

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|----|------------------------------|-----------------------|------|--------|------|---|--|
| 2 | Respondent and date | Document | Page | Para | Line | Comment | LBE comment and action |
| 3 | | | | | | Church St/Fore St Conservation Area Appraisals | |
| 4 | Edmonton Study Group 10.1.16 | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | | |
| 5 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | n/a | | Most original fabric in area is at first floor level and so unappreciated. Frontage restoration should be considered to enhance rather than hide historic buildings. | There is specific reference in the documents to the potential for shopfront improvements. |
| 6 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | No photos of Silver Point. Would be interested to see comments on this. | There is text in the document on Silver Point. Not all buildings are photographed. |
| 7 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Notes that strategies proposed in 2006 appraisal including boundary extensions were not implemented and that these areas are now too altered to justify inclusion. Critical of this. Reports little CAG scrutiny of cases in Conservation Area (CA) and need for strong local presence monitoring change. | Enforcement project initiated with significant number of notices served and prosecutions underway. Would welcome greater monitoring of the condition of the Conservation Area (CA) by local group. |
| 8 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Mentions several apparent cases of planning infringements and states that works to redress these would be fairly minor | Noted. Where appropriate these are under investigation by enforcement. |
| 9 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | 34 | 2.6.16 | | Reference to properities where repairs of upper floors was grant-aided. Now scope for shopfront improvements. | No funds currently available. Opportunity is noted. |
| 10 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | 38 | 2.6.25 | | Refers to importance of Angel Place and need to keep it within the CA boundary | Properties are listed buildings. No proposal to remove from the CA. |
| 11 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | 2.9.1 | | Notes continuing threat to CA from inaction as well as harmful interventions. | Noted. Enforcement project underway but local engagement and monitoring will also be important going forward. |
| 12 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | 62-3 | | | Comment on need for feedback on summary of issues | Noted. Feedback will be to CAG. |
| 13 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Comment on document formatting and potential for text to be overlooked. | Formatting reviewed |
| 14 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Query about reporting of apparently unauthorised works. | Confirmed that unauthorised works should be reported to Enviro Crime direct. |
| 15 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Support for CA boundary revisions is dependent upon assurance that key groups of buildings will continue to have protection. | Not all buildings proposed for exclusion are suitable for local/statutory listing. Where of sufficient quality buildings are either being considered as part of the Local Heritage Review or could be put forward for consideration for statutory listing. |
| 16 | Historic England,19.1.16 | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | | |
| 17 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Development of appraisal and guidelines important step to addressing issues affecting the conservation area and as such support these documents. | Noted |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|----|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| 18 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Refers to NPPF policy 127 and need to ensure that designation is justified. Principal issue is de-designation of areas south of North Circular. Notes these areas always considered more marginal in terms of architectural and historic merit. However, full boundary change would be disappointing in light of public funding for repairs, including from English Heritage (now Historic England). May be detrimental to management of the area to remove conservation area controls for one half of street. | Boundary revisions proposed reflect NPPF guidance. Quality was already marginal and has deteriorated. Former Burton's building is proposed for local list. Whole terrace and streetscape have effect on setting of Conservation Area and can be managed in this way. |
| 19 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Church St and Fore St Conservation Areas on 'Historic England Register of Historic Buildings at Risk 2015'. Character derives from different periods of ribbon development along one of London's principal historic routes and is subject to significant pressures. Any decision to de-designate should be based on extent of historic significance of its individual elements and collectively its contribution to the significance of the CA. | Buildings proposed for exclusion on west side generally less architecturally/historically significant than much of east. Limited contribution of particular buildings/groups. Current enforcement project helping redress the deterioration of the area. |
| 20 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Comments on effect of North Circular on Fore St south. Quality of townscape affected by poor public realm, lack of signage control and erosion of architectural features. Comment on effect of some recent development on setting of CA. | Public realm and need for improvement identified in CAA/CAMP. |
| 21 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Western side less architecturally significant than the east. Number of buildings on west, however, include architectural detail. Low buildings frame Art Deco former Burton's store which makes positive contribution. Would be preferable to have holistic management strategy covering public realm and shopfront design, retaining both sides of street within CA to better protect positive elements of local character and their setting. | Former Burton's building proposed for inclusion on local list. Whole terrace directly affects setting of CA opposite. Development can be managed on this basis without retaining degraded townscape within CA. Proposals for managing public realm and shopfronts already in document. |
| 22 | | | | | | Area to south of no.152 proposed for de-designation is fragmentary. Few buildings make positive contribution; only 132 [sic] survives with any integrity. Former bank and White Horse PH of more significance but already outside CA boundary. Agree that this section does not warrant CA status on grounds of historic or architectural merit. | Noted. |
| 23 | REACT group 25.1.16 | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | | |
| 24 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Welcomes document highlighting concerns of the group raised previously | Noted |
| 25 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Concerned by deterioration of area and reasons for this. Queries role of English Heritage (now Historic England). | Enforcement project is in place. Management proposals and redefined CA boundaries should help focus resources and sustain and enhance the areas proposed to remain in CA. Historic England commented in response to consultation. |
| 26 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Refers to group's frequently expressed concerns about high street, quality of shopfronts and quality of new build as well as damage to existing buildings | Noted. Potential to increase referral of specific cases to CAG and strengthen local study group |
| 27 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Desire to ensure enforcement action is taken against unauthorised works. This should be given priority. Similar issues included in 2006 documents not acted upon. | Noted. Enforcement initiative for Fore St/Church St already underway. |
| 28 | | Church St/Fore St CAA | | | | Would welcome further opportunity to discuss the High Street being restored and enhanced. | Met group 8.3.16. Contact information provided for reporting unauthorised works and for local study group. |
| 29 | | | | | | Church St/Fore St Conservation Area Management Proposals | |
| 30 | Edmonton Study Group 8.1.16 | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | | |
| 31 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Notes problem of erosion of detail, unauthorised works and loss of character. Stresses need for focus on area and its vulnerabilities. | Enforcement initiative should help to redress this. |
| 32 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Notes that Church St is identified in documents as being compromised. Considers it imperative that measures are taken to protect this key conservation area. | Noted. There is reference in CAMP to implementation and monitoring. |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|----|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| 33 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Query on status of proposed Sustrans project in Church St intended to improve pedestrian and cycle access | Scheme still live but not fully developed. Reference in text. |
| 34 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Notes many shopfront cases on CAG agenda but very few from Fore St, despite new shopfronts being in place. | Shopfront applications not routinely referred to CAG. Noted. |
| 35 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Queries coverage of Fore St in ongoing Local Heritage Review with reference to particular buildings (196-8) understood to be proposed for exclusion from the CA. | 196-8 not proposed for exclusion from the conservation area and being considered as part of the Local Heritage Review. |
| 36 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Concerned about absence of Article 4 Direction in the CA. | Little justification for an Article 4 Direction here as CA principally comprises non-dwelling houses. Monitor situation. |
| 37 | Enfield Society 7.1.16 | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | | |
| 38 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Accepts findings of review documents and reluctantly support de-designations. Should concentrate attention on proper management of remaining designated areas. Potential for an enhanced role for the study group. | Current enforcement project should help redress this. Will support moves to expand local study group. |
| 39 | Society 11.1.16 | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | | |
| 40 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Refers to importance of no. 198 Fore St and apparently unauthorised installation of Upvc windows | Under investigation by Enviro Crime (enforcement) |
| 41 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Many problems appear to derive from the 'erratic' enforcement regime but notes there have been many efforts at a 'new start' over the years. | Noted. Current enforcement project should help redress some of the problems. |
| 42 | Historic England 18.1.16 | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | | |
| 43 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Recommends including reference to national policy and guidance as well as Historic England publication on setting. | Reference to NPPF and NPPG in preamble. Text re. setting revised. |
| 44 | | Church St/Fore St CAMP | | | | Notes this advice does not affect obligation to advise on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this request and which may have adverse effects on the environment. | Noted |
| 45 | REACT group meeting 8.3.16 | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | | |
| 46 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Concern about protecting 169-171 Fore St | Being considered for local listing under Local Heritage Review. Comprises part of setting of part of CA opposite |
| 47 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Concern about enforcement | Enforcement project is having some success. Discussed process. Link since provided for reporting unauthorised works. |
| 48 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Questions concerning extent of early-stage consultation and response to that, particularly of Historic England. | Confirmed early stage consultees including Historic England, who raised concerns particularly regarding ongoing management of west side |
| 49 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Question of how comments would be reported to councillors | Confirmed that response table summarising responses accompanies the Cabinet report |
| 50 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Comments relating to quality and interest of areas proposed for de-designation including their value to the community | Discussed relative quality of areas in context of existing appraisal and management proposals and accompanying townscape analysis as well as NPPF. Local Heritage Review underway and has identified possible inclusions in the section of Fore St. |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|----|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| 51 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Questions relating to extent of protection that designation brings | Discussed difference between local and statutory listing but confirmed that no designation gives absolute protection against demolition. |
| 52 | REACT group at public meeting 8.3.16 | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | | |
| 53 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Concern that councillors not present at the public meeting | Confirmed that notice of meeting had been sent to ward members and briefing notes on project. |
| 54 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Question regarding sequence of programme of Review of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Proposals and whether this reflected relative affluence of areas | Confirmed that sequence not directed by relative affluence of areas. |
| 55 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Query regarding absence of Article 4 Direction in Church St/Fore St. | This maintains position of earlier documents that number of dwelling houses with permitted development rights is low and so an Article 4 Direction would be disproportionate. Situation will be monitored. |
| 56 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Importance of trees in the area should be recognised | Reference to importance of trees in both appraisal and management proposals |
| 57 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Impact of traffic on the area is of concern, particularly around the North Circular. | Some reference in documents to impact of traffice and scope for public realm improvements |
| 58 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Query regarding CiL and Section 106 | Discussed with reference to Council CiL |
| 59 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Comment on poor quality of signage in the area with the lowest common denominator contributing to a downward spiral. Colour a particular issue. Feeling expressed that other authorities seem better able to control advertisements and more stringent controls should be applied in Fore St. Strong local support for this. | Shopfront guidance available on website. |
| 60 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Historic buildings have an educational value for the community | Heritage website has educational resources link |
| 61 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Silverpoint is out of context and comments made on extent of consultation. Desire that developments should reflect the area and be respectful of its historic buildings | Historic England have published advice on setting of Conservation Areas which would be material to any future applications. |
| 62 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Request that consultation feedback should be presented to members | Advised that response table would be attached to Cabinet report |
| 63 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Discussion of how consultations are notified. Possibility of using 'Our Enfield' for future events | Consultation followed protocol of previous two phases of Review of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Proposals. Comment noted. |
| 64 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Importance of the former Burton's building to the area raised and its architectural significance | Building is recognised in appraisal document and being considered for Local List under Local Heritage Review. |
| 65 | | Churc St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Comment that Trafalgar Place is an important part of the character area and should be retained within the CA. | Discussed prevalence of buildings with a negative contribution to the CA identified. Noted importance of 134 Fore St in context of Local Heritage Review. |
| 66 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Comment that Council should lead on initiatives to enhance the Conservation Area such as hanging baskets | Noted and discussed whether any such initiatives might come out of Meridian Water |
| 67 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Request that successful enforcement cases should be publicised | Limited scope for publicising this. Discussed recent appeal decision. |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|----|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-------|---|---|---|
| 68 | Website respondent 17.3.16 | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | | |
| 69 | | Church St/Fore St CAA/CAMP | | | | Buildings valued by the community are not necessarily recognised as important by Council. Concern that these will be demolished without reference to community preferences. Another Silverpoint should not be built, which would increase traffic and air pollution. Existing buildings should be retained and repaired and consideration given to traffic management and residents' parking schemes. | Local heritage review underway. Setting of a conservation area is an issue in considering planning applications. Management proposals set out how Council will approach development proposals in the CA but do not put forward proposals for demolition or new development. |
| 70 | | | | | | Montagu Road Cemeteries Conservation Area Appraisal | |
| 71 | Historic England 12.1.16 | Montagu Road Cemeteries (MRC) CAA | | | | | |
| 72 | | MRC CAA | | | | Development of the appraisal and guidelines an important step to addressing issues affecting the conservation area. Highly supportive of these documents. | Noted |
| 73 | | MRC CAA | | | | Lack of maintenance or co-ordinated management has led to an unfortunate level of harm. Encourages Council to address this. Report by Dr Kadish lists recommendations which feed into the management programme. | Recommendations reviewed. |
| 74 | | MRC CAA | | | | Form, architecture and demographic information of cemeteries are often valuable resources and should be recognised as such in the documents | Text revised. |
| 75 | | MRC CAA | | | | Relatively plain but dense architectural character of the Jewish cemeteries is a reflection of cultural values and pressures created by the volume of burials and should be recognised as part of the character in the text. | Text revised to emphasise this |
| 76 | | MRC CAA | | | | Condition of Tottenham Park Chapel is critical. CA overall appears to justify inclusion in the Historic England register of assets at risk. Area should be identified in text as requiring review on grounds of deteriorating condition. | Will liaise with Historic England re At Risk status. |
| 77 | Edmonton Study Group 10.1.16 | MRC CAA | | | | | |
| 78 | | MRC CAA | | 1.3.1 | | Reason for designation was to give these cemeteries similar statutory protection to other cemeteries. Seems that this protection has not been given. | Hope was to encourage owner groups to apply for grants and support this. Unfortunately this has not been pursued. |
| 79 | | MRC CAA | | 2.6.5 | | Comments on condition of chapel and boundary treatment | The owners are aware of the condition of the chapel. Will liaise once documents approved. |
| 80 | | MRC CAA | | 4.1 | | External funding sources should be investigated if necessary. Vital that the CA designation remains. | Will revisit this with owners once documents approved by Cabinet and liaise with them and Historic Enland regarding Urgent Works Notice. |
| 81 | | MRC CAA | | n/a | | Comment on potential for inclusion in Open House. | Beyond scope of these documents but will pass comment to Friends of Tottenham Park group. |
| 82 | | | | | | | |
| 83 | | | | | | Montagu Road Cemeteries Conservation Area Management Proposals | |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|----|--|--------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| 84 | Historic England 12.1.16 | MRC CAMP | | | | | |
| 85 | | MRC CAMP | | | | Pleased to note priorities for action and particularly the commitment to work with user groups to improve condition and management. | Noted |
| 86 | | MRC CAMP | | | | No listed buildings in CA. However, recommend that CA considered for inclusion in Historic England Register of assets at risk. | Will liaise with Historic England re. At Risk status |
| 87 | | MRC CAMP | | | | Adopting a co-ordinated approach to maintaining paths, planting and overall management important for redressing overall condition. Notes these are identified in documents but recommends greater emphasis as action points. | Wording reviewed. Document format needs to be consistent with format across set of CAMPs |
| 88 | Edmonton Study Group 8.1.16 | MRC CAMP | | | | | |
| 89 | | MRC CAMP | | | | Suggests Council should work with owner groups to increase awareness of grants. | Noted. Will liaise with Council departments and owner groups if documents approved. |
| 90 | | MRC CAMP | | | | Reference to Tottenham Park Friends group. | Has been consultation with Friends group. |
| 91 | | MRC CAMP | | | | Reference to buildings and potential for local listing | The prayer halls and mortuary have been put forward for consideration under Local Heritage Review. |
| 92 | | MRC CAMP | | | | Suggest CAG agenda could include review CA in light of management proposals | For discussion by CAG if documents approved. |
| 93 | | MRC CAMP | | | | Comment on importance of CA designations and value of heritage assets in Edmonton. | Noted. The CAA/CAMP Review identifies both problems and opportunities to take forward for their management over the next five years. There has been close consultation across departments on these proposals. |
| 94 | Enfield Society 7.1.16 | MRC CAMP | | | | | |
| 95 | | MRC CAMP | | | | Accept reasons for continued designation. Comment on planting. | Noted. Planting included within CAMP. |
| 96 | REACT group representatives, public meeting 8.3.16 | MRC CAA/CAMP | | | | | |
| 97 | | MRC CAA/CAMP | | | | Condition of boundaries generally and the chapel in the Tottenham Park chapel of concern. | Council aware of condition of boundaries and former chapel building and some communication with owner groups |
| 98 | | MRC CAA/CAMP | | | | Comment on the value of the crucifix monument in the Tottenham Park Cemetery and its potential for listing | Link to relevant part of Historic England site has been passed on. |