



## **SOUTHGATE GREEN WARD FORUM**

**Tuesday, 21st November, 2017 at 7.15 pm in the Upper Park Road,  
London, N11 1BH**

### **Membership:**

co : Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment), Alessandro Georgiou and Claire Stewart (Labour Group Whip)

### **AGENDA – PART 1**

- 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**
- 2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (ATTACHED) (Pages 1 - 2)**
- 4. MATTERS ARISING**
- 5. NOTES FROM CCG CONSULTATION MEETING (ATTACHED) (Pages 3 - 4)**
- 6. PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDERS (VERBAL UPDATE)**
- 7. LADDERSWOOD/MONTMORENCY PARK (UPDATE ATTACHED) (Pages 5 - 6)**
- 8. AIR QUALITY (UPDATE ATTACHED) (Pages 7 - 8)**
- 9. BROOMFIELD HOUSE (UPDATE ATTACHED) (Pages 9 - 10)**
- 10. GARFIELD SCHOOL (VERBAL UPDATE)**
- 11. COUNCILLOR UPDATES**
- 12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **SOUTHGATE GREEN WARD FORUM MINUTES**

Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2017

Beaumont Nursing Home, 15 Cannon Hill, London N14 7DJ

### **COUNCILLORS IN ATTENDANCE**

Ward councillors: Cllr Claire Stewart (Chair); Cllr Alessandro Georgiou (Minutes); and Cllr Daniel Anderson.

Approximately 25 residents were in attendance.

### **GUESTS**

Peter George, Assistant Director for Regeneration, Enfield Council  
Rathai Thevananth, Managing Partner of the Arnos Grove Medical Centre

### **INTRODUCTIONS**

Cllr Stewart welcomed everyone to the forum and introduced her colleagues.

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Jeff Leaver, Evelyn Ryan, Andy Barker, Don Arthur, Anna Marianska and Alok Agrawal.

### **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

Accepted as a true record.

### **MATTERS ARISING**

- Residents were concerned about harassment from beggars along Bowes Road. A resident suggested signs designating areas as no begging areas;
- A resident informed the meeting that traffic monitoring strips had been cut in the Lakes Estate;
- Residents were curious as to why there was traffic monitoring on the Lakes Estate;
- Derek Honor has included minutes of a meeting of the CCG meeting at Ruth Winston House (attached); and
- Questions were raised around the timeline of Safer Neighbourhoods.

### **POLICE UPDATE (Written Update provided)**

A resident was concerned about the increase in violent crime in Broomfield Park, taking of legal highs, violent attacks in the bowling green, and the use of the netball poles for damage to other areas of the park.

## **REGENERATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHGATE GREEN**

Peter George, Assistant Director for Regeneration provided an update on developments in Southgate Green including Ladderswood/Montmorency Park; the Lee Valley Heat Network (Energetik); Crossrail 2 and the Ritz Parade.

### **Matters arising**

- A resident of Highview Gardens asked why they cannot be included in the Energetik Scheme;
- Residents raised concerns about the lack of infrastructure in place for the substantial increase in population within the ward (North Circular and Montmorency Park Developments) and wanted a greater level of consultation for all prospective developments in the future. Peter George agreed that these developments would cause more pollution due to the increase in cars in the area;
- A resident suggested Seafield Road should be opened up; and
- Residents were concerned about potential change alluded to in the Local Plan that had recently been out to consultation.

## **ARNOS GROVE MEDICAL CENTRE UPDATE**

Rathai Thevananth, Managing Partner of the Medical Centre, provided an update and her plans for expansion subject to support and agreement from NHS England and Enfield's CCG. The surgery has over 5,000 patients on its roll. 19 years ago they had 1,800 and yet the space within the surgery is currently the same.

Concerns were raised at the waiting times for GP appointments.

Councillors agreed that the practice should meet with senior officers and councillors in the administration to help progress the proposed expansion.

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Residents raised concerns about traveller incursions in our parks and the ongoing issue with beggars along the A406 North Circular.

## **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To be confirmed.

**Notes of a meeting of  
NHS's Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group  
To consult on proposed changes to clinical procedures  
Based on new evidence based criteria  
Held at the Ruth Winston Centre, Green Lanes, N13  
On 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2017**

1. **Attendance:** Dr. Abedi, M. Eaton, Gail Hawksworth (All from Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group) + circa 50 members of the public.
2. **Consultation to Date:** Consultation with GPs' and the public have been ongoing since March and would continue to June 30<sup>th</sup>.
3. **Purpose of New Procedures:** To introduce new evidence-based criteria to determine new procedures for many treatments. A handout at the meeting covered 13 procedures including bunions, hearing aids, knee replacement surgery, hernias, vasectomies, prolapses, and homeopathy.
4. **New referral Procedure:** As a result of the new evidence it had been concluded that the NHS were undertaking unnecessary operations where alternatives existed. In future a GP would no longer refer a patient directly for treatment: Instead the GP's referral would be vetted by the Clinical Commissioning Group which would decide which cases should be referred for treatment.
5. **Meeting reaction to the new procedures:**
  - a. The idea that the NHS was conducting unnecessary operations was rubbish and the reason for the review was to cut costs. In reply, it was stated that cost cutting was denied.
  - b. Why were new procedures being considered on evidence seen by the local CCG and not applying NICE recommendations? In reply it was stated that NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) had not issued full guidance in all areas.
  - c. A questioner asked why there was a need for GPs' to have their referrals vetted as this just added another layer of bureaucracy.
  - d. Monty Meth (Over 50's Forum) sought reassurance that feedback from the public consultation would be taken into account. He also complained that he had seen none of the evidence on which the proposed changes were based.
  - e. A questioner asked if there was evidence that the public supported the proposed changes: In answer it was stated that there was universal support for many of the proposals, but opposition to others.
  - f. Future consultation: the meeting was promised further consultation if current recommendations were changed, but the period of consultation was currently unclear.
  - g. A member of the public said that he did not understand why the NHS was being localized and offered the opinion that NICE should be dealing with the issues discussed at this meeting, not the CCG.
6. **Funding:** The issue of NHS funding was raised and the CCG representatives were asked why they were engaging in what appeared cost cutting instead of backing the public in seeking more money from government: In reply it was stated that the medical profession urged better funding at several bodies and that Enfield's historic underfunding was being addressed with the capitation level expected to be met in future years.

**D. S. Honor**  
**23/6/2017**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **LADDERSWOOD/MONTMORENCY UPDATE**

Though Phase 1 is now complete, Phase 2 works at Ladderswood have been unavoidably delayed.

Following the Grenfell Tower fire, the National House-Building Council (NHBC), as both building control and buildmark warranty insurer for this project withdrew all previous approvals for Mulalley's external wall constructions pending investigation. You should note that this was not just for Ladderswood - builders across the country have experienced something similar. At Ladderswood Phase 2, owing to its complexity, this meant some eighty plus individual wall details were in question. Mulalley had to get an external consultant to provide further details and (in some cases) alternative materials for the NHBC to consider.

These were duly submitted to the NHBC for further examination. They have come back and approved some of the wall details - mostly those with a brick outer skin. They have not yet approved those details where there are various types of cladding/render.

When the problem initially arose, Mulalley ceased all works to Phase 2 external wall structures. Not knowing at that time how long this issue would take to resolve, they put in place a mitigation strategy which involved carrying on as far as possible with the external Metsec structure (the metal framing that backs the cladding), first fix internal mechanical, electrical and partitioning works, screening and internal dry lining to those areas that would not be affected by the building not being watertight.

These mitigation works continue at present. Additionally, Mulalley have been able to restart external wall construction where there is brickwork.

At this juncture Mulalley estimate a total delay of four to six months - on the basis that approvals from the NHBC will be forthcoming in the next few weeks. If they do not, then delays may well extend beyond this.

Once these issues are resolved then Mulalley's will be able to calculate a more accurate completion date, but for now, they are working (internally) to a six-month delay and basing all of their cash flows, resourcing schedules, etc, upon this.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Measures of air quality along the NCR and elsewhere in the Ward

In regard to air quality measures in Bowes Ward we have recently completed a green wall project at Bowes Primary. This was the installation of ivy at the front of the school facing the A406 to try and establish if the planting reduced air pollution on the playground side of the wall. Monitoring was undertaken for several months and we are awaiting the results from our partner, Environmental Research Group.

Last week Bowes Primary also had an air pollution audit by a representative of WSP, which is an environmental consultancy working on behalf of the Mayor of London to provide audits to 50 schools across London which have air quality issues due to road traffic emissions. Representatives of the Council met at the school, along with the auditor. We had a question and answer session with the pupils, who were very well informed regarding air pollution and its causes. The school building and surrounding area was surveyed and WSP will propose measures that can be employed at the school to reduce exposure to air pollution.

Following the meeting with Bowes Primary we are also discussing running an anti-idling day in the winter to encourage parents to switch off their engines when collecting their children.

We have now installed nitrogen dioxide diffusion tubes at 92 Warwick Road and 134 Brownlow Road; Warwick Road has been there since January and Brownlow Road since August. To compare the sites the following are the results for August and September for both locations in microgrammes (ug)

### August

92 Warwick Road: 31.3ug/m<sup>3</sup>

134 Brownlow Road: 48.7ug/m<sup>3</sup>

### September

92 Warwick Road: 31.4ug/m<sup>3</sup>

134 Brownlow Road: 53.1ug/m<sup>3</sup>

To give this some context the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 set an annual mean for nitrogen dioxide of 40ug/m<sup>3</sup> and the two results we have for 134 Brownlow Road indicate that this location will exceed the annual mean, whereas none of the results for 92 Warwick Road this year have exceeded the 40ug/m<sup>3</sup>. Caution should be exercised with diffusion tubes as they are not as accurate as real-time analysers, such as the one we have at Bowes Primary and they are for indicative purposes only. To compare, the nitrogen dioxide analyser at Bowes Primary has shown the average concentration for nitrogen dioxide this year to be 41ug/m<sup>3</sup>. It is unlikely that 134 Brownlow Road has higher concentrations of nitrogen dioxide than the A406.

As you are aware, we have no measures available to us that can directly impact upon the A406; however, the Mayor London does have the power to affect traffic on this road. The most powerful tool currently being discussed is the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) and air pollution dispersion modelling predicts that implementation of the ULEZ could lead to a 20% reduction in nitrogen dioxide concentrations. Unfortunately, the Mayor currently does not intend to extend the proposed ULEZ to encompass the Whole of Greater London. The proposed boundary is to be the North Circular Road (if the ULEZ is expanded to Inner London) this could mean an increase in concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and PM10 as it will be an escape road around the ULEZ. The Council has lobbied the Mayor of London to expand the ULEZ to cover the whole of Greater London as the health of all residents is important and not just those living inside the A406.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Broomfield House Update

The latest position on Broomfield House is as set out in the update to 18<sup>th</sup> October Cabinet. Point 7 below is what officers are currently working on. The results of the marketing are programmed for reporting to Members later next year. Meanwhile the next meeting of the Broomfield Partnership Board is scheduled for 16<sup>th</sup> January 2018.

1. Broomfield House is a Grade II\* listed building. The house is the focus for the Grade II registered historic park and its stable block (not previously open to the public) is also listed Grade II\*. Both House and stables are included within Historic England's Heritage at Risk Register. An integrated strategy is needed for the House and Stables.
2. Following a series of fires in the 1980's and 1990's numerous schemes for the restoration and reuse of Broomfield House have been put forward, but have not been possible to bring to fruition. The expectations and hope to recreate a building of similar appearance and use to that which existed before the first fire have never been able to be achieved in a way acceptable to the local community and residents. The schemes that came forward were either too commercial or unfunded / unviable. The most recent of which was a lottery application in 2012/13 for funding to establish a heritage and learning centre, which was not supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund.
3. In planning designation terms, development in the stable yard would only be justified if for example, it generated funds towards the repair of the listed buildings, but the site would not otherwise be a development site.
4. A Partnership Board was established in October 2014 Chaired by Cllr Bambos Charalambous. Board membership includes the Broomfield House Trust, Friends of Broomfield Park and Historic England. The remit of the Board was to explore whether the House and Stables could be restored with lottery funding to provide public access and a viable future use. This was on the clear understanding that if the board were unsuccessful an application to the Secretary of State for the demolition of the remaining structure would be the default position.
5. The purpose of this agenda item is to update members on the progress of the Project Board. The Project Board have met ten times in the two years since it was established and overseen the production of a very significant amount of work. These outputs include studies on heritage significance, structural feasibility, use options, costs and soft market testing.
6. Structural surveys of the building remains have shown that only 20-30% of the remains could be restored as it stands. The remaining 70% of the structure is unviable for the use for which it was intended (see technical footnote). Any reconstruction of the House would therefore to a large extent be a replica rather than a restoration. All options will be examined from full reconstruction through to demolition, however for the reconstruction options the funding gap (the cost of repair and its market value on completion, including income from any new uses) could be as high as £9m. The covenant which restricts trade or business raises risks around the provision of any future income generating use. The HLF feedback is that they still have issues around the funding gap and how the proposed end-uses would meet their requirement for very secure long-term income generation and sustainable business viability.
7. In the coming months officers will undertake the further work which is required by Historic England, in accordance with government guidance (the National Planning Policy Guidance), on further testing of options.
8. The Council understand the frustration at the perceived lack of a resolution, however, it is not possible to consult local people on the future of Broomfield House until a limited range of options or a preferred scheme has been identified. This can only be evolved by fully testing

viability through the market. The extent to which development in the stable block / yard enables options for the House needs to be tested. Officers will undertake a marketing procedure to seek expressions of interest from a commercial partner (a process which takes 9-12 months). This will help test viability and inform future public consultation on options including the costs, pros and cons and trade-offs associated with each option.

9. As part of this work, officers will continue to work with the community on the alternative options and continue to liaise with the HLF. In particular, to obtain further feedback from the Heritage Lottery Fund on whether they would support a less costly partial restoration and reconstruction of the House (as HLF engagement to date has only been based on full reconstruction).
10. Once this work has been completed officers will be able to bring a full report to the Cabinet for a decision on the way ahead. Given the deteriorating condition of the remains and the risk of collapse of the supporting structure, vandalism and injury, the Council is determined to continue to work with the community to deliver a timely resolution.

Technical Footnote to point 6.

Whilst the majority of the brickwork could be retained and repaired, the majority of the building was of timber framed construction, that is not capable of repair and retention.

A drone survey has recently been carried out and the resulting video footage will be placed on the Council's website. This will aid understanding of the building construction and the limited fabric which remains.

The Conservation Management Plan, (Donald Insall Associates June 2016) states that 'no more than 20-30% of the historic fabric of the building remains.

The survey drawings in the Structural Appraisal Report (Conisbee July 2014) identify that the construction of the external envelope is brickwork on the ground floor (on the front elevation the brickwork is only below the window openings). Above this the walls are timber framed and rendered. The exception is the eastern corner (facing the lawn) which is brickwork through both storeys. The internal walls are mainly missing, but the evidence suggests they were timber construction, other than a couple of ground floor walls that are still present.

This report states that 'a large proportion of the timber elements are severely damaged and it is felt that the potential for stabilisation, repair or retention of these elements is unlikely to be viable. The masonry has suffered less damage and deterioration...Therefore these elements of the structure, including the chimney stacks, can be retained'.

The Structural Feasibility Study (Conisbee March 2017) states that the majority of the remaining masonry elements may be effectively refurbished and retained and has assessed that the percentage that could be refurbished 'would be in the order of 80-90%'.