shop there regularly. It is a vital facility for the shoppers of Ponders End, particularly those of us who do not have a car.

Is Enfield Council seriously considering shutting down these establishments? I'm surprised it even has the power to do so.

Hoping you can reassure me on this matter and looking forward to your reply in due course,

Regards
Residents, Queensway

Comments with regard the Ponders End Central Planning Brief

The proposed erection of houses between the back gardens in Queensway and the Broadbent building.

Currently this space is occupied by a single, two story Grade II listed Caretaker’s cottage. The windows in this building mainly face east and west, with only two small utility windows overlooking Queensway gardens/houses.

I presume you cannot knock down or alter a Grade II listed building from the outside, therefore I am interested to know how you are going to build four houses on this area unless they are all going to be detached from the cottage (which is not how it appears on the Planning Brief), or you are going to completely alter the Caretaker’s cottage? I am not overly happy with the prospect of having four houses looking directly into my back garden, particularly as there is no mention of storey height of the houses, or indeed screening to protect our privacy. This small development you have shown is not mentioned at all within the Planning Brief.

Queensway is a quiet area in the evenings and weekends as it is mainly comprised of light industry, and the Broadbent building is currently empty. Even when the Broadbent building was in use as a university it was mainly empty in the evening and at weekends. What will happen to my peace and privacy when the old University site is ‘transformed’?

Has any consideration been given to using the Broadbent building as a school?

Traffic

The amount of traffic in Ponders End is currently very high with the areas you have identified for regeneration being amongst the worst. The worst traffic hot spots are:

Junction from the A10 onto Southbury Road, regularly the traffic here is already queuing before the slip road on the A10, which when the speed of the A10’s traffic is 40mph this can feel like you are a sitting target. Then along Southbury Road to the junction with Nags Head Road, the traffic is regularly queuing from the start of Southbury Road (A10 end) right the way down towards the Nags Head Road junction with the High Road.

The High Road is usually backed up to before Galliard Road up to the junction at Nags Head Road and Southbury Road. This is just going to exacerbate the congestion by making the High Street more pedestrian friendly. It does not resolve the weight of traffic issue particularly as the regeneration is increasing the number of residential dwellings with parking capacity and therefore further increase in traffic.

It is mentioned in the report that the A1010 Corridor Study is currently being conducted. I have a major concern in relation to the timing of this study as it is being conducted when the schools are closed, at the peak holiday period. This will give inaccurate results as the amount of traffic is significantly increased during term time and non holiday periods, I urge that a balanced study is made so that you do not have incomplete, biased and weighted evidence.
Your proposal shows that after re-generation of the old Middlesex University site there will be approx 450 new homes. You states that each home will be given 0.75 of a parking space, which equates to 337 cars using the two exit/entrance sites on Queensway. This concerns me for the following reason:

1. Compared with the vehicular access at present and working on the basis that every person uses their car at some point during the day this will increase the traffic flow around the whole area significantly.

2. As you will only be providing 0.75 parking spaces per house where are the other cars in that household going to park particularly as you are proposing the larger 3 – 4 bedroom houses? Some basic research shows that according to the 2001 Census 44% of households on one car, 24% own 2 cars and 4% own 3.

I am aware that not each household will have a car, and that the Government and people in general are trying to encourage people not to use their cars but traffic will increase drastically by your proposals and I therefore think the issue of traffic flow and the amount of cars need to be looked at very closely before any building works take place.

With the increased amount of households in one place there is no mention of consultation with the Emergency Services regarding access to the site and the increased fire risk!

The mosque is well used and we have an increase in the amount of people parking when the mosque is being used. Could an area of land not be used for a multi story car park for people visiting to park? We also have in Queensway the Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministry which attracts a large congregation. I particularly notice this on Sunday mornings when it is almost impossible to move for cars which block Queensway. There was no change of use agreed from an industrial unit to a religious building or consultation or thought as to the parking requirements.

I am aware other means of travel are trying to be encouraged around the area but I think you might need to broaden your research as a large amount of people visit the area using their cars. This will increase when the plans are put into place.

There is also no direct access by bus into Central London and the only way to get there in any reasonable amount of time is via the train from Southbury. However, currently the service only operates every half an hour and takes approximately the same time to reach Liverpool Street. Would consideration be given to a more frequent service, say one every 15 minutes during peak hours and also perhaps the re-introduction of the service which used to just stop at Edmonton Green, Seven Sister and Liverpool Street (fast train). I feel taking this into consideration might ease the traffic flow around the area and also my issues with all the vehicles. I feel trying to address the transport problems by increasing the number of buses will only increase the amount of traffic.

**Environmental impact**

I am extremely pleased the report details commitment to the environment and sustainable living, if only all new developments had this as a priority. Green roofs, bee hives, water harvesting and porous paving should not just be encouraged by the Council – it should be enforced. However, on P74 it states that closed mesh front of shop shutters will be resisted, (excellent) but the internal open shutters will be encouraged on shop frontages as will illumination of windows. Is this a good use of energy?
By the tone of the report you are hoping that all these changes will mean Ponders End is going to resemble the likes of Dalston. To be able to attract the diverse mix of people and talents into the area I feel that the main priorities for the area should be to reduce the fear of crime, increase sustainable living, and community spirit. It also requires a wide variety of shops, restaurants and coffee shops, which should not just focus on the community at present but be far reaching trying to encourage different cultures and religions into the area. Also without good transport links to London I think it would be difficult to encourage many people into the area.

**Fly tipping**

You say that fly tipping is a major issue in the area and that in any new designs this needs to be taken into consideration, which I whole heartedly agree with. The reason you may have such high instances of fly tipping is that your ‘3 free collections a year’ policy is not heavily publicised. Having spoken to some neighbours they still think one has to pay! If street cleaning was completed more often and the weekly waste collection personnel didn’t drive past a full-up bin, bag of rubbish on the pavement, put our wheel bins back inside our property boundary not leaving them on the pavement etc etc etc then maybe people would take more pride in their surroundings. To some it’s natural; to others encouragement may be needed. I have also wondered how many people report fly tipping and you manage to get full details i.e. car registration number etc. Are the majority of reports where the residents have spotted the resultant mess and want it moved? If this is the case then surely the council should take some responsibility in keeping the area clean as the waste collection agents see the whole of the borough on their rounds? If it is the same team that cover one area then why don’t they report it to the fly tip team at the end of their shift? This may mean the waste gets moved more quickly. If residents see one fly tip happen I am sure they will still report it and give all the details they have. Would this make Enfield more efficient at cleaning up its Borough?

Please take my comments as constructive as I am pleased that Enfield Council is looking into improving the Ponders End area especially Queensway. As you can see, however, I do have my reservations over some aspects. I myself have had connections with this area for many years and look forward to it being re-developed. I am aware that many Enfield residents feel like the bad end of the Borough in the Councils eyes compared to Enfield Town Centre.

I look forward to hearing from you regarding the points mentioned above and may I also ask that you send me any future proposals or applications in full at the earliest opportunity.

I am also interested in receiving more info on the traffic flow in the area and the result of the A1010 traffic reports. Could you provide me with any contact / website details regarding this please?

Recd. 18th August 2010
Ponders End Community Development Trust

Dear Daisy

Ponders End Community Development Trust sees itself as a Voluntary organisation that seeks to represent the view of smaller organisations that provide diverse services to the people who live or work in the Ponders End. The work of the trust is not limited to Ponders End as in political ward, but Ponders End in its spatial and geographical interpretation.

Over the past few years, the Trust has been involved in a number of consultations. All these consultations started with good intentions, but the community always ended being disappointed with the result of these consultations as it would seem that sometimes entrenched views are imposed on the community.

On this occasion, the Trust shares the Council’s vision for Ponders End Central, as stated in the Planning Brief. However the Trust believes that this Vision should not just be for Ponders End Central, but for the entire Ponders End Area.

Residents of Ponders End that have spoken to us through their organisations strongly expressed their views on some of the principles:

Principle 1 = Work on the Park should reflect the views already expressed at the various consultation meetings. The trust is of the view that sustainability should be built into the design of any future improvement on the park, taking into consideration cost implication on maintenance. Whilst safe and accessible route through the park is important for users, some of our members organise festivals in the park and indeed more community festivals could be organised in the future if such usage is high in the priority of designers.

Principle 2 - The density of housing to be provided in the development and the mixture of units should take into consideration the aspiration of the area. We are of the view that to encourage young professionals into the area who have either started a family or having such thoughts, there should be a good number of 2 to 3 bed units. The height of the developments should respect surrounding buildings.

Principle 3 - The communities in Ponders End have in the past been promised a community building, a replica of what is in Edmonton. We have been assured that the proceeds from Howard Hall, has been placed in a special account and will be available for the community once a suitable venue is identified. Looking at what is currently available in the area, we are of the view that the Swan Annex provides an opportunity for such community facility. Having recently completed our strategic plan, the trust believes that we are in a better position to achieve one of our goals of owning and managing an asset that would guarantee its future. With an enlarged board that brings
in additional expertise, the trust would have the capacity to secure any additional funding that would be necessary to refurbish the building to meet community needs. Also we believe that there will a Section 106 funds accruing from the Ponders End Central development. Such funds should also be channelled towards the refurbishment of the community facility.

Such a facility could also house the Library, GP or Health related facilities, a museum, community post office, flexible community hall that could accommodate up to 400 guests and a lot more. The trust will be willing to negotiate an asset transfer at an acceptable valuation. We have made contact with some major funders, such as Capacity Builders, who have expressed their willingness to consider such proposals. The current thinking on Big Society could also provide the Trust the opportunity of managing if not all, at least one of those facilities. Such facility we believe will be sustainable. Other organisations in the area, such as Enfield Women’s Centre, Community Aid, the Bangladeshi groups, and others will be part of this negotiation to ensure that the interest of all the major groups in the area is accommodated.

The trust would want an opportunity to enter into formal discussions with the Council on how the above objective will be achieved.

Emmanuel Ahanonu
Chair
PECDT
emasonbiz@gmail.com
Dear Daisy

Thanks for this. I am not sure the church people will want to remove the bench but I will raise it with them. If they want to take up the offer I will get back to you. Memorials are such personal things - they may decide to move it round the back.

I thought it a very good meeting, and gave me the opportunity to meet a few residents for the first time. I hope you got some positive outcomes from the meeting.

On reflection I would like to add to the general discussion my astonishment at hearing that there is no residents' priority at all on the car park, while the local garage uses it for business purposes. That surely restricts public use as well as people in the flats?

While we were told it would be difficult to 'police' designated spaces, it would at least give the residents a moral justification for challenging people who parked illegally on their spot. Drivers do (on the whole) obey parking restrictions (and not always only where there is risk of a fine) - and at least it would not give carte blanche to the garage or anyone else regularly using a number of spaces for business purposes - which seems a blatant misuse of a public facility.

It is important to avoid the conclusion that the council can't make things better for one group of people while maintaining the preferential use of another group with less 'right' to be there. I am fairly sure the use of a public car park would not be part of an agreement granting planning permission to a garage to operate a business. Interestingly, though the car park is unregulated, neither is it advertised as a free public car park (there are no signs that I am aware of).

I will be pleased to be involved in any further discussion with the residents and planners, and/or to ensure that the church is represented in discussion about shared space and its improvement.

With good wishes
Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Ponders End Central Brief Consultation

Thank you for your email which we received on 21 July 2010, requesting Natural England’s views on the above document. We the following comments:

**The Vision for Ponders End Central**

As it stands, we are of the opinion that *The Vision for Ponders End Central* does include enough reference to open space provision, green space connections or biodiversity. *The Vision* needs to go further in addressing these issues and be in line with the relevant core strategy policies, specifically Policy 34 (parks and open spaces) and Policy 36 (biodiversity).

**3.1 Green, Playful and Accessible Streets, Parks and Public Spaces.**

We recommend that this section needs to go further with regards to protecting and enhancing the natural environment, in line with the Policies 34 and 36. In addition, we recommend that green infrastructure should be referenced within this section. Green infrastructure can deliver multiple benefits for the area, including those relating to health, climate change adaptation, biodiversity and sense of place.

**3.2.4 All new development should provide adequate communal and private open space. Where gardens are not feasible, opportunities to create south facing balconies and roof terraces should be maximised.**

This section should address green infrastructure, and recognise that additional open space can be delivered through the provision of green infrastructure, such as tree lined streets, green roofs and walls.

**3.5.4 A Lifetime Neighbourhood That Will Stand the Test of Time and Have Minimal Impact on the Environment**

It would be appropriate to reference the benefits of green infrastructure as a climate change adaptation tool within this section, specifically under Section 3.5.4 – *Enhancing biodiversity through redevelopment.*
Natural England’s London region has identified four expressions which reflect what achievement of natural value looks like. These describe the key features of a place that is designed to maximise the value of nature’s services.

**Natural Signature** - People value their local neighbourhoods through a ‘sense of place’ informed by the natural environment. Local environments have distinctive landscapes, wildlife and ecological connections – their unique ‘natural signature’.

**Natural Resilience** - The greening of towns and cities provides a significant contribution to climate change adaptation. The incorporation of sustainable urban drainage, green roofs, street trees and green corridors within the built environment significantly assists flood management and urban cooling – providing a natural resilience to climate change.

**Natural Health Service** - People are able to easily access natural green spaces close to where they live and work. Opportunities for physical activity, relaxation, mental well-being and healthy living through contact with nature are available to all.

**Natural Connections** - Children have the opportunity for imaginative play in the outdoors in spaces that are wildlife-rich, experiences that are essential for healthy child development. Adults are involved in environmental activities through food growing or volunteering, reinforcing a sense of place and social cohesion engendering greater care about and action for the environment.

We recommend that expressions be integrated into the Planning Brief for Ponders End. In particular, we would expect any development to positively contribute to and reflect the ‘natural signature’ of the area and make reference to, and be in line with, the Upper Lee Valley Landscape Strategy objectives.

In addition, we recommend that the Planning Brief should include a section on Nature and Biodiversity, which should detail strategies on protecting, enhancing and connecting green space and biodiversity.

I hope that this makes Natural England’s position clear but if you have any further questions about this letter or require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Isabel Assaly  
Planning Adviser  
Natural England London Region  

Direct Dial: 0300 060 2821  
Email: isabel.assaly@naturalengland.org.uk
3 September 2010

Ponders End Central SPD

Dear Daisy,

Thank you for allowing Thames Water to comment on the above document, we have the following comments to make:

Water and sewerage undertakers have limited powers under the Water Industry Act to prevent connection ahead of infrastructure upgrades and therefore rely heavily on the planning system to ensure infrastructure is provided ahead of development either through phasing or the use of Grampian style conditions.

It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to assert whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the statutory undertaker, then the developer needs to contact the undertaker to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.

We would therefore welcome a general reference within the SPD on utility infrastructure, to the effect that new development may need to be phased to allow the prior completion of the necessary infrastructure.

I trust the above information is of use, but please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any further queries.

Yours sincerely

Mark Mathews
Senior Town Planner
Thames Water Property Services
Thank you for your email of 20 July consulting The Theatres Trust on the Ponders End Central Planning Brief as part of the North East Enfield Area Action Plan.

The Theatres Trust is The National Advisory Public Body for Theatres. The Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995, Article 10, Para (v) requires the Trust to be consulted on planning applications which include ‘development involving any land on which there is a theatre.’ It was established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 'to promote the better protection of theatres'. This applies to all buildings that were either built as theatres or are used for theatre presentations, in current use, in other uses, or disused.

Due to the specific nature of the Trust’s remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and expect therefore to see matters relating to cultural facilities.

We note at para.3.3.4 that developing and promoting the arts is a key strand of the strategy to create a more lively evening economy but we cannot find any proposals for buildings to be built to house any arts-based industry. Community centres play an essential part in enhancing the quality of life of the local population and should offer multi-purpose space that can accommodate a range of leisure, recreation, cultural and entertainment activities including a performance space.

Somewhere in this vast document there is talk about making provision for a community hub in the high street for creative use but it isn’t clear exactly what is being proposed. The document itself contains far too much explanatory text making it difficult for the reader to see clearly what is being proposed.

We look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents.

Rose Freeman
Planning Policy Officer
The Theatres Trust
22 Charing Cross Road
London WC2H 0QL
Tel: 020 7836 8591
Fax: 020 7836 3302
planning@theatrestrust.org.uk
Dear Sirs

DRAFT PONDERS END CENTRAL PLANNING BRIEF SPD CONSULTATION

REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE AUTHORITY (MPA)/METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE (MPS)

I write on behalf of our client the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA)/Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) with regard to the above document. CgMs previously submitted representations to the Ponders Ends: A Framework for Change, the overall strategy for the Ponders End Place Shaping Priority Area (2nd October 2009) (copy attached).

Context to Representations

The Metropolitan Police provide a vital community service to the London Borough of Enfield and policing is recognised within the 2008 London Plan and the emerging London Plan as being an integral part of social infrastructure.

The relevant planning policy framework is set out in previous representations to the Core Strategy Proposed Submission (28th January 2010) (copy attached).

To ensure that the planning brief accurately reflects the aim and objectives of the MPA/MPS and the most recent estate strategy some comments and suggested changes are set out below.

The High Street

There are instances in which Ponders End Police Station is said to be underused (page 20 and page 22 insert 7). The MPA/MPS do not consider this facility to be underused as it is used for training and includes a Safer Estates Unit, a Special Constables unit, a Driving School Team and two Neighbourhood Teams.
**Recommendation:** The MPA/MPS therefore recommends that all references to Ponder End Police Station being under-used should be removed.

3.3 A lively, prosperous town centre with more jobs and improved local facilities for all

Paragraph 3.3.5 states that a priority for public realm and development improvements is that they should adhere to Secured by Design principles. The MPA/MPS welcomes the inclusion and weight given to Secured by Design.

3.3.6 Option 1

The document sets out two Options for the redevelopment site west of the High Street, which Ponders End Police Station is located within. Option 1 is for a new community-focused building with residential above and Option 2 is for a new retail/café focused building with residential above (new community facilities to be provided on another site east of High Street).

It is considered that a police office is likely to be required on the site and therefore the MPA/MPS would like to indicate their support for Option 1.

The MPA/MPS welcomes the inclusion of essential infrastructure, which includes police shops/facilities, within the community uses that would be supported at ground floor level.

The MPA/MPS request that the above comments are taken into account in the final Planning Brief. Should you have any queries or wish to discuss the nature of these comments and representations, please do not hesitate to contact either Vanessa Garner or myself at this office.

Yours faithfully

PP.  [Signature]

John N. Smith
Senior Associate Director

c.c. Metropolitan Police

Enc. Letter to LB of Enfield dated 2nd October 2009
    Letter to LB of Enfield dated 28th January 2010
Dear Sir/Madam,

A VISION FOR PONDERS END

Although I no longer live in Enfield, it was where I was born and bred and my home for the majority of my life. Work, family and friends mean that I am still visiting Enfield most weeks. So I hope you will consider my comment on the "Vision for Ponders End" plans which I read about in 'Our Enfield' magazine. Indeed, my home for 29 years was in Lincoln Road, which begins just behind the 'artist's impression' viewpoint published in that article.

The thing that hit me most about the artist's impression is something I have been banging on about to many local authorities everywhere for at least a decade: namely the unfortunate fashion for seating without backs. The vast majority of area 'improvement' schemes of which I am aware have involved removing proper seats and installing backless blocks of concrete/marble/plastic/wood. No doubt designers think these look trendy but they are quite unsuitable for many of us. The older I get, the more I find that I cannot sit in comfort for more than a couple of minutes on a backless seat. The reason is obvious: such seats put all the pressure on the legs, hips and lower back - the very areas of the body that wear out quickest. The whole purpose of seating is (or should be) to give relief to those areas. Many younger people as well (eg young mums or pregnant women or the disabled) would also appreciate the simple consideration of a back on a seat.

Since the fashion for backless seats took off, I have written countless letters to councils, developers, government departments, the London Assembly, newspapers, broadcast news, etc. etc. I include L.B. Enfield in this list! And yet still, every new set of plans that I see envisages these useless items of street furniture, which shows just how little people's views really count in the planning and design processes these days.

Numerous times I have been told "Oh, it's only an artist's impression" - then when the real thing takes shape, the backless blocks appear. Please please will you break the mould and ensure that the Ponders End scheme, and indeed all other future schemes in Enfield, incorporate proper seats, rather than those blocks of stone in the picture, because they are simply not fit for purpose for so many of us.

Yours faithfully,

C. Weston
DEar Daisy

London Borough of Enfield Local Development Framework – Ponders End Central Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Development (SPD)

Thank you for your letter dated 20th July 2010 seeking our views on the above document.

As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment English Heritage welcomes the opportunity to comment on this document, and to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process.

We welcome the plan-led approach being taken towards Ponders End Central via this SPD. We hope that this will help ensure carefully managed change and high quality development which is based upon and utilises the areas existing historic environment. For example we see the SPD as an opportunity to ensure that the local historic character is reinforced in new development. To help achieve this aim English Heritage has published Understanding Place (2010) and Building in Context to illustrate how this can be delivered through best practice guidance and case studies.

Broadly speaking Ponders End Central’s historic environment is composed of a series of Victorian and Interwar industrial and educational buildings and spaces, set within a wider context of low-rise Victorian terraces. Taller residential blocks, community buildings and modern warehouse development have subsequently been added to this setting, but the site’s earlier educational and industrial structures continue to make a significant contribution to the local character. This includes the Grade II listed Enfield Technical College (and associated outbuildings) which is of local historical and architectural significance and is a key landmark within the SPD area.
Conservation of local historic character is a key objective of the new PPS5, which requires that Local Authorities seek to protect the wider historic environment (not just heritage assets) as an integral part of sustainable regeneration and design. Policy HE3.1 states that:

Local Development Frameworks should set out a positive, proactive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment in their areas, taking into account the contribution made by the historic environment by virtue of:

   I. Its influence on the character of the environment and an area’s sense of place
   II. Its potential to be a catalyst for regeneration in an area, in particular through leisure, tourism and economic development
   III. The stimulus it can provide to inspire new development of imaginative and high quality design
   IV. The re-use of existing fabric, minimising waste, and
   V. Its mixed and flexible patterns of land use that are likely to be and remain sustainable.

This approach coincides with PPS1 paragraph 33 which states that:

Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted

and with the Core Strategy Submission Version policy 41 which states the Council’s support for:

High quality new development that complements the heritage assets and historic environment of Ponders End, such as the listed Middlesex University building in Ponders End Central and Ponders End Flour Mill at Ponders End Waterfront.

In addition, PPS5 and Core Strategy policy 31 requires that planning policy should avoid causing harm to heritage assets, including their settings. This approach has informed our detailed comments on the Ponders End SPD provided below.

General comments

We would draw our attention to the guiding policy principles as set out in PPS5 concerning the proactive, positive strategy for the conservation of the Borough’s heritage assets and the wider historic environment (policy HE3). We would advise that this SPD should be supported by a robust and justified evidence base (policy HE2), which includes a detailed understanding of the historic environment, especially where the SPD proposes promoting demolition of a heritage asset.

Detailed comments

Planning Policy Context (page 9)
The National Planning Context should include PPS5 (2010) and its accompanying documents the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (2010) and the Government’s Statement on the Historic Environment for England (2010). These set out how the historic environment should be managed through spatial planning by providing a proactive and positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.

Site Analysis (page 19-20)
It is not clear how the key issues shown within the site analysis have been determined. For example, the analysis does not give any account of historic environment considerations, for example, the historic qualities of Queensway campus and the surrounding warehouse buildings which have a significant value for the site as a whole in terms of built character, and which have design implications for the site as a whole.
Opportunities for Future Development (page 39)

There are clear opportunities to reinforce local distinctiveness as part of the sustainable regeneration of Ponders End through designs which are informed by historic character. These should be explicitly addressed in the SPD.

Ponders End Central History (page 45)

Welcome the brief description of the historical development of the area which provides a useful context for proposals. However, it appears that this important historical context has not been used to inform or draw out the heritage values of the site, and its implications for opportunities in terms of development proposals. We would advise that the heritage values of the area should be proactively used. To help determine the heritage values of the site we recommend referring to English Heritage’s Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (2008); as well as Understanding Place (2010) and EH/CABE’s Building in Context (2001).

Vision and Principles for Development (page 54)

The vision and principles do not currently promote the enhancement of locally distinctive character through high quality contextual design. Local distinctiveness is fundamental to sustainable placemaking and successful regeneration. We suggest that the vision articulate, as the outcome of the SPD, a locally distinctive place where contemporary design is rooted in historic context and responsive to the setting of the Broadbent buildings. This approach should be incorporated into the guiding principles of the SPD as well.

A healthy and welcoming neighbourhood with a mix of affordable homes for all (page 64)

We welcome the intention to establish a strong frontage to the High Street (Figure 3.5, number 02). However, this site also provides an opportunity to strengthen the character of the high street, drawing on the contribution made by its historic environment (PPS5, policy HE.3). This could include, for example, retaining the vertical emphasis which arises from the existing plot widths, or using locally characteristic materials. We suggest that this text is inserted to encourage this opportunity.

3.2.6 Figure 3.6 – indicative building massing (page 66)

We welcome the suggestion in 3.2.6 that building heights of the blocks adjacent to the Broadbent buildings should gradually drop in height from the High Street to the listed building. However, this is not made clear in figure 3.6 which shows the three proposed blocks all reaching 5 – 6 storeys with “taller accents”. These heights may not allow for the listed building to be the dominant building (3.2.6, paragraph 4) as the existing building heights for the Broadbent building are lower at 3 storeys (as shown on pages 31-32). In all cases where the setting of heritage assets such as listed buildings could be affected by new developments a full assessment of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting should be made and used as a basis in which to inform the form, scale and design of developments and their relationship with their context. PPS5 and its Planning Practice Guide should be referred to in this instance.

3.2.8 Important listed buildings, including the Broadbent Building on the former Queensway Campus Site, and their settings, will be retained and enhanced through any redevelopment and public realm improvements (page 67)

English Heritage welcomes proposals for the sustainable reuse of the Broadbent buildings through sensitive conversion. However, we object in principle to the proposed removal of the range to the rear of the Broadbent Buildings, which is part of the principal listed building and subject to listed building control. In putting forward this proposal, the draft SPD contradicts PPS5 and the policy principles guiding the conservation of heritage assets.
Should the Council wish to support the removal of these buildings through the SPD, we would expect the SPD to outline a clear and convincing justification for demolition (as required by PP55 policy HE9), based on assessment of the buildings historic significance (PP55 policy HE2). This rationale could be drawn out more strongly throughout the document, for example, through the Queensway Campus Site analysis on page 23, within the historic environment section on page 45, and within the labels accompanying the indicative masterplans.

There should also be an explicit reference to the requirement for applications for listed building consent to provide an assessment of historic significance and justification for removal, and that, as part of the consent, evidence regarding the site be made publicly available (PP55, paragraph 7), for example, by feeding into the Historic Environment Record.

We would also support opportunities to retain the Caretakers house, which, though undesignated, is contemporary with the Enfield Technical College, and which sits within its curtilage.

3.3.6 Options 1 and 2 (page 73 – 76)
Proposals for building A should seek to strengthen the character of the High Street, drawing on the contribution made by the historic environment (please see earlier comments regarding page 64).

The Indicative Masterplan (page 91 – 110)
In principle, we support options, or variations of options which demonstrate the greatest consideration of the historic environment, and in particular, designs which have the least harmful impact on the setting of the Broadbent building, both in terms of surrounding building heights, and in terms of the amount of open space surrounding the building itself. We also support designs for new buildings which respect historic characteristics of the site, for example, the form and scale of the warehouses on Queensway or existing plot widths on the High Street. We support options which retain the Caretakers House, which is contemporary with the Enfield Technical College, and which sits within its curtilage.

5A Delivery, Putting the Plan into Action (page 113)
English Heritage welcomes any opportunities for further involvement in the delivery of proposals for the Ponders End site, particularly in regard of the site’s heritage assets.

6 Proposed developer contributions (page 118)
English Heritage supports opportunities to invest developer contributions into the wider historic environment, not just the Council’s key heritage schemes, and heritage assets at risk, for example, into public realm improvements which enhance the setting of heritage assets such as the Broadbent buildings and surrounding warehouses. We suggest that this be reflected in the table shown.

Conclusion

To help you in improving the robustness of the Planning Brief we would strongly advise that the Borough’s own conservation staff are closely involved throughout the preparation of the Planning Brief as they are often best placed to advise on these matters.

Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by you. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, where English Heritage consider it appropriate to do so.

Yours sincerely
Nick Bishop
Regional Planning Advisor
LONDON REGION
Ms Daisy Johnson  
London Borough of Enfield  
Planning Policy, Projects & Design Service  
PO Box 53  
Enfield  
Middlesex  
EN1 3XE

Our ref: NE/2006/100445/PO-03/IS1-L01  
Your ref:  
Date: 06 September 2010

Dear Daisy

Ponders End Central Planning Brief

Thank you for consulting us on the above planning brief.

We are encouraged by the content of the brief and the opportunities that it identifies.

We would suggest that the only amendment is as follows. Section 3.5.5 requires each development site to have a flood risk assessment. We would like each proposed development site to be required to submit a preliminary risk assessment for land contamination, as per PPS23.

I trust that you find this response acceptable, if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Please quote our reference in any correspondence

Yours sincerely

Mr Matthew Parr  
Major Project Officer

Direct dial 02070914070  
Direct e-mail matt.parr@environment-agency.gov.uk
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Local Business, George Wood & Sons Ltd

George Wood & Sons (Enfield) Ltd

276 Alma Road  Enfield  Middlesex EN3 7RS
Tel: 020-8804 1928
Fax: 020-8804 9312

24 August 2010

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Ponders End Central

Background

Our companies have been in Ponders End for about 80 years. 1930 for Enfield Timber Company and 1938 for Geo. Wood & Sons (Enfield) Ltd., which was originally on the site now occupied by Barclays Bank.

As such we have a great deal of experience of traffic flows at different times of day, days of the week and different months of the year.

We have experienced the effects of road closures, one way systems and pedestrian traffic lights on traffic volumes. Also the changes of use of buildings, be they factories to retail use, or schools where children come by bus and now the students come by car, e.g. Enfield College.

Two factors need to be considered: traffic lights at the High Street/Southbury Road junction and Lincoln Road junction inevitably restrict the number of vehicles which can use the road; also the transformation of the site in South Street from gas holders to a school will add considerably to the junction at Lincoln Road/South Street. At certain times of day this junction is already overwhelmed.

That having been said, real jobs are needed in this part of the borough, more flats would benefit by being sited near stations or bus routes.

If I can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Yours faithfully,
GEO.WOOD & SONS (ENFIELD) LTD.

N.V.Sill,
Managing Director
Dear Ms Johnson,

Enfield Local Development Framework
Ponders End Central Planning Brief SPD

Thank you for consulting the Greater London Authority (GLA) on the above document. The Mayor has afforded me delegated authority to make comments on his behalf and this letter represents a joint GLA/TFL response.

You are reminded that all local development frameworks, including supplementary planning documents must be in general conformity with the London Plan (Section 24 (1) (b) of the Planning and Compulsory Planning Act 2004).

You will be aware that the area is located within the Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area, which is identified in the London Plan as being capable of accommodating 15,000 new jobs and 7,000 new homes. Paragraph 5.39 of the London Plan states “there are several development sites within the area, and the main requirement is for high quality renewal, including modernising estates and improving transport”. A draft planning framework (OAPF) is currently being finalised, with the intention that public consultation be carried out later this year. Part of the OAPF involves a strategic transport study, and the conclusions of this study may further help to inform the strategic transport issues related to the Ponders End area.

The planning brief clearly sets out the intentions of the Council in relation to shaping Ponders End Central. The delivery of a mix of uses, including housing and employment, accords with the targets set out in the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area planning framework.

The planning brief focuses around the Middlesex University Queensway Campus site, and seeks to bring the site back into use in ways that will rejuvenate the High Street. As you may be aware, concerns were raised by the Mayor during the consideration of the recent planning application for this site, where it was noted that the Indicative masterplan did not appear to be based on the existing building footprints and failed to knit together to form a comprehensive re-development proposal. The options set out in the indicative masterplan reflect the GLA’s view that a strong
frontage to the high street should be provided, whilst maintaining clear routes through the site and focusing on the new (relocated) community centre fronting the High Street.

In relation to sustainability issues, the intention to seek Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 or higher for all new homes is supported, so too requirements for green roofs, water recycling and other climate change adaptation measures. The intention to seek a combined heat and power plant for Middlesex University is supported, and early consideration should be given to the size and location of a single energy centre needed to facilitate a site wide network. This should be brought forward as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site. The Council should aim to identify whether the deployment of decentralised energy networks to supply both existing (particularly Council owned buildings) and major areas of development is feasible. It is suggested that the Council confirm that it will work with partners to maximise the opportunity to provide new networks supplied by decentralised energy.

Reference should also be made to requiring new developments to maximise the reduction in carbon dioxide through the use of on-site renewable energy sources, unless it can be demonstrated that such provision is not feasible.

In terms of transport matters, it is noted that the A10 just to the west of the area forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). The A1010 which runs north south through the site is part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The area is served by eight bus routes and a night bus service, and two railway stations: Southbury which is on the ‘Southbury Loop’ which runs from Hackney Downs to Cheshunt via Seven Sisters and Ponders End on the West Anglia Main Line. However the public transport accessibility level (PTAL) is patchy, ranging from 1 to 4 across the site, where 1 is poor and 6 is excellent.

As a general point, it would be helpful to have a map at the start showing Ponders End in the overall context of the Upper Lee Valley as well as a mechanism for locating individual maps within the overall Planning Brief area.

Page 35: In terms of highways, walking and cycling, it is noted that appendix C shows average PM, midday and PM traffic peak flows. The date and time periods of this data should be clearly stated within the text. Data for the A10 Great Cambridge Road (TLRN) should also be included as well as weekend data (considering the retail elements that exist in the area).

Page 35-37: The current operational levels of the wider highway network and future impacts resulting from development need to be clearly established, taking account of the cumulative impact of land use proposals. Proposed levels of development and transport impacts must be satisfactorily accommodated against a background of both existing and forecast transport conditions phased up to the year 2026.

It is mentioned that an A1010 Corridor study is currently under way and is to inform this brief during the consultation process. Tfl. (Surface Transport) is willing to work with the Council on this study and to assist in reviewing the outcomes. The data will require appropriate levels of validation and calibration to give sufficient weight to the results of the assessment. However, restricting the study to just the A1010 (SRN) is considered too narrow in scope as development in Ponders End Central has the potential to impact on the performance of adjacent highways (A10 Naqs Head Road and TLRN A10 Great Cambridge Road). It is intended that developers will be required to contribute to this assessment and evaluate the particular implications of their site via a full transport assessment, which is welcomed.
Page 47: The forecast years of the transport study should be based on years 2012, 2017 and 2027 (the visions put forward within the Brief). A phased impact assessment methodology should be undertaken clearly setting out development, infrastructure and public transport service changes assumed.

Page 52: With respect to parking, an assessment should be made in relation to existing on-street parking restrictions (e.g. controlled parking zones) and any potential for overspill onto the public highway. A lack of on-street parking controls would not only result in a negative impact on the local amenity but would add to concerns in relation to future vehicle trip generation and associated impacts. The Council should give consideration to the introduction of a controlled parking zone (CPZ), if one does not already exist, with developers contributing towards its implementation.

Page 52: Reference is made to changes to the High Street. All proposed changes need to be fully assessed to determine the impact on the flow of all modes of traffic. London Plan policy 3C.21 ‘Improving conditions for walking’ and consultation draft replacement London Plan policy 6.10 ‘Walking’ set out the adopted and proposed policy for walking.

Section 3.4.3: The introduction of a ‘Legible London’ pilot scheme will need to be carried out in consultation with TfL and the Wayfinding Strategy.

Section 3.4.4: TfL considers that along with showers, employers will also need to provide cycle storage. Cycle clubs, cycle pools and cycle hire should also be considered. All walk and cycle routes will need to be designed to the relevant current design guidance and provide access to destinations such as schools, retail and employment. London Plan policy 3C.22 ‘Improving Conditions for Cycling’ and consultation draft replacement London Plan policy 6.10 ‘Cycling’ set out the adopted and proposed policy for cycling.

Section 3.4.7: There should be consideration of more radical approaches to local freight and waste collection, to reduce vehicle journeys, through the introduction of stringent management regimes and potentially freight and delivery consolidation. Consideration should also be given to waste collection and consolidation of recyclable waste. All developments will need to include a delivery and servicing plan and a construction and logistics plan with their respective transport assessments. Reference should be made to the emerging TfL ‘Planning for Freight’ guidance. London Plan policy 3C.25 ‘Freight strategy’ and consultation draft replacement London Plan policy 6.14 ‘Freight’ set out the adopted and proposed policy for freight.

With respect to buses, TfL advises that there is generally sufficient capacity on bus routes along the main north south A1010 road. However if there is substantial development to the east then extra capacity on route 191 may be required. Connections are generally acceptable in the area but one way of providing extra capacity, if required, may be to introduce new direct journey opportunities. Discussions regarding any route changes or enhancements should be held with TfL London Buses. In general terms, TfL would like to see all bus stops in the area upgraded to be fully accessible and bus priority measures introduced where required, funded through developer contributions.

A factual point is noted on table 2.2 (page 9) - the frequency of route 192 and route 341 is every 10 minutes in both directions for both routes.

With respect to travel demand management, paragraph 3.4.1 refers to travel plan requirements. Overall this section is acceptable with a strong commitment to travel planning and behaviour
change. TfL welcomes this but believes it should be taken further. Travel plans are not just aimed at reducing car use, particularly single occupancy car journeys, but also to encourage people away from public transport and into more walking and cycling. Ideally travel plans will be required of all development, within reason, especially given the volume of cumulative development in the area.

Also in this section, the wording of the bullet point ‘Site specific travel plans should be developed with residents of the development sites upon and following occupation’ is not quite correct. If a site is covered by a framework travel plan that encompasses several land uses then individual travel plans are developed at a later date. However, if only individual travel plans are being produced for each land use then the plan should be written before occupation, with only a few details such as targets and some specific measures confirmed once the site is occupied.

In relation to rail services, it should be made clear that although Southbury and Ponders End are on the line to Cambridge, there are no direct services, with passengers having to change at Cheshunt or Broxbourne. There are only infrequent services between Ponders End and Bishop’s Stortford. It takes approximately 20-25 minutes from Ponders End to London Liverpool Street, not 15-20. Southbury Station can be reached from London Liverpool Street in just under half an hour. A key aspiration has been the provision of step free access at Southbury Station. However, funds for station improvements are likely to be limited within the Government’s current comprehensive spending review and alternative funding sources will have to be considered.

TfL supports improvements to service levels on the West Anglia Main Line and is actively seeking commitment for funding towards the WAML Four Tracking project which has been proposed as part of Network Rail’s improvements between 2014 and 2019. TfL recognises that this will improve the attractiveness of development to residents, business and visitors and encourages support for this scheme from developers.

I hope this letter is of assistance. Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Samantha Wells on 020 7983 4266 or by email at samantha.wells@london.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Giles Dolphin
Assistant Director - Planning

cc Joanne McCartney, London Assembly Constituency Member
    Jenny Jones, Chair of London Assembly Planning and Housing Committee
    John Pierce and Ian McNally, GOL
    Colin Lovell, TfL
    Javiera Maturana, LDA
3rd September 2010
Our Ref: JP/Planning/Job Files/J024135/Ponders End Enfield
Letters/Letter 9 - 23/08/10 reps Ponders End

By Post and Email
FAO Ms Rachel Smith
Freepost
Place Shaping Core Team
London Borough of Enfield
PO Box 61
Civic Centre
Silver Street
Enfield
Middlesex
EN1 3BR

Dear Sir / Madam

TESCO STORES LIMITED
PONDERS END CENTRAL PLANNING BRIEF

GL Hearn is instructed by Tesco Stores Limited (Tesco) to comment on the ‘Ponders End Central Planning Brief’ document. It should be noted that the following representations reflect and build upon, representations submitted during October 2009 on behalf of Tesco to the ‘Ponders End – A Framework for Change Document’.

To summarise, Tesco previously submitted representations in respect of Tesco’s store at 288 High Street, Ponders End which was identified within the Ponders End document as Development Site 10: Queensway & Tesco Car Park. In summary, the previous representations sought clarity in respect of the implementation of the Council’s objective of seeking to provide up to 160 residential units on and around the Tesco Store. This issue was raised in the context of understanding how this objective may impact on the store’s day-to-day operation, such as customer access, servicing and deliveries as well as general uncertainty.

In view of the above, Tesco requested the opportunity to be involved in the development of the planning brief for Ponders End. To date, there have not been any such discussions. Consequently, and given that little further detail has been provided in the current Planning Brief in respect of the Tesco Car Park, we would again re-iterate our request for a meeting to discuss the site.

Section 1 - Ponders End Central

Paragraph 1 on page 15 provides the context to Ponders End Central area and in doing so explains that the High Street is at the heart of Ponders End and benefits from a diversity of retailers. In view of this the Council states that the High Street should be, ‘the focus of a thriving community’.
The Tesco store at 288 High Street makes a significant contribution to the vitality and viability of the High Street as well as making a sizeable contribution towards local employment and the Town Centre’s retail function. The store also provides for much needed car parking which serves the needs of visitors to the store and the High Street.

The contribution that the store makes to the area is acknowledged within paragraph 3 which explains that the location of the store to the north of the High Street provides an anchor to the Town Centre and offers useful car parking to visitors of the store and the High Street.

Despite the contribution that the store and car park makes to the Town Centre, it is explained under the final paragraph of page 17 that the car park covers a large surface area and creates gaps in buildings fronting Queensway. This statement effectively seeks to provide justification for the redevelopment of the Tesco car park of which we comment upon later.

Notwithstanding, whilst it is acknowledged that the car park does indeed cover a large surface area, this is an inherent characteristic of a car park, and as acknowledged by the Council, the car park in its current form makes a significant contribution to the High Street in terms of providing visitor car parking as well as visitors to the Tesco Store which in turn makes a significant contribution to the High Street’s retail function.

We provide further comments on the suitability of part of Tesco’s car park for an alternative form of development but for the reasons set out above it is considered that the redevelopment of the car park will be to the detriment of the town centre.

Section 2 – Developing a Vision and Principles for Ponders End

In developing a vision and principles for Ponders End paragraph 1 of Section 2 explains that,

"The ideas behind this Planning Brief have been gradually developed in dialogue with residents and other stakeholders over a considerable period of time."

Tesco finds this statement questionable given that Council has not discussed the emerging proposal with Tesco following previous representations. Accordingly, Tesco would again respectfully request that the Council engage in discussions in respect of the Car Park site.
Section 3 – Planning Brief, Vision, Principles and Guidance

Paragraph 3.2.2 – Residential-led mixed use development (C3 land use) will be supported on the Queensway Campus Site, High Street and Tesco Sites

In pursuance of the Council’s objective of seeking to identify locations for future housing it is made clear that the Council is looking to achieve residential development of between 60-90 residential units on the Tesco Site.

There is no further guidance on this matter and notably no plan or text identifying how the site will be developed or where the proposed residential units are to be located. On this basis, Tesco reverts back to a common theme raised in previous representations submitted during March 2009 which effectively sought clarification as to how the Council intends to realise the redevelopment of the Tesco Car Park site.

The fundamental concern in this respect is the impact that the proposed residential development may have on the operation of the Tesco Store at the High Street. This is particularly important given that the Tesco store acts as an anchor to the High Street, provides significant employment opportunities and makes a sizeable contribution to the vitality and viability of the High Street.

The appropriateness of the Council’s approach towards the redevelopment of Tesco’s Car Park becomes even more concerning when consideration is given to the fact that the High Street suffers from a number of issues relating to diversity of retail units, high vacancy levels. All of which are compounded by the closure of the former Middlesex University Campus and associated loss of trade.

Section 3 – Planning Brief, Vision, Principles and Guidance

Paragraph 3.3.8 – More Efficient Use of the Land around Tesco

Under Paragraph 3.3.8 the Council makes reference to the usefulness of the Tesco Car Park both in terms of visitors to the store and those visiting the High Street. However, in the same paragraph the contribution that the car park makes is disregarded by virtue of the fact that suggests that there is scope to provide between 60-90 residential units.

Accordingly, there is little account of the impact that redeveloping the Tesco Store Car Park, either in part or full, will have on the vitality and viability of the High Street. As with comments in respect of how the redevelopment proposal is to be achieved, further consideration needs to be given to the impact the loss of car parking will have on the High Street.
Section 4 - Indicative Masterplan

In pursuance of the Council’s objective for the High Street and the wider Ponders End area, a draft conceptual masterplan has been prepared. Whilst this plan is useful in the context of the overall aspirations for the area it does not provide any form of guidance, either in terms of illustrative or detailed, in respect of how the Council envisages the redevelopment of the Tesco Car Park.

Indeed, and in terms of the car park, the masterplan simply includes the site within the masterplan boundary and states, ‘Potential site for future housing (60 -90 units)’. Furthermore, the site is subsequently omitted from options A & B which illustrate how the wider area could be transformed.

In view of the above and in line with comments made within these and previous representations clarification is sought as to how the Council intends to realise its objective of delivering residential development on the Tesco Car Park. Tesco looks forward to discussing this matter with the Council in due course.

This concludes Tesco’s written representations.

Should you have any queries with regards the above please do contact Paul Manning of GL Hearn in the first instance.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Paul Manning MRTPI
Planning Director
paul_manning@glhearn.com
Neighbourhood Regeneration Team
Place Shaping and Enterprise
London Borough of Enfield
PO Box 61
Civic Centre
Silver Street
Enfield
EN1 3BR

27 August 2010

Dear Sirs

Ponders End Central Planning Brief
Comments on consultation document

We write on behalf of our client, Inpath Ltd., who are the owners of the Former Middlesex University site that forms the heart of Ponders End Central Area, to make comments on the planning brief that has been issued for consultation purposes. The development team that has been put together by Inpath Ltd has been in discussions with officers from the Council for several months regarding the future redevelopment of the former university site. We look forward to continuing positive dialogue with the Council over the coming months. However, we wish to make the following comments on the draft brief.

We wholeheartedly support the Council’s aspiration to transform Ponders End into a vibrant town centre with development of architectural excellence.

We consider that the planning brief has been put together well and clearly sets out the objectives and principles for the future development of the area. The introduction clearly states that the planning brief should be flexible and be able to respond to, and accommodate, a range of options for detailed design. We consider that this recognition of the need for flexibility will be important in enabling a viable and deliverable development to come forward on the former university site and must be included in any final brief that is adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

We note that the aim of the brief is to provide more detail to Core Policy 41 of the Core Strategy and to set out the principles of development indicating the broad development parameters of land use mix and quantum of development for the key sites. It will outline the planning policy framework that developments should adhere to and it is intended that it will be flexible in order to be able to respond to and accommodate a range of options for detailed design. Again, we welcome the inherent flexibility that it is within the consultation version of the brief and urge the Council to carry this through to the final version.
We note that the brief states in the reasoning behind its preparation that it is crucial that development on the former university site is of the right size and type and has the right connections to thrive. The development of this site is seen as the impetus for preparing the brief but that the rejuvenation of the High Street is equally crucial. We agree that any future development will need to be of the right size and type, but this should be determined by the constraints of the site and the surroundings, having regard to the aims and policies of the emerging Core Strategy and making the best and most efficient use of previously developed land. We strongly consider that the brief should acknowledge that any future development of the site will need to be a viable and deliverable proposal and in order for development to come forward the size and type of development will be determined by what is ultimately a viable and deliverable scheme on the site.

It is clear that there is an opportunity to bring the site back into use in ways that will rejuvenate the High Street, which is currently suffering. The redevelopment of the former university site is seen as vital in order to bring forward the regeneration of the High Street, which is identified in the brief as being equally crucial. Therefore, in order to be able to kick start the regeneration of the High Street, it is considered that the brief needs to be flexible in order to allow a deliverable and viable development to come forward on the former university site.

We acknowledge the 5 guiding principles identified in the brief for development in the wider Ponders End Central area to contribute towards, in summary: green spaces and accessible streets, homes for all, a lively town centre providing jobs and prosperity, an inclusive and accessible neighbourhood; and a sustainable neighbourhood.

In particular, we would wish to comment on the vision for housing. The brief supports a residential-led mixed use development of the Ponders End Central Area and identifies a quantum of development of between 350-450 new residential units on the former university site. We consider that there may be scope to provide more dwellings on this site, which would significantly help contribute towards the Core Strategy Policy 41 objective of up to 1,000 dwelling in Ponders End by 2026. Ultimately, we consider that the quantum and density of any future development on the former university site should be determined by an assessment of the appropriate scale, bulk and mass of new building, and the quality of its design, in relation to the existing listed buildings and surrounding development; the level of public transport accessibility, the protection of amenity of existing neighbouring residents and the provision of satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers of the development. This may well result in more units being able to be provided on the site.

The brief seeks a mix of housing tenures and types across the area and states that the size and mix of both market and affordable housing should reflect the need for larger family housing, as required by Core Strategy policy, which should include houses and duplexes. Core Strategy policies relating to both the provision of affordable housing and housing type are Borough-wide targets and should not necessarily be rigidly applied on an individual site-by-site basis. We are pleased to see that the brief recognises that the amount of affordable housing on individual sites will be subject to viability testing. However, we consider that the brief needs to also recognise that the appropriate housing mix across all tenures, not just intermediate housing, will also be
determined on a site-by-site basis subject to the financial viability of bringing sites forward for development.

We consider that the requirement for 100% amenity space for houses and 75% amenity space for flats needs further clarification to explain how this will be calculated.

We recognise that the architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings on the site needs to be respected. However, we consider that the description of the Broadbent Building, gym and caretaker’s house as an ‘architectural gem’ exaggerates their quality. The brief recognises the need to find a viable use for the building in order to ensure its long-term survival, and therefore there will need to be some flexibility in the approach to the conversion of this building and it is considered that the brief needs to recognise this in order to achieve this aim. Government guidance has always advised that most listed buildings can accommodate new uses and that although achieving a balance between the special interest of the listed building and proposals for alteration can be demanding, it is rarely impossible if reasonable flexibility and imagination are shown by all parties involved.

The brief outlines indicative massing across the site and identifies that taller elements can be located towards the northern end of the site. We would consider that there are opportunities in the northern and central part of the site towards the High Street for well-designed taller buildings than envisaged in the brief, which would not harm the setting of the listed building, have no impact on the residential amenities of existing residents, would not appear over-dominant given the existing buildings on the site and its location in central Ponders End, and provide a welcome enhancement to the current townscape. We therefore consider it important that any indication of height in the brief remains indicative so that there is scope to consider alternatives.

Although we recognise that the masterplan contained with the planning brief in Section 4 is indicative, we consider that some of the summary guiding principles quoted need to be reworded. In particular, the requirement for a residential led mixed use development of 350-450 units of predominantly family housing is considered to be inconsistent with the identified visions of the brief in Section 3, which encourages family housing rather than requires such housing to be provided. The quotation of the Core Strategy affordable housing Borough-wide targets is also considered to be inconsistent with the vision identified in Section 3, which acknowledges that the quantum of affordable housing will be based upon viability.

We would consider it more appropriate if the masterplan requirements in relation to housing sought a residential-led development with the provision of family housing encouraged and the maximum viable amount of affordable housing to be provided on site.

Finally, we have financially tested an indicative scheme based on the masterplan’s layout, massing and height and applying Core Strategy policies in respect of housing mix and affordable housing provision. This exercise, using residential sales prices provided by local agents and build costs from our surveyors, has demonstrated to us that a strict interpretation of the masterplan brief will not result in viable or deliverable development being able to come forward on the site. The need for flexibility within the brief in relation to the quantum of development, the type of housing provided and the
provision of affordable housing is therefore of paramount importance if a deliverable scheme is to be found for this site.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Simon Wallis
The London Planning Practice

d  020 7420 6370
e  sw@londonpp.co.uk
Dear Sir

Response to Ponders End Central Planning Brief

Please see my responses to your questionnaire, which is attached. I also want to write separately as the form does not have much room for comments.

I have run a business from Queensway for 22 years. In that time I have seen the area change. Not always for the worse, but I would agree that most of the aspects in the Vision for Ponders End in your brief are missing and what is there needs building on to create the Vision. Currently one of the worst things about Ponders End is the traffic. At all times of day the High Street from Lincoln Road to Nags Head Road is congested, which makes getting in and out of Ponders End in all directions frustrating and time consuming. This needs to be addressed as the mix of traffic buses and pedestrians is lethal.

Along with this issue goes parking and I would strongly recommend that very careful consideration is given to the proposals for getting rid of car parking spaces in the area. Also, if and when new buildings/houses are built, enough car parking needs to be provided.

I am particularly interested in your plans for Queensway. I think the old University site needs developing so that it becomes productive land again.

I think that generally Queensway lends itself to studio and light industrial use because of its access restrictions.

I would like to support the re-use of old buildings. I think this would help keep the character of Ponders End. The only exception to this is the Roberts Building, which is not on the plan, but would appear to be in the old University site. If it is the tall one I think it is, then I have no preference about it going or remaining.

Regarding the new public square I think there should be cafe style restaurants as well as stalls for artisans to sell their crafts and a Farmers Market. It should be designed so that it is used for most of the day/evening so that it does not lapse into a sad dis-used space, used only by people loitering and up to no good.
I am interested in the development of Ponders End and as a local businessman I would like to be consulted as the project develops. I would also like to be involved where I can.

Yours faithfully

K. Christou

Kerry Christou
**Resident (Additional comments to questionnaire)**

**Additional comments to Ponders End Central Planning Brief Questionnaire**

Mainly relating to principle 4

**Connecting Ponders End**

Central Ponders End needs to be connected.

It could be the central crossing point of footpaths / running ways / cycle routes between

- The recently renovated QEII athletics track with the National Athletics track at the Lee Valley
- Enfield town with route through the reservoirs to Chingford and Sewardstone Road paths

Connecting a local sports facility, the renovated QEII track and the National athletics training centre with a green foot / path / run / cycle way is beneficial. The places are ~3 miles apart. Ponders End is in the middle of the route. Physically it shows the path from local to national excellence and resonant with 2012 Olympics.

**Better Access to Southbury Railway station**

Create step free entrance to Southbury railway station from Emilia Close (off Kingsway, near junction with Queensway) to the end of the London bound platform.

- Easy to do
- Automatic ticket machine / CCTV camera could be added at entrance if required
- Makes Southbury railway station much closer to Broadbent Centre (ex Middlesex University / Queensway campus site), Lincoln Road (Kingsway / Lincoln Road / Suffolk Road / Norfolk Road / Oxford Road)
- Northbound platform step free access is less straight forward, two options are:-
  - Slope downside of existing station stairs from Southbury Road bridge starting where the current bicycle rack is located (entrance could be integrated into existing station buildings)
  - Create pathway from southern end of platform to Lincoln Way (near to entrance to the Haslemere industrial estate). This might be simple to do, opens up Southbury station to the south however does make a long way round to gain step free access from one platform to the other.
- If Southbury is made step free, then other stations on the line should also be made step free, especially Seven Sisters

**Rail service**

Ponders End will develop if better connected, example train frequency of every 15 or 20 minutes.

My understanding is that the Lee Valley railway line is at full capacity and it is not practical to increase frequency of trains stopping at Brimsdown and Ponders End unless the line is expanded to 4 tracks; a desire but unlikely to occur this decade. However there is capacity to increase train frequency through Southbury to Seven Sisters in the near future (however not Liverpool street due to restricted capacity). Consideration should be given to allocating Ponders End money to facilitating an increased service along the line including Seven Sister railway station development. This will benefit Ponders End. For example, at Seven Sisters station adding a central turn back siding (be constructed in /over the South Tottenham line triangle) and a third platform face (turn the north bound (west side) platform into an island platform) would enable a significantly better rail service to be run between the Victorian Tube line and Enfield Borough in general.
Resident (Additional comments to questionnaire)

**Background:** I was born in 1966 in Lincoln Road and my mum still lives there. I have shopped at Ponders End and used the park and community facilities (Library, Ponders End Congregational Church, Doctors and Dentist) most of my life. I am still a regular shopper and am still registered at the doctors at Dean House Surgery.

**Starting from Left to Right of the plan**

**Improved access to Southbury Station:**

This is a really good idea – perhaps installing a lift down to the platforms. However I'm not sure if a wheelchair could easily gain access onto the trains from the platform. This is something the rail company would have to address.

**The Queensway Campus – Housing Development - problems with school places**

I understand there is a need for affordable housing particularly as the make-up of the population of Ponders End are some of the most deprived people in the Borough, largely living on benefits. However, there seems to be no provision for either primary schools or Secondary schools in the plan to accommodate all these extra families, who generally have more children per family than 2. The plan is in danger of turning Ponders End into a residential ghetto with no infrastructure or work opportunities to support it.

When I spoke to the young lady from your team when there was a consultation desk at Tesco's and who gave me this leaflet, she seemed to think that St Matthews, Southbury and Alma Road primary schools would somehow absorb them. I pointed out that St Matthews only take Church of England religion families. This would exclude the Muslim families.

Southbury and Alma Road (which is a bit of a trek from the High Street Area) Primary schools cannot take on all these extra children as well as the children already living in the area who need to go to school too.

This young lady's attitude to Secondary school provision was that Oasis Academy Hadley, which is to be relocated to the Ponders End Ga works site, would also absorb the additional Secondary school age children. However she seemed to ignore those kids already living in the area, as well as the children who will have to bus from the existing old Albany school area to use this school.

I worked at Albany school before it became an academy and I know that many of the children come from far afield, sometimes as far as Hackney. I think there should be a change in education policy so that only those children living in the Borough to go the Enfield schools. There needs to be room for additional intake built into Oasis Academy Hadley on the Ponders End GAS works site. No-one seems to have taken into account that there have been a large number of flats built on the old Long and Somerville site, now named Poppy Drive and when these are occupied there will already be pressure on
existing schools. There is too much concentration of housing in Queensway, i.e. too many flats. Why can’t houses be built with gardens for the kids to play in? Concentrating people in small compact flats is not good for raising a family, even if there is communal space outside.

Taller elements of Housing proposed on the High Street should be set back from the High Street to make the general vista of the shopping area more pleasing to look at. If tall buildings are placed directly on the High Street it makes a small area overbearing and unattractive, especially if it overlooks a smaller more ornate building such as The Goat Public House.

**Improved setting for the Church (United Reformed College Court)**

Because of the change in Ponders End demographics, the congregation of this church has diminished drastically. When I went to the Church in my youth there were Boys and Girls Brigades, clubs for elderly people, Sunday schools and 3 services on a Sunday. It only has a lay preacher now and one service on a Sunday, and you are lucky if 10 people turn up. I believe an Evangelical group use it as well but the Church is essentially dying and the Church hall, which used to be a really well used community facility is barely used. It might be an idea to knock it down and build a primary school on the site.

**Ponders End Library**

The Plan shows that the present building is demolished. This is a shame, but I admit it is a bit out-of-the-way. If it is to be demolished, it must be moved to the Swan Annexe building which fronts the High Street. Ponders End MUST retain a library.

**Ponders End Police Station and Play Street**

The plan shows that this is demolished. In my view, a Police Station is essential, especially in an area of high population density, which is open to the public. In its place you have included a play street.

Without Police presence and high density population, the Play street, being tucked away out of site is just asking to become a place for drug dealing and criminal activity and thus become ‘no-go’ areas. This is hardly a contribution to community safety. I thought Councils were supposed to 'design out' potential areas of anti-social problems.

Play areas must be confined to the immediate areas where housing is concentrated so that parents can keep an eye on their kids without worrying about them.

The Play Street also appears to cut straight through the High Street. How does this contribute to a) road safety and b) congestion on the High Road?.

Have the people who have drawn up this plan ever visited Ponders End?

The Play areas take up the space currently used as a free car park in College Court. The people who live in College Court park their cars here. Where will they park if this is removed? This car park is also handy if you want to shop at any of the shops at that end of the High Street. If you want to revitalise Ponders End, you should remove all parking charges for the area e.g. in the service roads in front of the shops. Since the charges were introduced, fewer people park in the service roads and the shops have suffered as a
result.

Community Facilities Generally

There is no need for additional Doctors facilities in the Tara Kindergarten area. There is a custom-made surgery at Dean House Surgery. The problem which needs addressing is the number of doctors available. If the extra people being housed in Ponders End need a Doctor there is Dean House Surgery and Eagle House Surgery. Dean House was originally built to house 3 doctors and a day clinic room. It now has only one doctor. Doctors are hard to attract so something needs to be done to get this particular piece of infrastructure sorted out before any further housing is built.

The Co-op Chemist needs to be retained. Having a separate pharmacy next to a Doctor's surgery will only take away customers from this facility and you will end up with yet another empty shop on the High Street. Dean House Surgery used to have a Pharmacy attached but this closed up because they couldn't make it pay. Tescos also has a Pharmacy so there would be a surfeit of Chemists in the area. You need to make sure that there is not too much of the same kind of shop or facility in the same short stretch of road, as the competition it engenders results in businesses failing and more empty shops.

There needs to be a proper Post Office. At present there is a tiny Sub post office at the back of a tiny newsagent in the row of shops at the end of Derby Road. Usually there is only one or two counters open. If there is an increase in population in Ponders End a proper Post office is required. The queues go out of the door as it is, so more capacity is required.

A revitalised High Street

There are too many shops which don't sell anything people really want. There is a surfeit of cafes, hairdressers, and restaurants. Tescos has dominated the High Street and the two other supermarkets next to it are really struggling. However Tescos are not going away. They sell cheap food. There are a number of smaller green grocers/grocers who concentrate on ethnic foodstuffs but these are only frequented by ethnic minority shoppers. There is a general lack of diversity of shops. Years ago there was a wet fish shop, a butchers, stationers, a launderette, a shoe shop a toy shop and various small friendly grocers, but they all closed up because they couldn't make it pay. There are no decent clothes shops. Perhaps if a leading brand name like Marks and Spencers took some units it might make Ponders End a real shopping destination.

Community facilities should include a lunch club for the elderly (How about using the United Reformed Church Hall?) and After School clubs and maybe a Youth Club to keep the youth out of trouble.

When I spoke to the young lady, she suggested putting some industrial units in Tesco's car park. I think this is not a good idea as there is hardly any space in the current Tesco Car park as it is, and is chock-a-block at Christmas time. I don't think Tescoes would agree anyway as they want to maximise their profits. The shops in front of the car park are not very useful, so maybe these units could go there in their place, bearing in mind there are people living above the shops.

The Park
All community facilities should be confined to the park. There is no point in having a ‘festival ready public square’ as this would stay empty for most of the time. It would better be used as a parking area. The White Hart Public House looks like it has closed which is a common thing for pubs these days. How about setting up this site as a market stall area? There has already been a stall selling vegetables outside this pub before its demise. Then if a festival square is required over and above the area in the park, the market square could be used. Any improvements to the park must be maintained. For instance the adult exercise equipment has been installed but never maintained so when you want to use it, most of the pieces have seized up.

**Transport**

Only the 191 bus will serve the new Oasis Academy Hadley. The children coming from Enfield Wash area to attend this school and who use the 279 will have to change buses or walk up South Street, which for some of the more obese ones will probably be too much for them. There should be negotiations with the Bus company to change routes of other buses to serve this school.

As the Plan stands I do not think it will improve Ponders End. Apart from shopping at Tescos, which I access via the Southbury Road and maybe an occasional visit to my doctor’s I would personally not choose to visit the area for shopping or seek to move to the area simply because the proposed population density and lack of infrastructure.

However, although I have put a lot of thought and effort into this response, and, having worked in Local Government for over 30 years, I am aware that these ‘consultations’ are procedural requirements and I have very little hope that anyone will note what I have to say, let alone act on them.

R E Parkinson
31/8/10.
Dear Daisy Johnson,

RLC Council

Resident and Regeneration Officer

An effect to the newsletter... following recent circulation of the adhered to by criterion of interactive community involvement.

In pursuit of such an "Agenda" in the most diplomatically, that Enfield Council's actionnaire, justly proven, demonstrates a coincidental league of political correctness, affirmative is the generally erred efficiency and pleasing notion association definitive of the finer rules of Labour marginalised inherent artefacts are de tertiomyché Marxism thoroughly Communist Values appear safeguarded topicality at the outset insistence of the Council's maxim tenet distribution approach by them
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change, and readjustments within the
locality.

Yours Sincerely
# Questionnaire Respondent Representations from “Planning Brief Lite”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep No.</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Objection/ support/ comment (O/S/C)</th>
<th>Representation made</th>
<th>Officer comment</th>
<th>Change made to the Planning Brief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 PEC5 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>To improve the residents in the area to more owner occupied would increase how people care for there area. Too many rented properties and tenants with no respect for the area is the biggest problem</td>
<td>Developers will be required to provide 60% market and 40% affordable housing and within that a 50% social rented and 40% intermediate split. The intermediate homes are aimed at people like “key workers” (police, nurses, etc) and restrict owners from sub-letting to others. This should have a positive impact on the local buy-to-let market.</td>
<td>40% intermediate (not 30%) in the 40% affordable allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 PEC5 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spread the tenants over the whole Enfield area. If you continue to allow every home in Ponders End, Edmonton to be rented you will create a ghetto. No more takeaway, an area needs to attract shopper, takeaways do not do this</td>
<td>Re tenant issue, see response above. Takeaways will be restricted on the High Street as a result of strong views expressed by residents about this matter.</td>
<td>40% intermediate (not 30%) in the 40% affordable allocation. Takeaways restricted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 PEC6 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>That the younger generation need hopes of a future not the prospects of hanging about in the park all night now they are left unlocked and a high street full of cafes, take aways and off licenses. What is the White Hart going to make way for? A building that has been here long before us all that live here now, what ever. Its bound to be something that will not benefit any of us. I live right opposite.</td>
<td>The planning brief proposed retaining this building for heritage value but support was not strong enough. A planning application has not yet been submitted for the White Hart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 PEC10 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve on the sanitation of the area and alley ways</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 PEC22 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>More CCTV cameras to stop vandalism. Also Police Park patrol.</td>
<td>Noted and reported to Enfield Business Retailers Association Parks Police can be reached by contacting: Crawford Buchanan, PS 44YE, Ponders End SNT, T: 0208 345 1312; T: 0208 721 2682</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>PEC30</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Are we sure we need more new homes? There are already developments near the old post office, Southbury Station and it all adds up to more traffic, both people and cars and its unpleasant.</td>
<td>Ponders End is in a growth corridor which runs from London-Peterborough which means that it is considered suitable for more housing growth. At the local level, there is an identified need for more housing, especially family (3 bed plus). See Enfield’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment for detail. There were mixed views about the use of part of the Tesco car park for housing, which is why the Planning Brief will be amended to keep the site more flexible, possibly allowing for employment or leisure uses. Approach to Tesco housing site more flexible to allow for other uses (eg leisure, employment) and a new access into the car park at this point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>PEC30</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ponders End lacks a heart, should more than just fast food shops and supermarkets. Local business should be encouraged in terms of diversity (range of different shops).</td>
<td>Proposals to improve Ponders End Park, create a new square at College Court and the High Street regeneration project were all designed to achieve this aim. During consultation however residents of College Court expressed reservations about this proposed new square. To respond to these concerns the plans have been amended. New square at College Court has been downgraded to a “green pedestrian/cycle link”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>PEC31</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>The number of pigeons needs to be reduced.</td>
<td>Noted. Building designs to discourage pigeon roosting in detailed design guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>PEC31</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Also, in Ponders End as many as 20 people from overseas live in a 3-bed house. Can Enfield Council help in this matter?</td>
<td>Noted No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>PEC32</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Foot and cycle connection not needed. Not healthy and welcoming at all.</td>
<td>Noted No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>PEC32</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>More thought for people already living in the area. Now new street parallel to Derby Road with mins/terraced houses, Long &amp; Sommerville site mk II.</td>
<td>Noted The developer will be encouraged to look at the design of this site in detail and the final planning brief is more flexible in its approach. Design in final brief is more schematic (less specific), enabling Enfield to explore detailed design with the developers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>PEC35</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Keep the character of Ponders End with BRICK façade buildings (not all glass and hideous colour paint) with attic style flats on the top in keep with Tara Building and the shops near the Park. The rainwater runs off the sloping roofs for recycling.</td>
<td>Whilst viability will affect the materials the developers use to construct new homes, the Planning Brief requires Sustainable Code Level 4 or BREEAM Excellent in new development in this location. Encouraging an integrated approach to water management (including rainwater harvesting) is included in the draft Brief.</td>
<td>The importance of the local character of the area has been brought out in the final brief. Developer to be encouraged to use sustainable design and construction methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>PEC35</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Too many walk ways will make rat runs for anti social behaviour. It will be like broadwater farm, too many people in a small area - congests the roads and hard to police</td>
<td>Conversely, the more active streets you have that are overlooked, the less antisocial behaviour (ASB) takes place. Closed, sparsely populated, quiet backstreets are generally more likely to attract ASB than an active, well-lit street with people using it day and night.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>PEC36</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Small friendly centres set up for people to go to with issues of concern. Tends to be more friendly than police stations.</td>
<td>There are a number of voluntary organisations operating in the area, all of which have a different remit. For those not wishing to speak to the police (perhaps because the issue is a general concern rather than an acute problem) the Ponders End Community Development Trust may be a good starting point. Whilst community facilities are being factored into proposals, viability of future developments must be taken into account at this difficult economic time.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>PEC36</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Need more help to tackle anti-social behaviour, more safety around park areas where children and vulnerable people are. More nice shops rather than kebab and chicken joints!</td>
<td>The local Safer Neighbourhoods Team can be reached by contacting Crawford Buchanan, PS 44YE, Ponders End SNT, T: 0208 345 1312; T: 0208 721 2682 Takeaways will be restricted following community consultation.</td>
<td>Takeaways to be limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>PEC37</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>We need something new in Ponders End to go shopping / to spend time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposals to regenerate the High Street are designed to achieve that objective. The buildings will be designed to accommodate a range of business types and sizes, and will be flexible enough to accommodate change in future. The Creative Ponders End Working Group is a group of local residents, artists, etc who wish to encourage a creative hub in the area. To join, contact Daisy Johnson on 020 8379 5598 or email: <a href="mailto:placeshaping@enfield.gov.uk">placeshaping@enfield.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ponders End Park is being improved to provide more facilities for local people. Work has already started and detailed design is ongoing. If you wish to be involved in the project development, contact Daisy Johnson on 020 8379 5598 or email: <a href="mailto:placeshaping@enfield.gov.uk">placeshaping@enfield.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>PEC37</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>And to move the mosque to some where like industrial areas - not in the high street - and every Friday/special day they block whole high street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mosque is a well used community facility and needs to be accessible. There are issues about parking at certain times, which is something Enfield is addressing with the Trustees of the Mosque and will be factored into future regeneration plans. No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>PEC37</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No more A3-A5 in the areas. We need different kind of shop activities in the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted Takeaways to be limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>PEC38</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>One issue I do have is for a new square - this I feel would encourage even more undesirables to the area in question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposals for the new square received mixed responses, with some people very supportive and other people concerned. As a result, the square proposals have been downgraded from square to “new green pedestrian/cycle link” which will enable people to walk from the High Street into the Queensway Campus site. Whilst the space will be designed to be flexible enough to accommodate this request High Street regeneration plans to accommodate this request New square downgraded to “green pedestrian/cycle link”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20 PEC38</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Does improve the area around the mosque mean it will be made larger? If so a big ‘NO’</td>
<td>There is a need to enable the Mosque to function better at certain times (parking is a particular concern), and, at this key entrance to the Queensway Campus site there is a need to ensure it is fully integrated into plans. Discussions are ongoing with the Mosque trustees.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 1.21 PEC38 | O | 1. No more Cafes please! Or community markets. 2. No more roof terraces as these create lots of noise i.e. take a look at the roof terrace over the rear of Kays hairdressers in High Street!” 3. “Lively Evening Economy”? 5. No community market, rooftop growing thank you | The concern about the number of cafes is shared by a number of people, not least existing café owners on the High Street. There are others who would like to see different kinds of cafes introduced (for example health foods). There may be scope for a variety of café uses. Takeaways will be resisted because of strong resident views. An informal market was in operation for some time in front of the White Hart pub but now this has been cordoned off this no longer takes place. There is an interest in food growing locally (the allotments are nearby and there is support for community growing in the Lee Valley near Wharf Road). A market would enable local people to buy food as part of a wider market offering. The market needs to be scoped, however. Despite being potentially noisy, roof terraces can be a good way of enabling people to have some access to amenity space in busy town centre locations. Rooftop growing could be a good way of enabling people who do not have gardens to grow their own | Takeaways will be limited. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PEC</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>PEC40</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>This attempts to turn an urban area into a rural one and will not work</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>PEC41</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>The proposed vision is EXTREMELY ambitious. Ponders End is currently far from prosperous, inclusive, clean, green and stable. I think it is commendable to lay out this vision but practically I think it will be impossible to achieve since the community has changed so radically and those who remain have less ties to the area and prosperous middle class families will always want to move out of the area.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>PEC47</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>This area will become a ghetto - tomorrow's slum with shoe box shaped buildings. We need nice character buildings with traditional shaped roofs</td>
<td>Plans amended to require developers to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>PEC49</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.4 be careful re: “de-cluttering”. Railings are there for a reason = (Health + Safety)? The more red + cycle routes the better (not cars)</td>
<td>Other people have raised concerns about decluttering and shared surfaces, in particular visually impaired groups have warned against the perils of removing railings/introducing less defined areas of public realm. The idea behind the statement is to improve the quality of the High Street, to make it easier for people to move around, to remove signage that is not necessary. This comment will be taken into account at detailed design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>PEC50</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Flood area of litter ban / and advertising ********* / keep Ponders End clean</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>PEC52</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>There more emphasis on new housing than employment places. Where will people work? Links to the green areas (spaces) together.</td>
<td>Employment space will be encouraged within the Queensway Campus site itself, on Queensway and on the High Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>PEC53</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>You have completely ignored the demographic make-up of Ponders End, which is now mainly Muslim religion and people from Somalia and poorer countries. I have never seen any Muslim lady in a Burka on a bicycle, so some of your visions don't address the requirements of people living there. I am attaching a point by point critique of faults in this plan.</td>
<td>The need to address the issue of climate change and reduce dependency on the private motor car transcends nationality and faith. One of the big complaints about Ponders End is the large volume of traffic and congestion so, by encouraging those who can to cycle or walk to places, pressure will be relieved on the road and public transport networks. It is however recognised that walking and cycling is not a possibility for everyone which is why the approach to parking is to remain flexible, and proposals to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>PEC53</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>There is too much emphasis on 'arty cr afty' stuff, which in the end doesn't pay the rent. Why don't you concentrate on making Ponders End a working centre, so that even these people who have little English language can get a job where academic qualifications don't matter, but will pull them out of poverty. That is what is most important.</td>
<td>the key junctions on the High Street (Nags Head Road and South St) are being developed. New employment opportunities will be provided on the Queensway Campus site itself, on Queensway and on the High Street. Creative Enfield, the Council's Strategy for improving the cultural offering in the borough, identifies Ponders End as a potential hub for arts/creative facilities. Ponders End is already a very creative community with a variety of voluntary groups organising events. People have told us that there is a need for informal learning opportunities such as arts, crafts and music classes. Finally, it is widely acknowledged that the arts play a part in the regeneration of areas, for example, Dalston, Hackney, has blossomed in recent years as creative people have moved in and transformed underused spaces into performance and arts space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>OE4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Plenty of litter bins (to be emptied everyday), shops to be responsible for ensuring area outside their premises is neat and tidy. No excessive advertising on windows. Flowers and trees regularly maintained.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>OE7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>HIGHER VISIBILITY, BETTER LIGHTING, WE WANT A FRIENDLY AREA, NOT &quot;THEM + US&quot;</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>OE21</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Less jumble more quality shops less fast food outlets, needs centre and something to be proud of</td>
<td>There are issues with some shops spilling out onto the High Street which will be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
addressed with the businesses in question. The High Street regeneration scheme will encourage a variety of shops to cater for different needs.

It is envisaged the centre will focus around the entrance to the park (when it is complete) and the High Street regeneration proposals around College Court will support this objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.33</th>
<th>OE26</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Please include a craft shop that sells paper, stickers and wool</th>
<th>Noted</th>
<th>The planning brief allows for a variety of sizes of shop units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>OE23</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I do hope we have more useful shops, and not too many kebab shops and there are enough of them and to aim for a bit more british</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>Takeaways to be restricted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.0 High Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>PEC19</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Houses should be built away from High Street</th>
<th>Residential development will be encouraged on the Queensway Campus site, the High Street (above shops and business uses at ground floor) and on the Swan Annex site as part of a mixed use development. The housing proposed on the Tesco site will be reviewed with the landowner and in policy terms (in the North East Enfield Area Action Plan).</th>
<th>Tesco site no longer inflexibly allocated as housing site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>PEC30</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>The high street requires more grassy areas.</td>
<td>Noted. Will be included in proposals to TfL to improve the High Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>PEC34</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>the High St should be retail + community facilities. I don't want anymore eateries.</td>
<td>Noted. In order to make the High Street regeneration project financially viable it will be necessary to provide flats above. This will not negatively impact the High Street because shops will be provided at ground floor level. It could have a positive impact</td>
<td>Takeaways will be limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.4 | PEC46 | C | **as more residents move into the area who would use local shops and services.**
|     |     |   | **Noted. This issue will be raised with individual business owners.**
|     |     |   | **No change**
| 2.5 | PEC47 | O | **There are too many flats - It will make it overcrowded. Keep the High Street for shops**
|     |     |   | **The High Street will have shops and services at ground floor. It is common for flats to be reprovided on High Streets above shops. This has the dual benefit of making developments more financially viable and increasing footfall to the shops themselves.**
|     |     |   | **No change**

**3.0 Queensway**

| 3.1 | PEC39 | S | **I think that generally Queensway lends itself to studio and light industrial use because of its access restrictions.**
|     |     |   | **Noted**
|     |     |   | **No change**

**4.0 College Court**

| 4.1 | PEC25 | C | **It is a pity the College Court couldn’t be developed into a new College with grounds as it was during the 60’s and 70’s. It has been left to run down.**
|     |     |   | **Noted**
|     |     |   | **No change**
| 4.2 | PEC39 | S | **Regarding the new public square I think there should be café style restaurants as well as stalls for artisans to sell their crafts and a Farmers Market. It should be designed so that it is used for most of the day/ evening so that it does not lapse into a sad disused space, used only by people loitering and up to no good.**
|     |     |   | **The new square has been downgraded from square to green link following concerns from residents of College Court. The green link will be flexible enough to allow for occasional events such as markets but these will not define the space.**
|     |     |   | **New square own graded to green pedestrian/cycle link**

**5.0 Heritage Buildings**

| 5.1 | PEC22 | S | **Also any original buildings in High Street should be retained or new building should be done in traditional style.**
|     |     |   | **English Heritage also suggested that new development should reflect the existing built heritage of the area.**
|     |     |   | **Design guidance amended to reflect this.**
| 5.2 | PEC39 | S | **I would like to support the re-use of old buildings. I think this would help keep the character of Ponders End. The only exception to this is the Roberts Building, which is not on the plan, but would appear to in the old University site. If it is the tall one I think it is, then I have no preference**
|     |     |   | **Noted**
|     |     |   | **No change**
### 6.0 Community Facilities

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>PEC16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Need to ensure with all the new homes being built that all residents have access to facilities and amenities, standard of life does not diminish for some and improve for the few.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>PEC16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ensure that there are enough things to develop the skills of young people from all backgrounds such as community centres, youth centres, etc.</td>
<td>Community facilities are already being factored into proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>PEC19</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Get rid of Ponders End Police Station - not open to the public. Paradoxical, we need more Police/Enforcing bodies, i.e. Environmental.</td>
<td>The police station is currently used for training purposes. The Met Police have indicated they would want a police “shop” to be accommodated in any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>PEC30</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Principle 3 - should be more for teens to do. I am unaware of youth club or community centres in the area.</td>
<td>Ponders End youth Club is on South Street. Funding has just been confirmed for a new Academy next to Ponders End Station (on the former gas holder site) which will comprise an element of community facilities. Welcome Point Community Centre is on South Street. There area also community facilities such as Vincent House (corner Nags Head Road and High St) and various faith buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.0 Transport Connections

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>PEC7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Nags Head Road has traffic 24/7... The road is used by lorries, cars for links to M25, Brimsdown Industrial Estate, Chingford, Tottenham... Its dangerous for residents, not a nice road to live.</td>
<td>Noted. Junction improvements are proposed at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>PEC7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Please do something about the traffic on Nags Head Road, its not safe for residents. Pollution has increased 100%.</td>
<td>Noted. Junction improvements are proposed at the junction of High Street and Nags Head Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>PEC9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ponders End is not suitable for capacity building. The roads or transport system are clogged and full to capacity. We do not need more cars, homes or chicken shops.</td>
<td>There is a need for more affordable, family homes. Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity. Takeaways will be limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>PEC13</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I have concerns about traffic in this area, it's atrocious. Coming out of side roads is, most times brutal. My concern therefore is that the more homes become available, the more people, which will generate much more traffic.</td>
<td>Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>PEC19</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>No one uses bike lanes, 2) Intersection between Southbury Road/Hertford Road needs sorting, 3) Transport links already good</td>
<td>Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity. Transport links are good but could be improved, for example, train services from Ponders End to London Liverpool Street are only half hourly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>PEC20</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Nags Head Road needs to be improved. Traffic congestion is 24/7 with lorries, cars, buses, vans. Pollution must be at its highest. The road is dangerous and not nice for people to live. Expand the road at the eagle close end, as traffic builds up mostly in this area. Four lanes could be created, e.g. bus lane plus left, right turn lane. Resident at this end of Nags Head would be willing to exchange for new homes you build.</td>
<td>Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>PEC19</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Infrastructure i.e. road improvement should be made to High Street/Southbury Road before anything else - improve traffic flow - less cars parked on High Street is excellent as large vehicles cannot pass on these roads!</td>
<td>Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEC22</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>There is no motorcycle parking bay in Ponders End High Street. The nearest is Church Street Enfield Town.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>Factor motorcycle bay into plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>PEC23</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>If possible more cycle paths. Deal with traffic hotspots - especially at the Junction with South Street and Church Road. Banning Parking close to</td>
<td>Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Transport - the trains are very infrequently [sic] and poor. The Roads are not wide enough for the increase of motor vehicles in the area. Enfield is working with train service providers to increase the frequency of trains on this route. Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity. No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Its such a nuisance to be so close to work in East London (Leyton) but the only tube access that's to get there is OAKWARD [sic] - WHY! Enfield is working with train service providers to increase the frequency of trains on this route. No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>The footpaths in many areas of Ponders End need repair. Noted. No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Extra road provision must be carefully considered to ease present congestion. I don't want to attract more cars. Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity. No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Currently one of the worst things about Ponders End is the traffic. At all times of the day the High Street from Lincoln Road to Nags Head Road is congested which makes getting in and out of Ponders End in all directions frustrating and time consuming. This needs to be addressed as the mix of traffic and buses and pedestrians is lethal. Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity. No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I would strongly recommend that very careful consideration is given to the proposals for getting rid of car parking spaces in the area. Also, if and when new buildings/houses are built, enough car parking needs to be provided. Noted A more flexible approach to car parking will be included in the final Brief: “around 0.75 spaces per unit”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Building more homes and putting more people in the area will not make it easier to move around. Noted No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Diagonal parking outside shops on the left hand side of the High Street Enfield will work with TfL to look at the High Street and how it can be improved. No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I agree with the vision but am concerned that more housing will create more cars and traffic in the area which is already a nightmare Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity. No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By improving cycle facilities and making the area feel safer people are less likely to use their cars for short journeys. By improving the stations, they are more likely to use public transport. Enfield is in discussion with rail services providers about increasing the number of trains per hour.

| 7.18 | PEC57 | c | Most people coming from the south have to Come to Southbury Road why not let them enter and exit from Queensway. The traffic light would have to be moved a few yards this would alleviate the traffic converging onto Southbury Road. I have phone the council but they did not sound interested but I think the bus company might | Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity. | No change |
| 7.19 | OE6   | S | A cycle lane - more green. Ease congestion. | Noted | No change |
| 7.20 | OE8   | C | Traffic appalling in Ponders End High Street. Possible bus bay outside very wide pavement. Outside Tesco? | | This proposal will be considered in future. |
| 7.21 | OE9   | C | Improve Nags Head Road EN3 7AA. Everyday traffic at High St end is heavily congested for residents. Widen Road from No.43 to car park rebuild these house or replace with flats | Junction improvements are proposed for High St/South St and Nags Head Rd/High St with a view to improving capacity. | No change |
| 7.22 | OE12  | C | Get rid of High Street parking, Southbury Rd + Ponders End High Street, buses cannot pass | Businesses on the High Street are worried there is not enough parking for customers. Parking will be considered as part of wider transport reviews of the area. | No change |
| 7.23 | OE25  | C | The big risk is that by making vehicle access more difficult, you make people go round it rather than through it. Soon they forget its there, and it ends up a decayed and vandalised waste land like Waltham Cross, especially evenings and weekends | Conversely, by making Ponders End a more pleasant place to be with a more active evening economy, and by making the place feel safer to move around, local residents are more likely to use Ponders End rather than travel further afield for their entertainment. | No change |

**8.0 Ponders End Park**

| 8.1  | PEC25 | S | Ryan's Park could be upgraded. You have started a walk way which is left half finished. Lots could be done to restore this recreational park area. | The work in the Park was held up whilst Enfield resolved detailed design issues with local voluntary/community groups and | No change |
residents. It will continue in 2011. If you would like to find out more about the plans, visit www.enfield.gov.uk/placeshaping or contact Daisy Johnson on 020 8379 5598 or email daisy.johnson@enfield.gov.uk

| 8.2 | PEC30 | S | The park feels quite hemmed in and needs a facelift. Some good facilities at the front of the park but lacking in any nice features [sic] at the back. | The work in the Park was held up whilst Enfield resolved detailed design issues with local voluntary/community groups and residents. It will continue in 2011. If you would like to find out more about the plans, visit www.enfield.gov.uk/placeshaping or contact Daisy Johnson on 020 8379 5598 or email daisy.johnson@enfield.gov.uk | No change |

| 8.3 | OE6 | S | Public toilets - free. A café in the park | Local café owners are concerned about there being a café in the Park because they worry it may affect their trade. The existing changing rooms are scheduled for upgrade into a community pavilion in future (subject to funding) and this could include a café use. There is likely to be scope for a variety of types of café in Ponders End but it needs to be bottomed out during design of the pavilion. If you would like to find out more about the plans, visit www.enfield.gov.uk/placeshaping or contact Daisy Johnson on 020 8379 5598 or email daisy.johnson@enfield.gov.uk | No change |

9.0 Housing

| 9.1 | PEC4 | C | “Building more social housing flats, to low income peoples. Now is recession and hard to buy flat or house. There is 10000 peoples council’s waiting lists. Most of them are low income peoples. Enfield is one of Shelter’s bad housing list. East Enfield really needs more help to housing. That will reduce anti-social behaviour and burglarys” | 40% of new housing on the former Middlesex University site (Queensway Campus) will be “affordable” and within that split, 60% will be social rented and 40% intermediate (aimed at first time buyers)). | No change |

<p>| 9.2 | PEC28 | S | Higher percentage of private housing preferable. Attract “quality” retail units to the area. Avoid “overcrowding in the area” | 60% of new homes on the Queensway Campus site will be private or market homes. | No change |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>PEC30</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Enfield Council needs to provide more homes for local people, both homes and small units for single people, bed sits etc, and bed sits etc for people 60+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40% of new housing on the former Middlesex University site (Queensway Campus) will be “affordable” and within that split, 60% will be social rented and 40% intermediate (aimed at first time buyers)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>PEC34</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ideally I would like the housing to be quality housing with minimum social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60% of new homes on the Queensway Campus site will be private or market homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>OE1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Too much housing and flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION and COMMUNICATION PLAN

Background

The Ponders End Central Planning Brief sets out the principles of development within the Ponders End Central area, indicating how land should be used and how much development there should be on the key sites of the High Street, Queensway Campus (former Middlesex University) and Queensway Industrial Estate, as well as including a highly valued open space, Ponders End Park. The Planning Brief will eventually be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that provides supplementary detail/information on policies within the Local Development Framework (LDF).

The LDF is a set of documents that set out the Council’s policies relating to the development of land for new development. Within this set of documents, the Core Strategy sets out the overall vision for the whole borough, including new policies. Of relevance to Ponders End, an Area Action Plan covering the North East Enfield area sets a vision for the area, policies for its development and a delivery plan for future investment. A Public Realm strategy has been prepared that comes within the wider strategy illustrating how planning and design policies should be implemented for Ponders End as outlined in the Framework for Change. As part of the development of the Framework for Change, three development opportunity areas have been identified for more detailed masterplanning to accompany the Framework for Change, which will be taken forward as Planning Briefs to encourage improvements to these areas and give clear guidance to developers. The Ponders End Central Planning Brief is one of three Planning Briefs, which is being brought forward for consultation ahead of the other two on account of its important role in Ponders End and the potential for significant change through development.

In light of the urgency to undertake this consultation, the Ponders End Planning Brief will be subject to a consultation period of just under 7 weeks, which is compliant with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (adopted, June 2006), although short of the 12 week minimum that is recommended by the Enfield Strategic Partnership. In light of this, an intense period of activity is planned in order to ensure that all residents, business owners, workers and visitors to Ponders End have the opportunity to find out about the plans for the bustling central area and have their input into the plans which will translate into revisions prior to publication, ensuring that Place Shaping plans for Ponders End reflect the aspirations of local people.

The majority of this consultation period will span over the school summer break, which poses challenges in terms of opportunities to access school communities, absence of workforce and services running on lower resources so not in the same position to respond. This will make it all the more important to fit school-based work in the week before and following the holiday, and to be proactive in approaching groups whose views should be captured. The school holidays also present an opportunity, as many families do spend more time together during this period and there is a wealth of activities organised by the Council and other services across the borough. By harnessing these existing opportunities we can ensure that we are engaging with people in their environments of choice, and contribute to the success of these initiatives.

Scope of this document

This document outlines how the Council will interact with the Ponders End and wider Enfield community in the production of the Planning Briefs. This includes residents, businesses, voluntary/community sector organisations and others who come to or pass through Ponders End for transport, leisure, education, accessing other services or retail opportunities. It is to cater for individual or self-organised citizens to ensure that they have a strong voice and impact on the plans developed that will affect the places where they live, work, learn, play or visit.
As a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the Planning Brief will also need to be sent to statutory organisations such as:

- Partners in the Enfield Strategic Partnership, such as the Health Care Trust, Police, Fire Service;
- Statutory consultees, such as Natural England, Greater London Authority, Transport for London, Thames Water, the Environment Agency or the Highways Agency;
- Internal departments in Enfield Council;
- The list of general consultees held by the Planning Policy team, as those who have an interest in consultations and policies in the borough.

The purpose of this plan is to provide a detailed guide to engagement with the community, and as such does not detail how these other partners and statutory organisations will be consulted with.

Objectives

Through the consultation period on the Ponders End Central Planning Brief we aim to achieve the following objectives:

1. To raise awareness of Place Shaping and the Planning Brief, and how this relates to other activities and plans developed to date;
2. To develop a positive perception of Place Shaping within the local community and build confidence that this process will make a positive difference for residents, businesses, students and visitors to Ponders End;
3. To demonstrate that the community can have an impact on plans that affect their lives, and boost their perception that this is the case;
4. To enable the community to have a genuine influence in the development of the Planning Brief; this will in turn improve the quality of the plans and the sense of local ownership.
5. To enable as many residents, businesses and community organisations as possible have a range of opportunities to contribute their views;
6. To present information and enable feedback in ways that are inclusive of the whole community, including different ages, social and cultural backgrounds and other forms of diversity;
7. To create opportunities for individuals to work together and consider plans in more depth through interaction with other members of the community;
8. To seek opportunities for the community to meet and grow in capacity and cohesion through being gathered around a mutual interest;
9. To revitalise interest in and recruit new members for the Vision Team;
10. To establish a baseline in engagement that will facilitate consultations on the South Street Campus and Waterfront Planning Briefs later in the year.

Principles

We aim to ensure that every stakeholder is informed about the Ponders End Central Planning Brief and that they are offered a variety of accessible opportunities to be involved and give their views ranging from very brief and convenient interactions to more complex, in-depth and continuous conversations. In order to achieve this we endeavour to ensure that:
• we go to people in their normal environments rather than expecting them to come to us;
• opportunities to engage are interesting, relevant and enjoyable;
• there are multiple opportunities for people to choose how they wish to engage;
• specific approaches are tailored to the needs of special interest groups;
• all opportunities to participate are well communicated.

Context

Ponders End is of an average size within the 21 wards of the borough in terms of population, with 13,700 residents estimated by the Greater London Authority in 2009. This population is much more densely distributed than in other areas, however, with the 5th highest density in the borough at 165 people per hectare, 37% higher than the borough average.

In terms of age, Ponders End is distinguished as having the most substantial population of 16-24 year old young adults of any ward in the borough at almost double the borough average, and equalling just over 20% of the population of the ward. Most other age groups are a little below the borough average, with the most substantial group being 25-44 year old adults constituting 31.1% of the borough’s population. Working age adults are therefore a particularly prominent group to target with consultation, including those who are not in employment, education or training.

According to the 2009 Area Profile, the largest ethnic group in Ponders End is White British (32.9%) with substantial contingents of the following groups:

- Turkish (7.7%) / Turkish Cypriot (3.9%)
- White other (7.6%)
- Somali (3%) / Other Black African (8.6%)
- Bangladeshi (8.3%)
- Black Caribbean (7.7%)

It is significant that these dominant groups combined equal approximately 75% of the population, indicating the breadth of diversity in Ponders End, and the presence of numerous small minority groups making up a quarter of the population. The approach to consultation will need to take account of this diversity.

In terms of languages spoken in the community, the most up to date information available is the 2009 school census, which presents the languages spoken by families with children in primary education in the Ponders End ward. It is likely that in older sections of the community English is more prevalent; however this still indicates the extent and range of minority languages spoken in the community that will require sensitivity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akan/Twi-Fante</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of religion, according to the 2001 census, the most dominant stated beliefs are Christianity (59.7%), Islam (16.4%) and no religion (12%). In comparison with the borough as a whole, for the most part the extent of affiliation to religious groups is reported as similar, with all religions except Christianity, Hinduism, Judaism and Islam within 0.5% of the borough average. There are lower numbers of people who profess Christianity, Judaism or Hinduism, but the most noticeable
variation is the proportion of Muslims, at around 7% above the borough average. If the ward has followed the borough average trend there will have been a significant increase in the Muslim population since 2001 and in 2008 a classification based on the origin of people’s names from Experian estimated the borough average percentage of the adult population at 13.7%, which would suggest the Ponders End population of Muslims may be as high as at least 20%.

In terms of socio-economic indicators, according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation produced by the Department of Communities and Local Government in 2005, Ponders End has been calculated as the third most deprived of the 21 wards within Enfield. It also has a comparatively great number of low income households, with the third lowest average incomes in the borough at £31,100 as estimated by CACI in 2009. It also is reported to have the fourth highest number of households having an income of less than £15,000, at 19% compared to the Borough average of 14.1%. Those claiming out of work benefits make up 20.8% of the population, against 15.8% in the Borough as a whole.

Stakeholders

The Ponders End Central planning brief will have an impact on the full cross-section of the Ponders End community, as it serves as a local service centre in terms of public services, business and retail opportunities, social spaces and transport connections. A broad approach has been taken to defining stakeholders therefore, to ensure that all residents, businesses, community organisations and others who may use this space have the opportunity to learn about the plans for the area and comment, with targeted work focusing on particular networks and interest groups in accordance with an assessment of their interest. Stakeholders have been mapped in order to ensure that sections of the community are not overlooked, and this assessment has been exposed to public scrutiny through the Ponders End Vision Team.

Special interest groups have been identified as target groups who will need to be approached specifically so that they are likely and/or able to participate in the consultation:

**Young people (under 16)** – Under 16s are unlikely to engage with the consultation process through questionnaires and/or outdoor exhibitions or other methods that are not specifically targeted at their age group.

**Young adults (16-24)** – The area profile indicates that Ponders End is home to the largest young adult population in the borough.

**Older people** – These members of the community are more likely to have mobility and access needs that may prevent them from participating.

**Learning disabilities** – Information may need to be presented in a tailored format to enable meaningful engagement.

**English as an Additional Language (EAL) communities** – Given the diversity and prevalence of other languages in the Ponders End community, it is important that those who are more able and/or comfortable expressing themselves in another language have equal opportunities to participate.

**Commuters** – Ponders End has two busy train stations, a bus garage and busy bus stops on the High Street at Tesco, used for many commuter, school and personal journeys each day. There is a group of people who are likely to pass through Ponders End because of its transport connections without being resident in the area.

**Shoppers** – As a local shopping centre, developments Ponders End Central will impact on shoppers who may be from within or travel from outside Ponders End.

**High Street retailers/Queensway industrial area** – On account of owning or managing a business property or concern on the High Street or Queensway, this group will be particularly impacted by the Planning Brief.
### July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAYS</td>
<td>Rachel Smith not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 1</td>
<td>Sunset 21:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 6 – Mon 12</td>
<td>Daisy Johnson A/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 14</td>
<td>Jane Berger A/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 5 – Mon 19</td>
<td>PEN delivered by Ponders End Community Development Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To include delivery of Planning Brief summary/questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 19 – Mon 26</td>
<td>Hayley Coates A/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 20</td>
<td>Central Planning Brief Consultation Commences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 20</td>
<td>Tisha B’Av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish day of remembrance and mourning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 23</td>
<td>Enfield Schools Summer Term Ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No inset days for St Matthews, St Marys or Waverley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alma and Southbury inset days TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 25</td>
<td>Enfield Homes Community Festival – Albany Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 25</td>
<td>Bangla Mela Multi-Cultural Community Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 26</td>
<td>Dharma Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhist celebration of the beginning of Buddha’s teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 27</td>
<td>Reach Out and Play – Play Development Team in Ponders End Recreation Ground 12.55 – 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 27</td>
<td>Library Service Stories in the Park Durants Park 2.30-3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

- Consultation period
- Public/school holidays
- Religious festivals
- Existing events/activities
- Daylight hours
- Staff planned absence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed 28</td>
<td>Reach Out and Play – Play Development Team in Durants Park</td>
<td>4.00-5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 28 – Fri 30</td>
<td>Hayley Coates A/L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 29</td>
<td>Ponders End High Street Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 30</td>
<td>Sports Development Multi-Sports session – Ponders End Recreation Ground</td>
<td>12.30-2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**August**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun 1</td>
<td>Sunset 20:49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 2 – Fri 6</td>
<td>Jane Berger A/L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 2 – Fri 13</td>
<td>Joanna available for work experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 3</td>
<td>Reach Out and Play – Play Development Team in Ponders End Recreation Ground</td>
<td>12.55 – 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 3</td>
<td>Library Service Stories in the Park Durants Park</td>
<td>2.30-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 4</td>
<td>National Play Day event in Town Park</td>
<td>12.00-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 5</td>
<td>Space Kids at Ponders End Library</td>
<td>10.30-12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 6</td>
<td>Sports Development Multi-Sports session – Ponders End Recreation Ground</td>
<td>12.30-2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 7</td>
<td>Enfield Homes Community Festival – Bush Hill Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 9 – Sep 17</td>
<td>Nathalie Marshall available for work experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 10</td>
<td>Reach Out and Play – Play Development Team in Ponders End Recreation Ground</td>
<td>12.55 – 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 10</td>
<td>Library Service Stories in the Park Durants Park</td>
<td>2.30-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 11</td>
<td>Reach Out and Play – Play Development Team in Durants Park</td>
<td>4.00-5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 12</td>
<td>Ramadan Begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 13</td>
<td>Jane Berger A/L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 13</td>
<td>Sports Development Multi-Sports session – Ponders End Recreation Ground 12.30-2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 17</td>
<td>Reach Out and Play – Play Development Team in Ponders End Recreation Ground 12.55 – 2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 17</td>
<td>Library Service Stories in the Park Durants Park 2.30-3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 18</td>
<td>Reach Out and Play – Play Development Team in Durants Park 4.00-5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 20</td>
<td>Sports Development Multi-Sports session – Ponders End Recreation Ground 12.30-2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 22</td>
<td>Enfield Homes Community Festival – Craig Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 23 – Fri 27</td>
<td>Daisy Johnson A/L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 24</td>
<td>Reach Out and Play – Play Development Team in Ponders End Recreation Ground 12.55 – 2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 25</td>
<td>Reach Out and Play – Play Development Team in Durants Park 4.00-5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 27</td>
<td>Sports Development Multi-Sports session – Ponders End Recreation Ground 12.30-2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 30</td>
<td>BANK HOLIDAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 31</td>
<td>Nick Fletcher A/L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**September**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed 1</td>
<td>Sunset 19:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 3</td>
<td>Enfield Schools Autumn Term Commences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 4</td>
<td>Enfield Town Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 5</td>
<td>Enfield Town Show</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sun 5 | Central Planning Brief Consultation Ends
---|---
Fri 10 | Eid
*Muslim thanksgiving festival celebrating the end of fasting*
Stakeholder approach

Due to the differing needs and interests of these stakeholder groups, different initiatives will need to be tailored in order to enable them to access the opportunity to influence the development of the Planning Briefs. Degrees of participation have been identified as follows:

*Information* – stakeholders know what the Planning Brief is, that it is being consulted on, and how to participate in the consultation.

*Consultation* – Brief episodes of engagement such as personally giving someone a Planning Brief ‘Light’ summary and explaining what it is, a brief conversation covering a limited selection of topics or completion of a short questionnaire;

*Engagement* – In-depth and deliberative opportunities, such as lengthier individual or small group conversations, class sessions or workshops, with the opportunity for interaction during the process and gaining an overview of Planning Brief proposals.

In some cases, where groups are will be most directly impacted or are most likely to need additional support to access the consultation process, a proactive approach will be taken to creating opportunities to engage with the groups, while for others an offer of further opportunities will be made, and the impetus to pursue this will be taken up by the group themselves depending on their degree of interest.

The methods described are activities that we aspire to undertake, subject to capacity/willingness of organisations to work with us to create these opportunities. These will be reviewed during the consultation period if any additional opportunities arise or if initiatives seem likely to be unsuccessful due to experience, weather or other factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Degree of Participation</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
<td>Parents, children, governors, staff, PTAs</td>
<td>Quality of public spaces and sense of safety; Public transport links; Congestion/traffic in school run peak times; Availability and quality of local shops and amenities; Learning opportunities in the local area; Play opportunities.</td>
<td>Information                     Offer of consultation with parents/staff/governors  Engagement with children ‘Light’ Planning Brief with covering letter sent out with book bags; Option of attendance at staff/governors'/PTA meetings; Interactive class and/or school council sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>Parents, children, governors, staff</td>
<td>Quality of public spaces and sense of safety; Public transport links; Congestion/traffic in peak times; Availability and quality of local shops and amenities; Learning opportunities in the local area; Leisure and enrichment opportunities in the area.</td>
<td>Information                     Offer of consultation with parents/staff/governance  Engagement with young people Planning Brief documents sent to school for distribution; Offer of attendance at school staff/governance meetings; Interactive class and/or student council sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHENEL</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Planning Brief documents sent to college for distribution; Offer of attendance at school staff/governance meetings; Session with educational interest group, e.g. Geography/Citizenship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents, children, governors, staff</td>
<td>Quality of public spaces and sense of safety; Public transport links; Congestion/traffic in peak times; Availability and quality of local shops and amenities; Learning opportunities in the local area; Leisure and enrichment opportunities in the area; Job prospects in the locality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Offer of consultation with parents/staff/governance Engagement with young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Brief ‘Light’ delivered to every home with the Ponders End Newsletter; Local collection and distribution points established on the High Street; Press releases to local media; Information and questionnaire in Our Enfield; Banner promoting consultation period; Roving outdoor exhibitions in various locations on the High Street and around Ponders End; Presence at community events Bangla Mela and Enfield Homes festival in Albany Park; Exhibitions at summer activities programmes based in Ponders End Recreation Ground, Durants Park and Ponders End Library; Online presence through website including document download (including Word format for electronic completion and email), consultation schedule, online response (Limehouse) and Facebook presence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalities Groups</td>
<td>Accessibility of improvements to all irrespective of race, age, disability, sexuality, gender or faith; Opportunity for different minority groups to have a say and to benefit from improvements.</td>
<td>Planning Brief and ‘Light’ sent to representative umbrella groups with offer of meeting attendance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Offer of consultation session with trustees/members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Brief and ‘Light’ sent to representative umbrella groups with offer of meeting attendance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Quality of public spaces and sense of safety; Public transport links; Congestion/traffic in peak times; Availability and quality of local shops and amenities; Learning opportunities in the local area; Leisure and enrichment opportunities in the area; Job prospects in the locality; Community/public hire facilities; New accommodation choices; Population density; Green spaces; Parking</td>
<td>Planning Brief documents sent to college for distribution; Offer of attendance at school staff/governance meetings; Session with educational interest group, e.g. Geography/Citizenship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Multiple engagement opportunities</td>
<td>Planning Brief ‘Light’ delivered to every home with the Ponders End Newsletter; Local collection and distribution points established on the High Street; Press releases to local media; Information and questionnaire in Our Enfield; Banner promoting consultation period; Roving outdoor exhibitions in various locations on the High Street and around Ponders End; Presence at community events Bangla Mela and Enfield Homes festival in Albany Park; Exhibitions at summer activities programmes based in Ponders End Recreation Ground, Durants Park and Ponders End Library; Online presence through website including document download (including Word format for electronic completion and email), consultation schedule, online response (Limehouse) and Facebook presence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>Transport infrastructure for staff, customer and commercial purposes; Parking; Traffic and congestion; Business development opportunities; Customer base; Competition; Impact on property values; Potential relocation.</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Engagement with different business voices, both in representative groups and as individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organisations</td>
<td>Community facilities in the area, including hall space, meeting rooms and training rooms, for private hire and for group meetings; Public transport links to group meetings; Accessibility of spaces to target group members; Parking availability and cost for members; Quality of public spaces and sense of safety; Ability of members to have a say in plans that will affect their area; Opportunities to earn or raise money for community activities Potential for increased demand and desire to respond to changing needs in the community.</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Engagement with trustees/staff/members/users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Groups</td>
<td>Ownership and/or use of buildings in or near development areas; Access for members/attendees of groups, particularly at designated times of worship;</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Engagement with trustees, elders/leadership, staff, members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponders End Vision Team</td>
<td>Ensuring interests of the whole community are represented; Quality of plans and impact on the wider community; Oversight of and advice on consultation processes.</td>
<td>Information Deliberative engagement</td>
<td>Copies or web link of Planning Brief and ‘Light’ sent to all Vision Team members; Meeting to monitor consultation process and update on Recreation Ground in late July; Workshop to consider Planning Brief proposals in detail in early September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE</td>
<td>Implications of developments and design on community safety.</td>
<td>Information Consultation</td>
<td>Presentation on Planning Briefs at 29 July/26 August CAPE meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Area Partnership Board</td>
<td>Impact of developments and design on children and young people – safety, learning, play and opportunities.</td>
<td>Information Consultation</td>
<td>Presentation about Planning Brief at 15 July CAP 1 Board meeting; Web links sent to CAP1 members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEN</td>
<td>Ensuring the wider voluntary sector has a voice in initiatives that may affect some members.</td>
<td>Information Opportunity for consultation with interested groups</td>
<td>Information on ECEN website and through ECEN bulletin, with contact details for further consultation/engagement opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Forum</td>
<td>Impact of developments on this and neighbouring wards of Jubilee and Lower Edmonton – representing interests of wider community.</td>
<td>Information Consultation</td>
<td>Web links/Planning Brief ‘Light’ sent to Area Forum members; Presentation to 15 September Area Forum meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people (under 16)</td>
<td><em>As residents, and in particular:</em> Learning opportunities in the local area;</td>
<td>Information Engagement</td>
<td>Engagement through schools; Presence at summer activities events; Workshop session with Ponders End Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>As residents, and in particular:</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults (16-24)</td>
<td>Availability and quality of local shops and amenities; Learning and training opportunities in the local area; Leisure and enrichment opportunities in the area; Job prospects in the locality; Accessibility of support services, especially relating to education, employment and training; Appropriate accommodation options.</td>
<td>Centre and other local youth organisation(s); Detached youth consultation in collaboration with Youth Service and/or Voluntary Sector staff.</td>
<td>Engagement through CHENEL; Engagement through Niburu and Two-E contacts – walking tour and discussion of Central and/or group discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>Proximity of services and ease of access; Quality of public spaces and sense of safety; Appropriate accommodation options; Quality of pavements and crossings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set up group sessions with existing groups through contacts in Enfield Asian Welfare Association, Age Concern, Ruth Winston Centre and other local elderly social and support groups identified through Adult Social Care, Ponders End Community Development Trust or Sustainable Communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disabilities</td>
<td>Proximity of services and ease of access; Accessibility of support services Appropriate accommodation options; Learning and training opportunities in the local area; Leisure and enrichment opportunities in the area; Job prospects in the locality.</td>
<td>Workshop sessions with groups identified through Housing Associations and Adult Social Care.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disabilities</td>
<td>Proximity of services and ease of access; Planning Brief/’Light’ documents sent to groups representing physically and sensory impaired groups, requesting opportunity to hold a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Key Issues</td>
<td>Action/Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL communities</td>
<td>Quality of public spaces and sense of safety; Appropriate accommodation options; Quality of pavements and crossings; Adaptations for sensory impairments.</td>
<td>Workshop session with members. Identification of any local support groups through GP surgeries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters/public transport users</td>
<td>Regularity and reliability of transport services; Quality of environments around and between key transport interchanges; Availability and quality of local shops and amenities at/near transport interchanges; Quality of public spaces and sense of safety.</td>
<td>Information Consultation. Peak times consultation with public transport users at Ponders End and Southbury stations, and at key bus interchanges e.g. High Street by Tesco and Ponders End Recreation Ground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers</td>
<td>Value for money goods and services; Desirable range of goods and services; Proximity of retail and service opportunities; Parking availability and cost; Public transport connections; Quality of public spaces and sense of safety.</td>
<td>Information Consultation. Posters and local collection points established in High Street businesses; Outdoor roving exhibitions to include High Street location and Tesco car park; Consultation at key transport interchanges, especially bus stops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street businesses</td>
<td>As businesses, and in particular: Business development opportunities; Impact on property values;</td>
<td>Planning Brief ‘Light’ and covering letter delivered to every business, offering group meeting sessions; High Street Forum meeting to discuss and...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication

The first stage in community engagement is effective communication, including making people aware of the consultation, the quality of consultation materials/documents and ensuring people know about opportunities they have to participate. This is critical in ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to respond. The Enfield Strategic Partnership has produced a Communication Strategy containing guidelines for effective communication that will be followed.

- The full Planning Brief will inevitably be a substantial document, as it needs to contain detailed guidelines for developments in this dense area. Effort will be taken to keep this in as straightforward English as possible, without compromising the need for this to be a useful document to govern development in the future. Jargon will be minimised, and diagrams and pictures will be used throughout to break up the text. This will be primarily distributed via the website and on CD Roms; however a small number of hard copies will be produced to ensure that anyone who is not able or would prefer not to view this information on a computer has equal access to the information.

- In order to ensure that the maximum number of people can digest the key information in the Planning Brief, a short 8-page 'Planning Brief Light' summary leaflet will be produced. This will use plain English and colour, diagrams and pictures to make it attractive and easy to interpret for individuals. It will include 6 pages of background information, details of opportunities to participate in person, the details of the main proposals in the Planning Brief and a two-page questionnaire enabling people to respond and finding out information about them (optional) for monitoring purposes. A freepost address will be given to enable people to respond.

- Copies of the Planning Brief summary leaflet will be distributed with the Ponders End Newsletter to every household in Ponders End. Additional copies will be distributed through school book bags, by delivery to commercial properties, and through community buildings and shops.

- Local bases will be established as points of contact where people can view a reference copy of the full Planning Brief, pick up their own copy of the summary leaflet and return their completed questionnaire. In addition to the library, community venues and local businesses will be approached to ensure that there are a variety of convenient locations open at different times where people can pick up documents and return questionnaires. These will be advertised by a poster where possible in the window of the venue.

- The Planning Brief, summary leaflet and consultation plan will be available on the Council’s website for people to view and download. The questionnaire will also be produced in Word format so that people can fill this in electronically and return it by email. There will also be the opportunity to respond directly online via
Limehouse. We will also investigate the feasibility of setting up a Facebook page to refer people to, although the extent to which we have the capacity to make this interactive may limit the usefulness of this approach.

- Press releases will announce the start of the consultation period, update on progress at least once during the course of the period with highlights from activities undertaken, and will remind people of the end of the consultation period a week before it is due to complete, giving indications of early themes that are coming out.
- The next edition of Our Enfield is due to be distributed on Monday 23rd August. This will include an article outlining key aspects of the Ponders End Central Planning Brief and referring people to the team and/or website for more information, and a questionnaire for people to respond directly to the information in the article.

Incentives

For many stakeholders the significance of the proposals and the impact on their area will be enough rationale for participating in the consultation. For some who are doubtful as to whether they have the time and/or inclination to respond, some simple incentives will be offered to demonstrate appreciation of their contribution.

- A prize draw will be attached to participation in the consultation where contact information is left. This will be made clear at all group meetings, exhibitions and on documentation.
- At public exhibitions there will be attractional features such as helium balloons, a lucky dip and apples with Ponders End stickers on them to give away.
- Refreshments provided at formal sessions tailored to likely needs of specific groups.
- Detached/outreach work with public transport users and young people to use cereal bars or similar to attract involvement.

Costs

N.B. Costs are estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing full Planning Brief</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing Planning Brief business cards to promote web address</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Planning Brief ‘Light’</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Planning Brief ‘Light’</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing Planning Brief ‘Light’ – with PEN</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing Planning Brief ‘Light’ - businesses</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner(s)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other printed materials</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation stands for local collection points</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helium balloons</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky dip</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apples</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juice cartons</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prize draw</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation and/or meeting other access needs</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop room hire/refreshments – Vision Team, High Street Forum, community sector workshop, youth workshops</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal bars or similar for detached outreach</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop facilitation assistance</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGAGEMENT TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring

In order to evaluate how successful the consultation process has been in achieving its objectives and to learn about what the most effective forms of communication and engagement are in the Ponders End community, the response and experience of the local community will be monitored by the following means:

- Number of questionnaires returned and from what sources (i.e. by post, email or at local collection point);
- Additional questions on questionnaire to establish gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, faith and address of respondents, enabling disaggregation of responses according to specific groups;
- Additional question on questionnaire to establish how respondents heard about the Planning Brief consultation;
- Number of hits on web pages;
- Number of participants at events, workshops and other initiatives;
- Qualitative feedback from participants at events, workshops and other initiatives;
- Feedback/evaluation by the Vision Team.

The consultation report following the Planning Brief consultation will summarise how successful the process has been in achieving its objectives and what has been learned that can be carried forward into future consultations.