

IMPROVING
ENFIELD



North East Enfield
Consultation Statement

**The Town and Country Planning
(Local Planning) (England)
Regulations 2012**

Proposed Submission Stage

February 2014

1	Introduction	2
	Introduction	2
2	NEEAAP Interim Direction Document Consultation	3
	Bodies and persons consulted	3
	Duty to cooperate	3
	How bodies and persons were consulted	3
	Summary of main issues	4
3	NEEAAP Proposed Submission Consultation	5
4	Appendices	6
	Appendix A: Press Notice	
	Appendix B: Consultation Activity	
	Appendix C: List of Respondents	
	Appendix D: Summary of Consultation Responses	
	North East Enfield Area Action Plan - Interim Direction	
	Interim Direction Document Stage Aug 2012 - Nov 2012	

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This statement has been prepared to comply with the requirements of Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulation 2012. The statement sets out the consultation process undertaken at the interim direction stage; the main issues raised and how these have been addressed by the Proposed Submission NEEAAP.

1.1.2 The North East Enfield area is one of the identified Regeneration Areas confirmed through Enfield's adopted Core Strategy in core policies 40 and 41. The AAP will provide a comprehensive planning framework and identifies opportunity sites for redevelopment and key infrastructure in North East Enfield. It will be used to direct local investment, particularly redevelopment proposals and inform key infrastructure discussions and guide the estate renewal projects such as the Alma. It sets out a vision for what we want the area to be like in the future as well the plans and projects needed to deliver that vision on the ground and make it a reality for residents who want to see real change in their neighbourhoods.

1.1.3 The process for producing the NEEAAP started in 2008, and since then there have been a number of stages of consultation and ongoing discussions to develop the plan with local people, interested organisations and developers. This included:

- Stage 1: Issues & Options Stage in 2008; &
- Stage 2: Preferred Options Stage in 2009;

1.1.4 These formal stages of the document's development were carried out under the regulations of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, the regulation were subsequently superseded in 2009. On the advice of the then Government Office for London preparation of the NEEAAP was paused to enable the Council to progress its Core Strategy.

1.1.5 With the Core Strategy adopted in 2010 and with significant progress on a number of other local initiatives being progressed in the North East Enfield area, work on the Action Plan recommenced in 2012.

1.1.6 Under the 2009 Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations a further 'Interim Direction Document Stage' round of consultation was undertaken, Stage 3. The comments and representations received during this most recent consultation, together with those that had preceded it have informed the preparation of the Proposed Submission Draft North East Enfield Area Action Plan (February 2014).

1.1.7 Following a review of the consultation responses received over these 3 stages, a Proposed Submission NCAAP has been prepared; further details on this are provided in section 3 of this document.

1.1.8 In April 2012, the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 came into force and now govern the process of this next formal stage, the "Proposed Submission". In accordance with Regulation 19 of the 2012 regulations, this Consultation Statement has been produced as part of the Proposed Submission Documents for the NEEAAP.

2.1 North East Enfield Area Action Plan: Interim Direction Document

2.1.1 In August 2012 Enfield Council published for consultation the NEEAAP Interim Direction Document for a 12 week consultation period between August 2012 and November 2012.

2.1.2 The purpose of this stage of consultation was to re-engage the community and stakeholders since the Plan was paused in 2009. The intention was to publicise the Interim Direction Document to re-establish and confirm the key planning issues the area was now facing, given the changes the area was undergoing since the last consultation. This was extremely valuable and provided the Council with a number of very helpful suggestions that would then improve the Plan through Proposed Submission preparation.

Bodies and Persons Consulted

2.1.3 In line with the requirements of Regulation 18 of the 2012 Regulations, 'specific' and 'general' consultation bodies were consulted on the NEEAAP Interim Direction Document. Specific consultation bodies relevant to the Area Action Plan included:

- Environment Agency;
- English Heritage;
- Enfield Primary Care Trust;
- Thames Water;
- Highways Agency;
- Natural England;
- National Grid;
- Network Rail;
- NHS North London;
- Metropolitan Police Authority;
- Greater London Authority;
- London Borough of Haringey;
- North London Waste Authority;
- Hertfordshire County Council;
- Epping Forest District Council;
- Waltham Abbey Town Council;
- Essex County Council;
- Broxbourne Borough Council;
- Lee Valley Regional Park Authority;
- British Waterways – London region;

2.1.4 All consultation bodies are registered on the Council's Local Plan database. General consultees include a range of organisations and individuals or 'other' consultees. Email notifications of the NEEAAP Interim Direction Document consultation were sent out, and where requested, hardcopy notification letters were sent. Approximately 1500 individuals and organisations were notified, including specific, general and other consultees, internal Council officers and councillors.

Duty to Co-operate

2.1.5 The boundary of the Area Action Plan immediately borders Broxbourne Borough Council/Hertfordshire County Council to the north and Epping Forest District Council/Essex County Council and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority to the East. The Council has worked closely with its neighbours to ensure that the strategic and cross-boundary implications of the NEEAAP have been carefully investigated and that this process has fed into the preparation of the Action Plan. The 2011 Localism Act introduced a 'duty to co-operate' which requires such a process to be formal duty in the on the plan-making authority.

2.1.6 Partner organisations that are instrumental to the delivery of the NEEAAP have also been involved throughout its preparation. The Council's partners in the preparation of the NEEAAP include Transport for London and North East Enfield Area Partnership. The North East Enfield Area Partnership has been especially instrumental, bringing together and co-ordinating local people and partner organisations to help make positive changes in the area.

How bodies and persons were consulted

2.1.7 The NEEAAP Interim Direction Document was made available online, and paper copies were available at all Council's libraries and at the Civic Centre.

2.1.8 The document was published on the Council's website (www.enfield.gov.uk/neeaaap) as a pdf document.

2.1.9 Approximately 4,000 NEEAAP Summary Document Questionnaires were distributed through various consultation events held throughout the period of consultation in the North East Enfield area.

2.1.10 A banner exhibition was displayed at each of the consultation events held identifying the key issues and proposals for the area. Consultation response forms were also made available.

2.1.11 Emails and letters were sent out to approximately 1500 specific, general and other consultees informing them of the scope of the document, a link to a copy of the document online and the deadline by which comments had to be submitted. Consultees were also informed of ways of submitting comments which included postal and online methods.

2.1.12 On the 29th September 2012 The NEEP Community Lunch hosted locally at Co-op Unity Car Park, Enfield Wash Local Centre provided the widest coverage and exposure of the NEEAAP consultation and was attended by over 200 members of the community. A consultation plan of activity was prepared and this is set out in Appendix B.

2.1.13 A public notice set out in Appendix A advertising the public consultation was published in The Enfield Independent on the 22nd August 2012 and provided guidance on making comments and how and where to access the document itself.

Summary of main issues raised and how they have been addressed

2.1.14 Following a 12-Week Consultation period from the 16th August – 8th November 2012 and 26 consultation events, 96 respondents made comments to the NEEAAP Interim Direction Document. These were received via a combination of written responses via email/letter/objective online and completion of the summary document. A list of respondents is set out in Appendix C.

2.1.15 The 96 respondents are made of the following:

- 32 responses from organisations;
- 1 response from a Member of Parliament;
- 41 responses from residents;
- 19 responses from business;
- 1 response from a LBE Councillor; and
- 2 responses from resident organisations.

2.1.16 A summary of individual responses received and how they have been accounted for through the preparation of the proposed Submission NEEAAP is set out in Appendix D.

2.1.17 Key issues arising from 2012 public consultation include:

- **Local Centres** - the need to improve the key local centres of Ponders End, Enfield Highway, Enfield Wash and the need to improve retail provision, public realm, identity and car parking provision;
- **Housing** - the need for a variety of new housing that is affordable, in particular family homes;
- **Community Facilities** - the need for community facilities to support existing residents and future housing growth in the area, doctors, dentists and community space;
- **Access and Local Connectivity** - general support for the Northern Gateway Access Package (NGAP), in particular to public transport, improved walking and cycling routes, better way-finding signage, future of level crossings, improved stations and reducing congestion on the road network. There was endorsement and objection to the Northern Gateway Access Road part of NGAP;

- **Open Space** - in particular improvements to existing parks in the study area; support for improved links to the Lee Valley Regional Park and Waterways, additional leisure and recreational facilities linked to the parks;
- **Industrial Estates** - comments from businesses related to the need for better network connections, support for the Northern Gateway Access Package (NGAP), environmental improvements, and signage to improve overall identity;
- **Local Economy** - improving the local economy and access to education and jobs for local resident; and
- **Future Provision of School Places** - residents wanted the Bell Lane site redeveloped for a new Academy and improvement in the provision for early years across the study area.

3.1 NEEAAP Proposed Submission Consultation

3.1.1 The Area Action Plan is being formally published for a six week public consultation period between Tuesday 27th May and Monday 7th July 2014. The NEEAAP and all of its supporting documentation will be made available by visiting the Council's website at: www.enfield.gov.uk/NEEAAP or hard copies of the Plan are available to view in all of Enfield's Libraries and the Civic Centre.

3.1.2 The Council proposes to submit the Area Action Plan to the Secretary of State for independent examination under Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, along with the required supporting documents. Prior to this, in accordance with Regulation 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 the Council is inviting representations to be made to consider whether the Plan is legally compliant and sound. Any representations made will be submitted with the North East Enfield Area Action Plan and considered by an independent Planning Inspector.

3.1.3 A public notice will be placed in the borough-wide circulate local paper, The Enfield Independent. A press article was also placed on the Council 'Our Enfield' web addition.

3.1.4 You may make your comments online via: <http://www.enfield.gov.uk/consultations> or in writing and send them to:

Regeneration, Leisure and Culture Department,
Strategic Planning and Design
Civic Centre,
Silver Street,
Enfield
EN1 3XA

Tel: 020 8379 3866 Fax: 020 8379 3887
or email: localplan@enfield.gov.uk

3.1.5 A Community launch event to promote and raise awareness of this formal public consultation process and the Plan's publication is provisionally planned to be held 31st May 2014 in the local area. This had been arranged with the North East Area Partnership on the back of the successfully attended event held during the NEEAAP Interim Direction Document consultation in 2012.

3.1.6 Further meetings and events will be attended by officers to promote the NEEAAPs publication, details of these events will be made available on the Council's website: www.enfield.gov.uk/NEEAAP.

Appendix A: Press notice

Enfield Council

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 Regulations 18

Notice is hereby given that Enfield Council is consulting on the following planning document

North East Enfield Area Action Plan 'Interim Direction Document – Working Towards a Submission AAP'

This document is about the future of North East Enfield which covers Enfield Lock, Enfield Highway, Ponders End, Southbury, and Turkey Street wards. The Council is preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) which will provide a planning policy framework to guide future development and investment in this area.

The Interim Direction Document – Working Towards a Submission AAP' engagement document is to bridge the gap between the consultation document published in 2009, the changes which have occurred on the ground since 2009 and plans for the future. The document is available to view on the Council's website at www.enfield.gov.uk/NEEAAP

Copies of the Interim Direction document can be requested from the Planning Policy Team on 020 8379 3866. Reference copies will also be available at the Civic Centre and local libraries.

Comments can be made on-line at <http://consult.enfield.gov.uk/portal>, sent by email to ldf@enfield.gov.uk or made in writing and sent to:

Planning Policy Team
Regeneration Leisure and Culture
London Borough of Enfield
Civic Centre
Silver Street
Enfield
EN1 3XE

The deadline for comments is the 8th November 2012

www.enfield.gov.uk/NEEAAP

Environment Direct Civic Centre: Monday - Friday 8.30am - 5.00pm

Enfield Town Library is open Sundays 12pm – 4pm

	Mon	Tues	Weds	Thurs	Fri	Sat
Angel Raynham	Closed	9-1	9-4	9-5	Closed	Closed
Bowes Road	Closed	2-7	Closed	2-7	Closed	9-5
Bullsmoor	Closed	9-12 & 2-7	Closed	9-12 & 2-7	Closed	2-5
John Jackson	Closed	9-7	Closed	9-7	9-5	9-5
Edmonton Green	9-7	9-7	9-7	9-7	9-5.30	9-5
Enfield Highway	9-7	9-5	Closed	9-7	Closed	9-5
Enfield Island Village	3-7	11-5	Closed	1-7	Closed	1-5
Enfield Museum	11-4	11-4	11-4	11-4	11-4	Closed
Enfield Town	9.30-8	9.30-8	9.30-5.30	9.30-8	9.30-5.30	9.30-5.30
Fore Street	9.30-7	9.30-5	1-7	Closed	9.30-5	9.30-5.30
Local Studies	9.30-4.30	9.30-4.30	Closed	9.30-4.30	9.30-4.30	Closed
Oakwood	9-6	9-6	9-6	9-6	9-6	9-5.30
Ordnance Road	9-8	9-8	Closed	9-8	9-5.30	9-5
Palmers Green	9-8	9-8	Closed	9-8	9-5.30	9-5
Ponders End	Closed	9-7	9-7	Closed	9-5	9-5
Ridge Avenue	9-8	9-8	Closed	9-8	9-5.30	9-5
Southgate Circus	9-7	9-5	Closed	9-7	9-5.30	9-5
Winchmore Hill	Closed	9-7	9-6	9-6	Closed	9-5.30

Appendix B: Consultation Activity

	Stakeholder	Methods	Date
All General Consultation Activity (residents, businesses and community organisations)			
	Formal Press Notice	Formal Press Notice to Enfield Advertiser	22.08.12
	Website	Web pages	16.08.12
	Hard-copy Summary Documents	4,000 circulated through course of consultation	16.08.12 - 08.11.12
	Leaflet Drop	To promote resident Drop-in events	07.10.12
	Enfield Highway Area Forum	Presentation to Forum	02.10.12
	Press Release	Advertising consultation and Community Lunch event	10.09.12
	Town Show	Promoting consultation with residents	1 st /2 nd .09.12
	On Your Door Step/Tesco – Ponders End	Promoting consultation with residents	14.09.12
	On your Door Step – Enfield Town Library	Promoting consultation with residents	21.09.14
	Enfield Homes Newsletter	Text provided promoting consultation	16.08.12
	Our Enfield	Text provided promoting consultation	16.08.12
1.0 Residents Specific			
	Tea Jive – Resident Community Event	1:1 with residents	16.09.12
	Community Festival	1:1 with residents	15.09.12
	Community Lunch Event	1:1 with residents	29.09.12
	Ponders End Resident Drop-in Event	1:1 with residents	09.10.12
	Ponders End Resident Drop-in Event	1:1 with residents	13.09.12
2.0 Community Groups			
	FERRA Newsletter	Text provided promoting consultation	16.08.12
	Enfield Voluntary Action	Text provided promoting consultation	16.08.12
	Ponders End Newsletter	Text provided promoting consultation	16.08.12
3.0 Businesses			
	EBRA	Meeting with Town Centre Managers	02.11.12
	Business Breakfast Workshop	Presentation/Discussion	29.11.13
4.0 Strategic Groups / Partnerships			
	6 Authorities Cross Border Group	Presentation/Discussion	13.09.12

	Ponders End Partnership Board	Presentation /Discussion	27.09.12
	North East Enfield Area Partnership	Presentation/Discussion	11.10.12
	North East Enfield Area Partnership workshop with adjoining authority Members and officers	Presentation/Discussion	02.12.13
	6 Authorities Cross Border Group	Verbal Updates	On-going - quarterly
	North East Enfield Area Partnership	Verbal Updates	On-going - quarterly
	NLSA led Cross Border Officers Meeting	Presentation/Updates	27.02.13
	NLSA led Cross Border Officers Meeting	Presentation/Updates	25.11.13
5.0 Targeted Groups			
	Enfield Racial Equality Council	Workshop	02.07.12
	Enfield College	1:1drop-in event with students	28.09.12
	Enfield Voluntary Action	Send copy of document and questionnaires and put on EVA facebook page Contact Paula Jeffrey	16.08.12
	Engagement with young people – Oasis Academy Enfield students	2 Workshops with students with subsequent presentation to the North East Enfield Partnership Board	10.10.12 06.12.12 18.04.13
	Older People	Information sent to Over 50's forum for inclusion in newsletter	16.08.12
		Meeting with Over 50's Executive Committee	04.10.12
		Presentation to Over 50's Forum	22.11.12

Appendix C: List of respondents

File 1	Contact Name	Email Address	Organisation	Date received	Response Acknowledgement	Comments
1.	Angela Atkinson	Angela.Atkinson@marinemanagement.org.uk	Marine Management Organisation	21.08.12	19.10.12 JEG	No comment
2. (i)	Gerry Ansell	gerryansell@gmail.com	Individual	29.08.12	Objective Comment I.D.1 19.10.12 + EQI JEG	Object to MOL Durant's Park/Collinwood Ave
2 (ii)	Gerry Ansell	gerryansell@gmail.com	Individual	20.10.12	Objective Comment I.D 4 12.11.12 & EQI JG	
2 (iii)	Gerry Ansell	gerryansell@gmail.com	Individual	20.10.12	Objective Comment I.D 5 12.11.12 & EQI JG	
3.	Gavin Whatmore	gavinwhatmore@talktalk.net	Individual	29.08.12	Objective Comment I.D.2 19.10.12 + EQI JEG	Object to MOL Durants Park/Collinwood Ave
4				20.09.12	n/a	No details available SD 4
5.	Jimmy. L. Omole	jjiomole@yahoo.com		27.09.12	Summary Doc Response 19.10.12 JEG	SD5
6.	Vesile Tekas	vtekas@levenes.co.uk		24.09.12	Summary Doc Response 19.10.12 JEG	SD6 Added to database

7	Abdulhaki m Mumin	n/a		24.09.12	Postal – 09.10.12 JEG	SD7 Added to database
8	Mrs S Boston	sallyboston74@hotmail.com		24.09.12	Postal – 09.10.12 JG	SD 8Added to database <i>Festival</i>
9	Mr James Haslam	jfhaslem@yahoo.co.uk		21.09.12	Objective Comment I.D.3 19.10.12 + EQI JEG	Support with conditions
10	Mrs Dorothy Pagin	unknown	resident		Postal – 09.10.12 JG	SD 10 Added to database Co-op event
11	unknown	unknown	unknown	08.10.12	n/a	SD 11
12	M Darling	unknown	resident	08.10.12	Postal – 09.10.12 JG	SD 12 Exhibition at Albany & Co-op
13	unknown	unknown	unknown	08.10.12	n/a	SD13
14	unknown	unknown	unknown	08.10.12	n/a	SD14
15	<i>can't decipher</i>	unknown	unknown	10.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	<i>SD 15 Add to database</i>
16	Malcolm Edwards	unknown	Resident	10.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	<i>SD16Add to database</i>
17	Mr Patel	unknown	Resident	10.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	SD 17Inform when AAP approved
18	unknown	unknown	unknown	10.10.12	n/a	SD18
19	Martin Denney	martindenney@live.co.uk	Resident	10.10.12	Email + EQI 10.10.12 JG	<i>SD 19 Add to database</i> - from poster in local area
20	unknown	unknown	unknown	16.10.12	n/a	SD 20

21	Ms R Lekha	Reisha.lekha@virgin.net	Resident	16.10.12	Summary Doc Response 19.10.12 JEG	SD21 add to database
22	Mrs S Pryor	Shanie.pryor10@virginmedia.com	Resident	16.10.12	Summary Doc Response 19.10.12 JEG	SD22 add to database
23	Miss R O'Hara	unknown	Resident	16.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	SD23 add to database
24	unknown	unknown	unknown	16.10.12	n/a	SD24
25	unknown	unknown	unknown	16.10.12	n/a	SD25
26	Ntalambi-Tuzolana	unknown	Resident	16.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	SD26 add to database
27	Mr E Tarling	unknown	Resident	16.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	SD27 add to database
28	G Siralusa	unknown	Resident	17.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	SD28 add to database
29	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	17.10.12	n/a	SD29
30	Mr Martin Shurras	Martin4678@live.co.uk	Resident	17.10.12	Summary Doc Response 19.10.12 JEG	SD30 add to database
31	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	17.10.12	n/a	SD31
32	Cllr Simon	Toby.simon@enfield.gov.uk	LBE Councillor	17.10.12	Verbal acknowledgement by NB 23.10.12	SD32
33	Carmelle Bell	Carmelle.bell@thameswater.co.uk	Thames Water	19.10.12	19.10.12 JEG	
34	Paul Zivager	paulz@kardwell.co.uk		24.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SD 34

35.	Andrea Gilmour	Andrea.Gilmour@hertfordshire.gov.uk	Hertfordshire Council	25.10.12	12.11.12 JG	
36.	Kathryn Richmond	kathryn.richmond@walthamabbey-tc.gov.uk	Waltham Abbey Town Council	29.10.12	12.11.12 JG	
37 (i)	Mr P Keywood	P.keywood@burnettpd.co.uk	Burnett Planning on behalf of Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd	24.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	Objective Comment I.D 6 Object to the description of retail park
37 (ii)	Mr P Keywood	P.keywood@burnettpd.co.uk	Burnett Planning on behalf of Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd	24.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	Objective Comment I.D 7 Object to the Policy approach re retail parks
38	John Preston	JPreston@eppingforestdc.gov.uk	Epping Forest District Council	29.10.12	KB 12.11.12 JG	
38	Shirley Hawkins	shawkins@eppingforestdc.gov.uk	Epping Forest County Council	08.11.12	12.11.12 JG	
39	unknown	unknown	unknown	24.10.12	n/a	SD39
40	Nichola Hubbard	Nichola81@hotmail.co.uk	Resident	24.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SD 40 Add to database
41	Chris Jones	n/a	Enfield MPTC Solar Way- Local Business	26.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	Found out via local MP submitted SD Q4 & 12 Only
42	Tony Sasaski	n/a	n/a	29.10.12	n/a	See Response No 43

43	Tony Sasaski	n/a	UK Garage Clarence Rd	29.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	
44	Rose freeman	Rose.freeman@theatrestrust.org.uk	Theatres Trust	31.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	
45	CJ Redburn	chris@redburn.co.uk	Redburn Transfer Ltd- Local Business	29.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SD Q4 &12 Only (local MP)Cover letter inc
46	M Gascoin	n/a	Driver Standards Agency- Local Business	26.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	SD Q4&12 only inc letter from N De Bois to Eastern Enfield Business
47	T Clarke	terry@eurotechmonitoring.net	Local Business Innova Park)	29.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SD Q4&12 only via NdeB MP
48		howard@bridgeman.co.uk	Local Business PJ Bridgeman & Co Ltd	29.10.12''''	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SD Q4&12 Only via local MP
49	Mike Wild	Mike.wild@greggs.co.uk	Local Business Greggs	29.11.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SDQ4&12 only
50	Krissy Craig	Krissy.craig@wealden.net	Local Business	29.11.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SDQ4&12 only via letter from MP
51	Henry Mitchell	henry@mdsbattery.co.uk	MDS Battery Ltd	29.11.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SDQ4&12 only via leter from MP
52	Simon Hume	shume@anovo.com	Anovo UK – local business	29.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SD Q4 & !2 only
53	J Leveridge	sales@aimer.co.uk	Aimer Products Ltd – local business	29.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SD Q4 & 12 only
54	Megan Fisher	Megan.fisher@fisherresearch.com	Fisher research - Local business	29.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SD Q4 &12 only via letter from MP
55	Nigel Jeffs	Nigel.jeffs@B-and-Q.co.uk	B & Q	29.10.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SD Q4 & 12 only

56	A L.Dear	tonyd@quantrelle.com	Quantrelle Packaging- local business	29.10.12		SD Q4 &12 only via letter from MP
57	Jon Glazier	jglazier@acfarlanepackaging.com	Macfarlane Packaging – local business	30.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	SD Q4 & 12 only via letter from MP
58	Andrew Bailey	vincyman@gmail.com	Resident	05.11.12		Add to database
59	Christine Whetstone	whettre@yahoo.com	Resident	29.10.12	Postal 10.12.12	Add to database
60	Enid Walsh	Enid.Walsh@loughton-tc.gov.uk	Loughton Town Council	05.11.12	12.11.12 JG	
61	Mel Barlow- Kay	melbarlowkay@dronwright.co.uk	Dron & Wright on behalf of LFEPA	07.11.12	12.11.12 JG	
62	Zhanine Oates	Zhanine.oates@essex.gov.uk	Essex County Council	07.11.12	12.11.12 JG	
63	Odette Carter	Odette.carter@hmwt.org	Herts & Middx Wildlife Trust	07.11.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	
64	David Hammond	David.hammond@naturalengland.org.uk	Natural England	07.11.12	12.11.12 JG	
65	Norma Green	normaleagreen@gmail.com	Waltham Abbey Partnership	08.11.12 13.11.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	* holding response
66	Vicky Carter	vc.planningpolicy@broxbourne.gov.uk	Broxbourne Council	08.11.12	12.11.12 JG	
67		purchases@forever-enterprises.co.uk	Forever Enterprises – local business	08.11.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	SDQ4 & 12 only via MP
68	Sonia Holloway	n/a	Resident	08.11.12	Postal 10.12.12	
69	Paul Head	phead@conel.ac.uk	College	08.11.12	12.11.12 JG	

70		almaresidentsass@btinternet.com	Alma Residents Association	08.11.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	
71	Claire McClean	Claire.mclean@canalrivertrust.org.uk	British Waterways	08.11.12	12.11.12 & EQI JG	+ appendix (map)
72	Nick Johnson	Nick.johnson@ebra.org.uk	EBRA	13.11.12	IM	
73	Chris Bearton	Chris,bearton@hertfordshire.gov.uk	Hertfordshire County Council	08.11.12	12.11.12 JG	
74	Nick Bishop	Nick.bishop@english-heritage.org.uk	English Heritage	08.11.12	12.11.12 JG	
75	Tricia Moxley	<u>Tricia_moxley@yahoo.co.uk</u> or office@cpressex.org.uk	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	08.11.12	06.12.12	
76	Martin Stroud	mstroud@pcclq.co.uk	Norfolk Truck & Van Hire	12.08.12	06.12.12	SD 76 Q4 & 12 only via MP
77	Dr C Jephcott	Hoehle39@gmail.com	The Enfield Society	12.08.12	06.12.12	
78	Claire Martin	cmartin@leevalleypark.org.uk	LVRPA	13.11.12	06.12.12	
79	M J Crosk	John.crosk@tradeteam.com	Local business	15.11.12	06.12.12	SD Q4 & 12 only
80	Scott Coleman	northlondon@totally-dynamic.co.uk	Local business	15.11.12	06.12.12	SD Q4 & 12 only
81	Tim Childs	Tim.childs@rimexmetals.com	Local Business	15.11.12	06.12.12	SD Q4 & 12 only
82	Peter Chapman		CACEY Internal	03.11.12	IM	
83	Samantha Wells	Samantha.Wells@london.gov.uk	GLA	20.11.12	20.11.12 JG	
84	Bernard Rees	roomhirepecdt@btconnect.com	Ponders End Community Development Trust	21.11.12	22.11.12 JG	

85	John Sturman	n/a	Resident/Individual	15.11.12	Postal 10.12.12	
86	Robert Taylor	Roberttaylor1024@btinternet.com	FERAA	26.11.12	27.11.12 JG	
87	unknown	unknown	unknown	26.11.12	n/a	
88	Barbara Herridge	Barbara.herridge@NLWA.gov.uk	NLWA	27.11.12	28.11.12	Officer response/ changes or additions to be received after 06.12.12
89	T Mylius	tristram@hitcjmylius.co.uk	Hitch Mylius Local Business	23.11.12	28.11.12	SD Q4&12
90	Patrick Blake	Patrick.blake@hghways.gsi.gov.uk	Highways Agency	04.12.12	IM	
91	Bob Ayton		Internal	20.08.12	IM	
92	Peter George		Internal	16.08.12	IM	
93	Daisy Johnson		Internal- Neighbourhood Regen	16.08.12	IM	
94			Internal - Property Services	30.11.12	IM	
95	unknown	unknown	unknown	05.12.12	n/a	Summary Doc
96	Christine Tyrrell	hallidaychristine@hotmail.com	Resident/Individual	05.12.12	06.12.12	Summary Doc

Appendix D: Summary of Consultation Responses North East Enfield Area Action Plan - Interim Direction Document Stage – August 2012 - November 2012

Table A

Ref	Consultee	Main issues raised	Council's response/ How issues have been taken into account
1A	Marine Management Organisation	- Have no comments to submit as the area does not include sea or a tidal river	- N/A
2A 2B 2C	Resident Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extend Metropolitan Open Land to include the area adjacent to the rear gardens of properties of the east side of Colinwood Avenue - The Kingfisher Hall Primary School proposed on Open Metropolitan Land, is inappropriate development in given the context and would be harmful to nearby residential properties causing traffic and congestion - Various sites suggested for a primary school in Ponders End including, Ripmax Corner, Green Street/Enstone Road, Middlesex University, Queensway Alexandra Road Industrial Estate, Alma Road Industrial Estate, car park at Glyn Road and car park at Nags Head Road/High Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adjustments to the boundary of Metropolitan Open Land is an issue that can only be addressed through the Core Strategy, it is not something that the AAP can do. - Noted. The AAP recognises that education facilities may need to expand in the future. Policy 7.1 Community Facilities sets out that the Council will continue to monitor the need for community facilities. - Noted
3A	Resident	- Consider extending the Metropolitan Open Land to include the area next to the back gardens of properties on the east side of Colinwood Avenue	- Adjustments to the boundary of Metropolitan Open Land is an issue that can only be addressed through the Core Strategy, it is not something that the AAP can do.
4A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More multiple retailer shops in Ponders End Local Centre - Durants Park, Enfield Highway could accommodated a coffee shop - Help for local business - Local centres should be improved as they provide local employment 	- Improvements to Local Centres are a key part of the AAP, and these are set out in a range of policies within Part C of the Proposed Submission Draft.
5A	Resident Summary Document	- Development needs should be should be considered against population increase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need for new development, including housing and employment, is informed by various 'evidence base' studies that support the Council's planning policy documents, including the Core Strategy and the emerging Development Management Document (DMD). The AAP has used this evidence to support policies that in turn reflect higher-level policy in the Core Strategy and DMD. - An updated socio-economic assessment has considered increased needs for community facilities as a result of increasing population, and a policy in relation to community facilities is included in the AAP. - Policy 7.1 Community Facilities sets out that the Council will continue to monitor the need for community facilities.

6A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the development of new housing and improving the local centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed
7A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More community facilities in Ponders End including a health centre - There is potential for improvements along Southbury Road and South Street - More shops in Ponders End High Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An updated socio-economic assessment has considered increased needs for community facilities as a result of increasing population, and a Policy 7.1 in relation to community facilities is included in the AAP.
8A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage multiple retailers to Ponders End High Street - Unsure about re-locating the parade of shops on South Street towards the Ponders End Station but options should be explored through the masterplan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council has commissioned a detailed Retail Study that is due to be completed in mid 2014. In the meantime, the AAP has a strong focus on improving local centres and a range of policies are included in Part C.
9A	Resident Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve the pedestrian access along Meridian Way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A planning application for the redevelopment of the Alma Estate is expected to be submitted in 2014. The AAP includes Policy 11.2 in relation to the Alma Estate, and this sets out that non-residential uses (including retail) should be located close to Ponders End Station. - The AAP includes policies for improving pedestrian and cycle access in Part B. A key east-west route is proposed in Policy 4.8 along Lea Valley Road, and would include improvements to the junction of Lea Valley Road, Mollison Avenue and Meridian Way. It does not include a specific policy for improving pedestrian access along Mollison Avenue. However, there are general policies for improving the pedestrian environment and improvements to Meridian Way could come forward.
10A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agrees with the revised study area boundary - There is a need for community facilities - Open spaces in the area should be improved - Supports the approach taken with key local centres - New employment land should be measured against need - New social housing is required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An updated socio-economic assessment has considered increased needs for community facilities as a result of increasing population, and Policy 7.1 in relation to community facilities is included in the AAP. - The AAP includes Policy 8.1 which seeks to improve open spaces within area. - The AAP does not allocate new land for employment. It reflects higher level policy (in the Core Strategy and the London Plan) by continuing to protect existing employment land. - The AAP identifies where new housing will come forward, and includes Policy 5.1 in relation to affordable housing that reflects those set out in the DMD and Core Strategy.
11A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the councils approach to regeneration of the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed
12A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is good library provision in the area and these should be retained - Very please with the improvements made to Albany Leisure Centre - There is a need for new housing and health centre - Local centres in the area should have less takeaways and more retail - Generally supportive of the Councils plans for the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The AAP does not propose any changes to library provision - The AAP identifies where new housing will come forward - The AAP requires the provision of a new health centre as part of the redevelopment of the Alma Estate in Policy 11.2. - The AAP includes policies to support Local Centres in Part C. However, it does not include specific policies to limit takeaways. Policy 32 in the Submission Development Management Document sets out policy in relation to takeaways.

13A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the approach taken with key local centres - Agrees with the improvements made to Ponders End Park and more should be done else where in the area - Need for traditional retail and a variety of outlets - More should be done to improve access for the elderly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted. The AAP includes policies to improve the Local Centres in Part C. - Noted. The AAP includes policies (ranging from the overarching Policy 4.2 to detailed policies for specific locations in Part C) to improve the pedestrian environment for everyone.
14A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agrees with the Council approach to energy and more should be done to embrace new energy technologies as part of this plan - Residents in the area should be encouraged to take up allotments - New university in Enfield - Moorefield Road Health Centre should be re-developed - Public realm in the key local centres should be improved - Improvements should be made to existing recreational areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The AAP includes specific Policy 9.1 relating to renewable energy - The AAP includes Policy 8.1 which sets out requirements relating to the provision of new allotments. - The loss of Middlesex University from the area has had a significant impact. It is unlikely that the Council will be able to attract a new university to the area. - The AAP does not include plans to re-develop the Moorefield Road Health Centre. However, the absence of a policy would not prevent appropriate re-development in the future. - The AAP includes specific policies to improve the public realm in the Local Centres in Part C. - The AAP includes Policy 8.1 for improving existing open spaces (including recreational areas).
15A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to regeneration of the area - There is a need to improve the provision of health centres in the area - More should be done to embrace new technologies with energy generation - The NGAP is required and will support the industrial estates - More family housing is required - Improvement to the key local centres in the area with better retail provision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new health centre is required in Policy 11.2 as part of the redevelopment of the Alma Estate - The AAP includes Policy 9.1 relating to sustainable energy. - The AAP explains the importance of NGAP and includes Policy 4.3 in relation to it. Ongoing work into its feasibility is being undertaken by the Council in partnership with TfL - The AAP includes Policies 5.1 and 5.2 in relation to housing, and emphasises the importance of family housing in the NEE area - The AAP includes policies to support and improve Local Centres in Part C.
16A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the councils approach to regeneration of the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed
17A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils plan for regeneration of the area - Ponders End is the key development area and more should be done now to bring about change - Ponders End High Street could accommodate multiple retailers - Improvements should be made to community facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted - The AAP includes policies specific to the Ponders End area in Part C of the Plan, including Ponders End High Street, Ponders End Central, the South Street Area, the Alma Estate and Ponders End Station. - The AAP identifies opportunities for improving existing community facilities in Policies 14.1 and 13.1.
18A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area - The NGAP must come forward to improve access to the industrial estates in the area - Improvements should be explored for the Queensway Industrial Estate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed and noted - The AAP explains the importance of NGAP and includes Policy 4.3 in relation to it. Ongoing work into its feasibility is being undertaken by the Council in partnership with TfL - The Queensway Industrial Estate is identified in Policy 10.2 relating to Ponders End Central and to Policy 6.1 which seeks to improve industrial estates.

19A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the need for new housing - Access improvements to parks in the area for disabled people - Improvements to public transport - Improve access to jobs and training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted - Improvements to parks are identified in Policy 8.1 relating to Green Network. Whilst these do not explicitly include access improvements for disabled people, this is something that would normally be considered where possible. The AAP also includes policies relating to the pedestrian and cycle network – these aim to improve accessibility for everyone, including disabled people. - Chapter 4, Movement includes Policies 4.11, 4.12, and 4.13 in relation to improving buses and Policy 4.4 in relation to train services on the West Anglia Mainline. - Chapter 4, Movement includes policies to improve access to employment areas and to locations such as Local Centres by public transport, walking and cycling, so helping to improve physical access to jobs and training. The AAP notes that the Council has ongoing commitments and initiatives in relation to education and training, but policy in relation to these is not included in the AAP as its focus is on planning policies that relate to land use.
20A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed
21A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area - There is a need for the NGAP to improve the local road network in the area and to ease congestion - More shopping facilities and retail parks along Mollison Avenue to support the communities of Brimsdown, Enfield lock and Enfield Island Village - Improvements to public transport to connect the area to neighbouring places 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - The AAP explains the importance of NGAP and includes Policy 4.3 in relation to it. Ongoing work into its feasibility is being undertaken by the Council in partnership with TfL. - Retail remains focussed in the areas already defined by the Council. However, the AAP includes a policy relating to the long-term development potential of the area around Brimsdown Station. Whilst this would be employment-led development as a 'gateway' to the Brimsdown Industrial Area, there is the potential for ancillary mixed-uses such as retail at the ground floor. - Chapter 4, Movement includes Policies 4.11, 4.12, and 4.13 in relation to improving buses and Policy 4.4 in relation to train services on the West Anglia Mainline.
22A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvements to car parks and more needs to be done to make the area pedestrian friendly - Better public transport connections - New housing to accommodate population growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The AAP includes policies to make the area more pedestrian friendly (ranging from the overarching Policy 4.2 to detailed policies for specific locations in Part C). It does not include specific policies to improve car parks, although it does set out policy in relation to the Coop site in Enfield Wash which includes improving the frontage to the road and incorporating car parking. - Chapter 4, Movement includes Policies 4.11, 4.12, and 4.13 in relation to improving buses and Policy 4.4 in relation to train services on the West Anglia Mainline. - The AAP identifies locations for new housing.
23A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area - Need to plan for future school places - Need for cleaner and cheaper energy sources should be explored - Need to improve public transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed - The Council has ongoing plans for monitoring and providing school places. These are reflected in Policy 7.1 - Improving public transport is a key aim of the AAP. Chapter 4, Movement

24A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improving retail provision in the area - Need for community facilities such as health centres and day care facilities for children - Supports the need for cheaper energy - Need to plan for future school places - Improve existing open space - Agrees with improving the local economy and access to Jobs - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area 	<p>includes Policies 4.11, 4.12, and 4.13 in relation to improving buses and Policy 4.4 in relation to train services on the West Anglia Mainline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The AAP includes policies supporting the Local Centres in Part C. - An updated socio-economic assessment has considered increased needs for community facilities as a result of increasing population, and Policy 7.1 in relation to community facilities is included in the AAP. - Improvements to parks and other open spaces are identified in Policy 8.1 relating to Green Network. - Welcomed
25A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed
26A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed
27A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed
28A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area - Supports new housing development in Ponders End - Need for better leisure facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments welcomed and noted - An updated socio-economic assessment has considered increased needs for community facilities (including leisure) as a result of increasing population, and Policy 7.1 in relation to community facilities is included in the AAP.
29A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agrees with the need to improve the local centres and shopping parades - Supports the approach taken with the industrial estates - Agrees with approach to improving access and connections in the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed
30A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the approach to energy - New homes need to be delivered alongside community facilities and open space - Supports the Alma Estate renewal and plans for Academy street - Agrees with improving the industrial estates and boosting the local economy with jobs - Supports the improvement of the key local centres - Supports residential development on the former Middlesex University site - Agrees with the approach taken with NGAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments welcomed and noted - An updated socio-economic assessment has considered increased needs for community facilities as a result of increasing population, and Policy 7.1 in relation to community facilities is included in the AAP.
31A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area - Supports the approach taken with NGAP - Supportive of sensitive housing development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments welcomed and noted

32A	Councillor Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supportive of the Councils regeneration plans for the area - Supports the Need for NGAP to ease traffic congestion - Agrees with approach taken towards local centres and shopping parades - Supports mix-use development in the identified local centres with residential development over ground floor retail uses - The need for community facilities should be explored alongside housing development - Important to improve the local economy to provide jobs and training - Improving access to public transport - Exploring the future crossing points alongside the 3/4 rail tracking project - Work with land owners such as Enfield Homes to explore potential development opportunities with their land holdings in the AAP area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments welcomed and noted - An updated socio-economic assessment has considered increased needs for community facilities as a result of increasing population, and Policy 7.1 in relation to community facilities is included in the AAP. - An overall aim of the AAP is to improve the local economy, and this has informed many of the policies. - Improving public transport is a key aim of the AAP. Chapter 4, Movement includes Policies 4.11, 4.12, and 4.13 in relation to improving buses and Policy 4.4 in relation to train services on the West Anglia Mainline - The AAP has been supported by a study on future crossing points that may be required as a result of the West Anglia Mainline Enhancement Project (also referred to as 3/4 tracking). The AAP identifies where further, more detailed Planning Briefs are required to inform and support crossing points. - Noted
33A	Thames Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 17 identifies potential access around King Georges Reservoir. The King Georges Reservoir is one of our Lee Valley raw water storage reservoirs which is used for public water supply - In operating, managing and investing in our assets we have to consider what is in the best interest of our customers. This includes considering opportunities for recreation and education. We consider there is potential for greater public access along the reservoir but this will need to consider our operational requirements. Access along the top (crest) of the embankment would not be acceptable due to health and safety requirements - Like the William Girling Reservoir, King George's Reservoir is designated a SSSI for its wildfowl interest and any future public access or recreational uses would also have to be compatible with this designation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, LBE to work closely with LVRPA to develop the next stage of the plan in-line with the Park's development framework - The AAP includes broad policies to improve connections for residents between their homes and the LVRP, whilst also recognising the need to protect the biodiversity of the area. It sets the scene for more detailed projects, and these would be developed in close liaison
34A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, Welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
35A	Hertfordshire Council Property and Technology	<p>HCC are aware that children in Enfield attend primary school in Hertfordshire, and vice versa. This dynamic should be considered in the context of both Enfield's long-term housing strategy and its school place planning. The development of NE Enfield needs to ensure that sufficient school places are</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, - The LBE Education department has been involved in the production of the AAP. Policy 7.1 included monitoring of the situation, and action in response.

36A	Waltham Abbey Town Council	<p>provided in tandem with the additional housing to prevent further pressure being placed on existing schools where there are already capacity issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applaud Enfield Council's efforts to improve the area for its residents and visitors, but with the inclusion of NGAP cannot support the document - Strongly objects to NAGAP for reasons set out at the previous Public Inquiry in 2002 - Objects in the NGAP has been brought forward prior to any discussions with bordering authorities - Not satisfied with the explanation of the scheme and residents and businesses in Waltham Abbey have not been made aware of NGAP - Considers that the process to achieve NGAP will be costly to the Public Purse - NGAP would bring congestion to residents in Waltham Abbey giving rise to serious concerns over road safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. Close liaison with neighbouring authorities is required in exploring the feasibility, and in any subsequent planning application. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
37A	Burnett Planning & Development Limited on Behalf of Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Re-word the description of Enfield Retail Park. Sainsbury's is not part of the Retail Park and is in separate ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted
37B		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure the policy approach for the retail parks reflects the NPPF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted
38A	Epping Forrest County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objects to NAGAP for reasons set out at the previous Public Inquiry in 2002 - Objects to the resurrection of the NGAP when the project requires two authority areas to bring the project forward; - The Council is not satisfied with the explanation of the scheme and views it will be expensive on the public purse 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. Close liaison with neighbouring authorities is required in exploring the feasibility, and in any subsequent planning application. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
39A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to regeneration of the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed
40A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally agrees with the approach to regeneration of the area - Agrees with the approach to energy - Supports the need to deliver more community facilities - Agrees with the approach taken with Ponders End and need for housing and improved retail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed
41A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning

			approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
42A	Resident	- Supports the Councils approach to regeneration of the area	- Welcomed
43A	Business	- Supports the Councils approach to regeneration of the area	- Welcomed
44A	Theatres Trust	- Minor amendments to diagram - Supports the Councils approach to regeneration of the area	- Noted, welcomed
45A	Business	- Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - Essential for NGAP to come forward to help the business in the area	- Welcomed, noted - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
46A	Response from Member of Parliament	- The MP strongly supports NGAP and encourages the Council to move forward now with the project rather than a position of continued consideration - The MP has written to a number of businesses in Enfield encouraging support for NGAP. Subsequently there have been a number of responses just in support of NGAP	- Welcomed, noted - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
47A	Business	- Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area	- Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
48A	Business	- Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area	- Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
49A	Business	- Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area	- Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP

50A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
51A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
52A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
53A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
54A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
55A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
56A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP

57A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
58A	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the approach to energy - More details required for NGAP - Employers should provide a percentage of local jobs for residents in the area - Supports the approach to rail as more residents are commuting outside the area for work - Transport infrastructure is the key requirement the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome, noted - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP - LBE is working closely with local employers to help support local people into jobs. However, as the focus of the AAP is on policies relating to land use, a policy in relation to local jobs is not included.
59A	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for community space with car parking - Supports the approach to energy - Agrees with the regeneration plans for Ponders End High Street and the re-development of available sites - Agrees retail provision and improvements to public realm need to be explored - Agrees the connections to the Lee Valley Regional Park should be improved - Supports a need for different housing typologies - Supports the approach to the local economy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 7.1 identifies the potential for a new community space. However, as a high level policy it does not include detail in relation to car parking provision. Other Council policies require facilities such as a community space to be located where they are highly accessible by a range of modes of transport (e.g. in a local centre) and so access will be carefully considered in any proposals.
60A	Loughton Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support Epping and Waltham Abbey Council responses to NGAP - The Council objects to NGAP as it would increase traffic, be detrimental to the environment, adversely affect wildlife and be congested if there were problems to the M25 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. Close liaison with neighbouring authorities is required in exploring the feasibility, and in any subsequent planning application. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
61A	Don and Wright Property Consultants on behalf of London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notes that with population increases there will be pressure placed on fire fighting facilities - The authority highlights that fire fighting facilities are important community facilities and would look to the Council to provide S106 monies to upgrade facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted - S106 contributions are not an issue that the AAP addresses
62A	Essex County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The County Council objects to the NEEAAP on the grounds of NGAP - Concerned with the impact that NGAP will have on the Green Belt - Effect of the proposed link road on traffic generation and congestion - Impact of other public transportation and traffic control measures that would be part of NGAP may rule out the need for a link road - Enfield Council should consider other reasonable alternative options - Request meaningful discussion on NGAP in accordance with the Duty to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. Close liaison with neighbouring authorities is required in exploring the feasibility, and in any subsequent planning application. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.

		Cooperate	
63A	Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomes the approach to leisure, recreation, health and wellbeing - Plan needs to be more vocal on benefits of nature conservation - Links to the LVRP Development Framework are welcomed - The vision is generally supported but requires a more environmental focus - Welcome the green routes highlighted on plan but more detail is required - The plan should not only consider the facilities that are needed or desired around natural open spaces but also the functions and services provided natural/semi natural habitats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed, noted - Policies 8.1 (Enhancing existing open space) and 8.3 (Joining green spaces together) highlight nature conservation issues - A Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken on the AAP, and this has helped refine some of the policies to ensure that impacts on nature conservation assets are minimised and mitigated.
64A	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomes references to the LVRP Development Framework - Welcomes reference to improve and enhance green environs and natural assets - Welcomes reference to the ecological value of the area being protected and enhanced - The Council should include green infrastructure wherever possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed, noted - Chapter 8 includes reference to green infrastructure along with Policies 8.1 (Enhancing existing open space) and 8.3 (Joining green spaces together)
65A	Waltham Abbey Town Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong objection to NGAP and support representation made by neighbouring authorities - NGAP would cause considerable traffic congestion and have a detrimental impact on Waltham Abbey - -Detrimental impacts to the LVRP and Rammey Marsh 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. Close liaison with neighbouring authorities is required in exploring the feasibility, and in any subsequent planning application. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
66A	Broxbourne Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Broxbourne Council welcomes joint working with Enfield Council on the provision of transport infrastructure and where there may be cumulative impacts of future development on the road network - The Council supports reference to improvements to public transport - Reference to improving connections to the LVRP are welcomed but more recognition of movement to the Lee Valley White Water Canoe Centre in Waltham Cross is required - The Council agrees with proposals to improve the public realm and are happy to work with Enfield on joint projects such as the future improvements to the Holmesdale Tunnel - The Council would like to be kept informed of the future of housing redevelopment in the study area and specific housing numbers that are to be allocated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. Close liaison with neighbouring authorities is required in exploring the feasibility, and in any subsequent planning application. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
67A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning

68A	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally agrees with the approach to regeneration of the area - Agrees with the approach to energy - Supports the need to deliver more community facilities - Agrees with the approach taken with Ponders End and need for housing and improved retail - Agrees with the approach taken with the industrial estates 	<p>approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed
69A	The College of Haringey, Enfield and North East London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the regeneration plans for the area - One of the key challenges is the current low skills base of the adult population and we think this should be recognised in the vision but in a positive way - There is a need for larger scale useable and affordable community space in Ponders End - Support the council's approach to the local economy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, recognised in Part A
70A	Alma Residents Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ARA note that it was agreed - because the Council removed the multi-use-games-area (MUGA), and installed a temporary one which would last between two to three years. Academy Street was identified as an area where the MUGA could be reinstated to its original size - Support the overall approach to regeneration of the Alma Estate, but would like community services to be developed for residents on Academy Street - Strongly oppose Academy Street being developed for housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 11.3 The South Street Area notes that any future redevelopment of the identified community facilities in this location is required to re-provide the MUGA. - Academy Street (now known as Dujardin Mews) has been granted planning consent and construction is due to start in early 2014.
71A	British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The organisation are keen that the AAP recognises the benefit and opportunities of the waterways as part of the borough's essential infrastructure particularly for sustainable transport, healthy lifestyles, carbon reduction, biodiversity enhancement, education, Tourism and placemaking - With regards to Columbia Wharf, clarification through the next draft is sought to what is intended to be developed for the site - Do not support lighting along waterways as this can adversely affect ecology - Support reference to residential moorings and would encourage more provision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunities for waterways specifically identified in Policy 12.1 Ponders End Waterfront - No lighting proposed along waterways in the AAP - More detailed proposed on Ponders End Waterfront (of which Columbia Wharf forms a part) in Policy 12.1
72A	Enfield Business and Retailers Association (EBRA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the described boundary with it's three core local shopping parades as well as the retail park areas, this includes existing industrial & business park zones - Note the potential for expanding retail growth and reducing unemployment within the new boundary parameters is something that must be explored to improve socio-economic growth in the area - Note it is good to strengthen the areas as a whole, but individual local centres should still be encouraged to build on their own identities, especially by using retail areas, particularly those that provide specialist or niche services as local focus points. This would help to keep local retail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed, noted, supporting evidence to be prepared evaluating the future provision for retail, community facilities and access improvements - Building on local identity is an important principle within the AAP, and this is set out in Policies 10.1, 13.1 and 14.1.

		<p>offers in keeping with local community needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the focus on the local economy, but additional attention should be paid to the threat from other retail centres such as Waltham Cross & Cheshunt which attract customers away from Enfield shopping centres - Support the key themes in their entirety and think that a holistic approach to the composition of town centre areas would create an ideal symbiosis between community and stakeholders that can only increase the appeal of the local retail offer - Note where new developments are being built, consideration should be given to needs of larger corporate multiples and their particular needs. Although bespoke solutions cannot always be applied, larger retailers will always be attracted to an area that will take care of most of their needs. If increased floorspace is a requirement or necessity, amalgamation of existing units could solve space issues if existing singular units fail to satisfy the needs of a particular business - Support the proposals for Ponders End as the proposed ideas will help establish a strong identity for the area, and help improve the prosperity for local traders. This should help to establish Ponders End as a destination, where the improved public realm encourages confidence throughout the town centre area - Support the plans to improve Enfield Highway, Enfield Wash and other town centres. If funding is available to improve the look of these particular areas, a focus should be on street branding including signage, design, paving, street furniture and parking should be highlighted as this will help to improve street aesthetics in the most positive way - Note that as well as improvements to the bus routes, consideration should be given to rail crossings using either bridge or tunnel construction for improved pedestrian and vehicular movement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The focus on local identity aims to help build a unique offer within the Local Centres that contrasts with larger centres such as Waltham Cross rather than try to compete directly with them. - Opportunities for development of larger units within the local centres. However Policy 14.2 identifies a specific opportunity for retail-led redevelopment in Enfield Wash at the Co-operative Store site. - Specific policies to improve the local centres are set out within the AAP in Policies 10.1, 13.1 and 14.
73A	Herfordshire County Council Planning Unit	<p>It is noted that North East Enfield borders Hertfordshire and as such HCC are aware that children in Enfield attend primary school in Hertfordshire, and vice versa</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Primary schools in Waltham Cross are at capacity and there is significant pressure for additional places - This dynamic should be considered in the context of both Enfield's long term housing strategy and its school places planning to prevent further pressures on school capacity - The County Council is awaiting the outcome of the recently commissioned Transport Modelling work to determine the scale of impact on the road network. Any additional traffic generation identified will need to be considered alongside development proposals and the potential benefits and impacts of NGAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 7.1, Community Facilities, sets out the need to monitor community facilities. Need for future school places to be informed by LBE Education department - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. Close liaison with neighbouring authorities is required in exploring the feasibility, and in any subsequent planning application. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
74A	English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Note the AAP could go much further in identifying heritage assets such as the Grade II listed Broadbent building, former Middlesex University site within the study area and discuss the historic environment as a component of local character - The document should provide a stronger steer on the need to enhance the historic environment identifying landmarks that could be of value - A clear policy approach to support conservation of relevant heritage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The AAP has identified areas of heritage importance, not only those designated as Conservation Areas but also other locations that are (or have the potential to be) 'special' and included specific policies. For example, key parts of the Local Centres along Hertford Road in policies 10.1, 13.1 and 14.1

75A	Campaign to Protect Rural England	<p>assets the contribute towards local character</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong objection to NGAP and support representation made by neighbouring authorities - NGAP would cause considerable traffic congestion, air pollution and a detriment to nature conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. Close liaison with neighbouring authorities is required in exploring the feasibility, and in any subsequent planning application. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
76A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP.
77A	The Enfield Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the approach to the local economy - Supports the approach taken with NGAP - Support 3/4 tracking project - Need for well designed affordable housing - Supports the approach taken with local centres and shopping parades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed, noted - Policy 5.1 sets out requirements for affordable housing, and the chapter refers to higher level policies in the Core Strategy and emerging DMD that require high quality design.
78A	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Authority supports the draft Vision and the objectives that seek to co-ordinate the growth of sustainable neighbourhoods maintain and enhance the network of linked open green space and which recognise the value of the Regional Park and its natural assets. The Authority welcomes the inclusion of the Regional Park boundary on the 'Key Diagram' Figure 13 - The Authority has concern that Objective 5 'Infrastructure Investment' and the Key Diagram include reference to NGAP. The Authority does not support this element of the AAP document and objects to its inclusion in the APP, insufficient detail is provided - The Authority's draft Area 5 Proposals and a small section from Area 4 are therefore relevant to the study area and should be included within the Area Action Plan - The Authority welcomes the policy approach to planning the future of Ponders End Waterfront, part of the Ponders End Neighbourhood Centre - The Authority supports the reference to the PDF Area Proposals in relation to Enfield Island Village and the need to improve walking and cycling connections between this area and the surrounding Park as well as other local centres - The Authority wishes to be informed of the outcome of the various studies concerning the NGAP proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. Close liaison with neighbouring authorities is required in exploring the feasibility, and in any subsequent planning application. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP. - The AAP has had regard to the draft Area 5 and Area 4 proposals
79A	Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the approach to the local economy - Supports the approach taken with NGAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed

		<p>link road and therefore consider the Council should await the results prior to any new draft of this AAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TFL welcomes the strong support for enhancements on the West Anglia Mainline - TFL welcomes the Council's aspiration to maintain and improve existing bus services in the area - The strong emphasis on the improvement of walking and cycling networks to enhance routes is welcomed - In relation to delivery and implementation, TFL would welcome more explicit wording to be included to reinforce the requirement for developer funding to facilitate transport improvements - The reference to the Lee Valley Heat Network and the approach to energy are strongly supported as means of delivering aspirations set out in the draft OAPF and London Plan 	
84A	Ponders End Community Development Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Trust notes that the MUGA on South Street was demolished and the land taken over by the new Academy. A temporary replacement has been built, to last for three years, on the other side of the Ponders End Youth Centre. The long-term replacement playing area was to be provided on the stretch of land now being referred to as "Academy Street" for new housing. This new proposal ignores the wishes of residents and the undertakings given earlier during the SPD consultations and when the playing area was closed - The Trust note it will be important to continue to realise the Olympic legacy in Ponders End by improving and upgrading sports provision. Such provision is especially important in this area experiencing multiple deprivation. It has a severe shortage of open space and sports facilities, which can be easily accessed and used by the poorer and less fortunate members of the community. It would be a profound mistake to build new housing without also providing adequate recreational buildings and spaces - The need to have one overall planning framework document for the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 11.3 The South Street Area - notes that any future redevelopment of the identified community facilities in this location is required to re-provide the MUGA. - The AAP provides the overall planning framework for the area.
85A	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for Public Toilets in Ponders End Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted. Policy 8.1 sets out how local open spaces will be improved. This does not specifically identify public toilets in Ponders End Park as the policy is generally at a 'high level'. However, the absence of a specific policy would not prevent such a scheme coming forward.
86A	FERRA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - -The organisation fully agrees with the Council's view that improving access and movement within North East Enfield is a key task. We also agree that the options that should be considered include: improving the frequency of trains stopping at stations along the Lee Valley railway line; a Northern Gateway Access Package to improve the link between the local road network to the M25; improvements to bus routes, walking and cycling Fully support the need to explore the options for the Northern Gateway Access Package. Our view is that the most important part of this package would be the construction of the link road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed

87A	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the Councils approach to regeneration of the area - There is a need for more health centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed, noted - Policy 7.1 identifies the need for a new health centre. Policy 11.2 requires the provision of a health centre as part of the Alma Estate Regeneration.
88A	North London Waste Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Authority agrees with the approach to energy in the Upper Lee Valley. As a member of the DEN project is aware of the on-going work and look to engage positively with the North London Strategic Alliance (NLSA) going forward 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted
89A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the Councils approach to the local economy - States the Council should go ahead with NGAP project now as congestion in the area is having a negative impact on business and community within the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted, welcomed - LBE and Transport for London carrying out early feasibility modelling work to explore the NGAP. It is a significant project that will require detailed work such as an Environmental Impact Assessment and is subject to planning approval. It is therefore a project that cannot be implemented immediately. Policy 4.3 is included in the AAP
90A	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For clarity and consistency with the Core Strategy the following is amended: <p>P67 of AAP Policy Approach 3 "3. Continued consideration will also be given to the potential benefits, and merits, and impacts of a Northern Gateway Access Package [NGAP] that involves providing a new link between the A1055 and the A121 to connect to junction 26 of the M25, mitigating the impact of the scheme in Rammev Marsh as much as possible. This has the potential of significantly improving access on to the M25 and beyond from key industrial areas. This, again, will be considered in the context of further technical studies being undertaken in partnership with stakeholders, such as Transport for London and the Highways Agency. However, the limited scale of the additional congestion caused by the projected development trips indicates that the NGAP scheme is not required to deliver the planned growth in Enfield alone and should be considered in the context of growth in North London as a whole;"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted
91A	LBE Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amendments to Figure 7 – Location of schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted
92A	LBE Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The target to deliver a 1000 + units by 2026 is modest - Welcome Point and the Youth Centre are not part of the Alma redevelopment plans - Make reference to the Council working with retailers on South Street to look at the future of the shopping parade location - More positive references are require for Ponders End 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted
93A	LBE Regeneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Alma Estate redevelopment needs to be mentioned early on in the document - Reference the Swan Annex as building of character - Reference the former Middlesex University site adding to the decline in the High Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted

94A	LBE Property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference in detail the South Street East project - Note access to the High Street should be public - Noted Enfield Business Centre improvement project, OLF2 monies - Schedule and plan of LBE owned sites/buildings in the study area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information on Council ownerships has informed the AAP. However, the scale of the area covered means that it is not possible to include a plan showing this at A4 scale.
95A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the councils regeneration plans - Improving congestion in local centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed, noted - Part C of the AAP includes proposals for the Local Centres, encompassing improvements to car parking and pedestrian access that aim to help address issues of congestion
96A	Resident Summary Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally supportive of the councils regeneration plans - More multiple retailers in the key local centres - Improving Enfield Island Village retail facilities - Networking of local employers with Jobsite - Housing for the elderly - Improving places of worship - Improvements to public transport, explore the potential for more bus lanes - Need for community space for the elderly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomed, noted - The AAP includes a focus on local centres along the Hertford Road, and does not include specific policies in relation to other centres such as Enfield Island Village. However, the absence of a specific policy does not mean that improvements cannot come forward. - The AAP includes policies in relation to new housing, but has not specifically identified housing for the elderly. - Improvements to public transport are key to the AAP, and Policies 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13 focus on buses. - Policy 7.1 sets out policy in relation to community facilities for all of the population.

Strategic Planning and Design
Enfield Council
Civic Centre
Silver Street
Enfield
EN1 3XY

Tel: 020 8379 1000
www.enfield.gov.uk

