

# Meridian Water *Scrutiny Workstream*

Reply to Response from The Leader & Programme Director, 15 September 2020

COMMITTEE (Disbanded 1 July 2020)

**Cllr Achilles Georgiou (Chair)**  
Labour, Bowes Ward

**Cllr Maria Alexandrou (Vice Chair)**  
Conservative, Winchmore Hill Ward

**Cllr Daniel Anderson**  
Labour, Southgate Green Ward

**Cllr Tolga Aramaz**  
Labour, Edmonton Green Ward

**Cllr Anne Brown**  
Labour, Southgate Green Ward

**Cllr Charith Gunawardena**  
Labour, Southgate Ward

**Cllr Joanne Laban**  
Conservative, Highlands Ward

**Cllr Doug Taylor**  
Labour, Ponders End Ward

[www.enfield.gov.uk](http://www.enfield.gov.uk)



The role of the Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream was to assess whether the ambitions of the Meridian Water Regeneration scheme were being realised, and to identify areas of concern so that these can be addressed.

The Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream issued its final report on 29 June 2020.

The Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream Report makes approximately 135 detailed observations and comments. The report also makes 14 recommendations and 8 suggestions for future work. The findings set out in the report are evidence based and detailed references to supporting documents have been provided throughout the report. Likewise, the calculations in the report are laid out in full in order to ensure complete transparency.

The Workstream has not been given the opportunity to present the report to officers.

The Leader and the Programme Director issued a response to the report online on 08 September 2020. Officers have provided their feedback and comments as an Appendix to the Leader's Response.

This public document provides a comprehensive reply to the Response from the Leader and Programme Director to the feedback and responses by officers.

This document is in 5 sections:

- Reply to the Response from The Leader and Programme Director of 08 Sep 2020
- Reply to the Appendix to Leader and Programme Director's Response of 08 Sep 2020
- Workstream questions (issued 8 June), Officer responses (received 30 July) and Workstream comments
- Appendix 1: Chronology
- Appendix 2: Ambitions of Meridian Water

**Statement in response to the letter by the Leader of the Council and the Meridian Water Programme Director (8 September 2020) and the accompanying appendix.**

This statement is in response to the letter by the Leader of the Council and the Meridian Water Programme Director on the Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream report.

The letter contains some interesting and useful new information and makes a number of claims which need to be addressed in order to present the most accurate public record in relation to the Meridian Water programme.

Firstly, it is important to recognise that the Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream Report did not seek to challenge the ambitions of the Meridian Water regeneration programme; the aim of the report was to assess whether these ambitions are being realised, and to identify areas of concern so that these can be addressed.

The letter says that the report contains some inaccuracies and misunderstandings and that the Leader and the Programme Director wish to clarify.

Much of the letter is given over to reasserting the ambitions of the scheme, its history, and its achievements to date.

The findings set out in the Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream Report are evidence based and detailed references to supporting documents have been provided throughout the report. Likewise, the calculations in the report are laid out in full in order to ensure complete transparency.

The clarifications suggested in the letter should be accompanied by evidence to corroborate them and this should be remedied as a matter of urgency.

**Overseas and Private Investors**

The “Meridian Water Phase 2 Financial Viability Assessment” dated June 2019 identifies overseas and private investors as sales targets. This viability assessment was submitted in support of the Council’s Phase 2 planning application, which was approved in March 2020.

Furthermore, a large proportion of the Phase 2 dwellings will be “build-to-rent”, a housing type which is often associated with institutional investors. The Meridian Water Residential Delivery Program report for the forthcoming Cabinet Meeting to be held on Wednesday, 16th September 2020 says that “this form of income stream is very attractive to pension funds and long-term investors such as sovereign wealth funds and family offices who are seeking long-term stable cash flows”.

The Programme Director has confirmed that UK and overseas investors will be able to buy property at Meridian Water, with some restrictions.

If there is evidence contrary to this it should be provided.

## Housing Affordability

The Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream Report raises matters about whether local people will be able to afford a home at Meridian Water and sets out detailed analysis and evidence to support these concerns. The Workstream examined the incomes of a range of key workers, and taking into consideration the proposed pricing strategy for Meridian Water and the Council's definition of affordability as specified in the Housing and Growth Strategy, found that the properties would be unaffordable to a large cross-section of key workers. The Programme Director has previously confirmed that our calculations about income and deposit requirements are broadly accurate.

If there is evidence contrary to this it should be provided.

## Employment

A large section of the letter is given over to repeating the ambitions of the Employment Strategy that was approved by Cabinet on 11 March 2020, most of which was not raised as a concern in the scrutiny report.

The letter challenges the comments in the scrutiny report regarding our concern that the site is big enough to accommodate the space necessary for 6,000 jobs and 10,000 homes, and that the report provides "little evidence" for this claim. The evidence for this claim comes directly from the Employment Strategy itself, which states that the Council's preferred employment option would impact the masterplan space and potentially the delivery of homes unless residential densities increased. Further increases to residential densities would be a concern and should not be implemented without a very detailed investigation of the potential consequences.

Hence the Workstream's concerns regarding whether the site is big enough to accommodate the space necessary for 6,000 jobs and 10,000 homes until further evidence is provided.

The letter also says that the report inaccurately states that there are currently 2,600 people employed at Meridian Water and that 1,500 of these jobs will be lost as a result of the redevelopment. It goes on to explain that there are not 2,600 people currently employed at Meridian Water as many of these jobs have already been lost. This clarification, regarding the timing of the job losses, is welcomed but it does not materially alter the concerns set out in section 2.5 of the report.

The letter says that 1,000 construction jobs are predicted, yet the Meridian Water website repeatedly says that 10x this number will be created. These inconsistencies need to be addressed.

The letter also says that no less than 25% or 250 construction jobs will go to local people, whilst local jobs are supported, the Workstream note that this figure is simply a reflection of Enfield's standard S106 requirements and are applicable to all such developments (Enfield Council Section 106 SPD November 2016).

## Publicly accessible parkland

The Workstream supports the ambition to deliver "park life on your doorstep" and to make Meridian Water "the greenest development in London", however the Workstream was concerned about whether these ambitions are truly being realised.

The Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan Scenario Testing says that the open space will be less than a third of that required by LBE policy and that 16.3 ha of open space and public amenity have been identified on site (i.e. 19%), however the letter says that the site can accommodate 30% of green open space. It would appear that there is inconsistency between the scenario testing report and comments regarding the size of the type of public park that is planned. Clarity on this inconsistency would be welcomed.

The plans indicate that two main parks (Edmonton Marshes and Brooks Park) will create approximately 8 hectares (ha) of public park land and that there will be in the region of 30,000 additional residents. By contrast, other wards have far lower populations (between 16,000 and 20,000), yet have far larger public parks e.g. Pymmes Park, Firs Farm, Jubilee Park and Broomfield Park are all individually around 20 ha or more and serve far fewer residents. Even smaller town parks are larger than the combined parks being created at Meridian Water, for example Enfield Town Park (9.5 ha) and Bush Hill Park (11 ha).

The Workstream also raised concerns about the utility of the proposed parks and whether they will be “open and inviting” and provide the sense of “escape” required. The Workstream set out its concerns about the park land in the report i.e. proximity to the A406 and incinerator, the presence of large electricity pylons and risks of regular flooding. Furthermore, the design of the parks will need to address issues related to “windiness”. The Environment Agency classified the chemistry of Pymmes Brook, which will run through and flood Brooks Park, as “bad”. As a result, the Workstream has concerns about the amount of usable public park space that will be created and available for use by future residents, especially for those wishing to safely partake in physical activities such as ball games, sports, etc.

The Workstream is also concerned about the potential impact on the existing public parks. The relatively low amount of public park land being delivered at Meridian Water may increase pressure on parks in neighbouring wards – this is a concern as these wards already have a deficit of park land. It is important that the quality and quantity of park land in Edmonton is improved.

The Workstream recognises that elements of the regeneration may generate some biodiversity gains (e.g. help to improve water quality), however, it is concerned that inadequate public parkland at Meridian Water will increase pressure from recreational use on Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs), such as Tottenham Marshes and the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

The Workstream notes and welcomes the comments in the September 2020 Cabinet report that the new site-wide masterplan will include more usable amenity spaces and quality green spaces.

## **Housing Density**

The report sets out the Workstream's concerns about the density of the Meridian Water development.

The Workstream recognises the need for pockets of high-density housing across the borough to help meet the demand for new housing. The Workstream's concerns regarding Meridian Water relate to the density of the housing repeated over such a large area. These concerns echo those set out in The Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan Scenario Testing, which said “there are few examples of such a large area averaging 6 to 8 storeys” and that “in short, there may be value, in all sense of the word, in a development that realises slightly

fewer homes”; this report also suggested that more in depth studies be undertaken to understand this further.

The Workstream responded to this suggestion and has set out its analysis and findings in sections 2.4.8 – 2.4.13 of the Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream Report. This analysis shows that Meridian Water would be one of the most densely populated areas in London. In the letter it states that this is not correct but no evidence or analysis to support this claim is provided. Evidence to support this claim would be welcomed.

### **Financial related risk for Enfield Council**

The information regarding the financial modelling is welcomed. This information does not alter the report’s findings.

Cllr Achilleas Georgiou (Chair)  
Cllr Maria Alexandrou (Vice Chair)  
Cllr Daniel Anderson  
Cllr Tolga Aramaz

Cllr Anne Brown  
Cllr Charith Gunawardena  
Cllr Joanne Laban  
Cllr Doug Taylor

## Response To Appendix in the Letter from the Leader and Programme Director

The Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream Report (June 2020), is a 50 page document that sets out approximately 135 detailed observations and concerns, the large majority of which are evidenced based and referenced to published council reports and documents; there are 7 pages of references in the report. The report made 14 recommendations and 8 suggestions for future work.

The large majority of the report was accepted without any comments. There were no comments in response to the Recommendations, Future Work or Appendix sections.

In the appendix there are a total of 32 comments; most did not address the concern raised with detailed evidence, reasserted the Council's ambition, or made comments that were not consistent with previous information. Approximately 7 of the 32 comments provided new information which helped to clarify the Workstreams concerns. It would have been helpful if comments were accompanied by evidence or references.

The Centre for Public Scrutiny says in its practice guide for local government that:

*“Ensuring that public services, and the deployment of public resources, **are evidence led**, or at least evidence informed, is vitally important, and even more so in these days of permanent austerity, deepening unsolved wicked issues afflicting society, and the emergence of public sector policy being driven by fake news, alternative facts, and post-truth narratives.”*

Members of the Regeneration & Economic Development Scrutiny Panel should find useful the issues covered below in detail as they monitor and take forward the recommendations of the Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream report.

### **Colour key to text below**

**BLACK:** Finding from MW Scrutiny Workstream Report - response provided by officers  
**RED:** Officer Response attached as an Appendix to Leader's Response  
**BLUE:** Reply to these Responses from Workstream

### **FORWARD:**

**ISSUE 1: A change in GLA policy has enabled the Council to take a new path, as the master developer for Meridian Water**

**RESPONSE:** It was not to do with GLA policy but rather a decision on the part of the administration.

**REPLY:**

The GLA's Affordable Housing Capital Fund (AHCFG) was launched in late 2017 and issued the rules and procedures for investment partners (IPs) providing housing with funding from the GLA (<https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/housing-and-land/increasing-housing-supply/affordable-housing-capital-funding-guide>).

This confirms the observation made in the report “The Greater London Authority (GLA) support brings its own constraints but also benefits and since 2018 there has been more GLA subsidy for affordable housing.”

The decision was made by the administration, but this decision was enabled by a change in GLA policy.

**ISSUE 2: And while work has started on phase 1 of Meridian Water, currently, because of London wide policy, specifically on Strategic Industrial Land, a limit of 5,000 homes and 1,500 new jobs has been set.**

**RESPONSE:** The ELAAP states that this is the number of homes and jobs that will have been delivered by the end of the 12 year ELAAP period which does not cover the 25 year duration of the project.

REPLY:

Whilst the Council may be working towards the de-designation of the Strategic Industrial Land, the Workstream was not provided with any evidence or information to indicate that such a change is guaranteed, or with information assessing the likelihood of the de-designation, despite the de-designation being a vital aspect of the regeneration. Furthermore, the Workstream notes the significant and relevant comments made by the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State in this regard (see Issues 2 and 3 of the Report on the Examination of the Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan, August 2019).

In this regard it would be useful and helpful to know what progress the Council has made in:

- Locating land to replace MW SIL?
- Fully understanding the technical requirements for flood storage and whether this will require additional land take or impact the utility of open space proposed
- Assessing whether all of the Tesco and IKEA car parks will be used for redevelopment

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

**ISSUE 3: Private investors (including those from overseas) have been identified as beneficiaries of the scheme and as a result, a good proportion of the planned housing and jobs will be out of reach of many local people**

**RESPONSE:** Private investors (whether UK or overseas) are not identified by the Council as beneficiaries of the scheme.

REPLY:

The “Meridian Water Phase 2 Financial Viability Assessment” dated June 2019 identifies overseas and private investors as sales targets. This viability assessment was submitted in support of the Council’s Phase 2 planning application, which was approved in March 2020.

Furthermore, a large proportion of the Phase 2 dwellings will be “build-to-rent”, a housing type which is often associated with institutional investors. The report for the September 2020 Cabinet Meeting states that “this form of income stream is very attractive to pension funds and long-term investors such as sovereign wealth funds and family offices who are seeking long-term stable cash flows”. The Programme Director has confirmed that UK and overseas investors will be able to buy property at Meridian Water, with some restrictions (see Q8-Q9 of Officer responses).

Planning – Planning Application Documents 19/02718/RE3 (Affordable Housing Viability Assessment)



[https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/files/C9E6114245E42475F785213049D51A6A/pdf/19\\_02718\\_RE3-MWP2-9\\_Affordable\\_Housing\\_Viability\\_Assessment-2162493.pdf](https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/files/C9E6114245E42475F785213049D51A6A/pdf/19_02718_RE3-MWP2-9_Affordable_Housing_Viability_Assessment-2162493.pdf)

Page 35 of report Hamptons International, London Residential Development, Market Report, Phase 2, Meridian Water, N18, March 2019

### **Target Market: Investors**

***“Investors are considered an essential element of the purchaser profile of any proposed development, to provide a revenue stream and maintain an optimum rate of sale. We would generally expect Meridian Water to predominantly sell to investors initially. These buyers would be looking to make a profit on any future uplift in values at the scheme and to take advantage of the regeneration effect. We would expect there to be a good rental demand at the development, providing high quality new build accommodation in a new and exciting location. We therefore envisage the development will appeal to private investors.”***

*“Whilst investor purchasers are still active in London, we have seen a reduction in both international and domestic investors due to the recent stamp duty and taxation policy changes. However, due to the fall in the Pound since the Brexit referendum we have seen a small upswing of investors, in particular from the Middle East and China, coming to London to take advantage of the fall in the Pound.”*

Furthermore, the Workstream did not see any information to suggest that local owner occupiers looking to purchase full priced market rate housing will be eligible for a discounted rate. Therefore, it is likely that prices for the properties will reflect the maximum price achievable across the total addressable market, which will include owner occupiers, as well as investors from the UK and overseas despite some restrictions on the timing and volume of sales. Whilst this approach would enable the council and/or the developer to maximise its ROI, it may also mean that local people are priced out.

### **ISSUE 4: Uncertainties surrounding the development, will impact upon the Council’s finances and are a risk to its financial resilience**

**RESPONSE:** The Meridian Water financial model approved by Cabinet demonstrates that the project delivers a positive return on investment for the Council – so the overall impact will be positive.

REPLY:

The approval of the Cabinet does not automatically demonstrate that the project delivers a positive return on investment for the Council.

The Meridian Water financial model was approved in October 2019 (Key decision – reference number 4469) and is based on a number of assumptions; however, the assumptions and outputs of the model have been classified as “commercially sensitive” so are not open to public scrutiny. Details of the approved financial model were not shared with the MW Workstream, so could not be scrutinised.

Below is an example of the types of uncertainties, risk and impacts, that the Meridian Water Workstream was concerned about.

In February 2020, less than 6 months after the financial model was approved, a grant funding decision by the GLA in regard to the finances for the Meridian Water Train Station noted that:

“... without the £6m grant funding Enfield would need to source the money from their housing revenue account which would directly impact their ability to deliver a number of estate regeneration schemes in the pipeline. They have indicated that a detailed analysis will need to be undertaken by their finance department but some schemes in their pipeline could be cancelled or delayed.”

“As with any housing development, there is a risk of not delivering to programme or budget, for example due to cost overruns or a housing market downturn. By leading the delivery of housing, LB Enfield is bearing more of this risk than it may have done had a private master developer been appointed for the scheme”  
<https://www.london.gov.uk/decisions/dd2426-meridian-water-station-intervention>

Furthermore, the response above is not entirely consistent with the response to the Workstream question 16 (What are the estimated profits for each phase of the development as well as overall?) which states “However, projects of the scale and complexity of Meridian Water are highly likely to change and evolve over time and as such the returns currently shown in the financial model are better considered to be contingency against future risks and an assumption that the Council will ultimately break even is more prudent”.

**ISSUE 5: Sensitivity testing on important scenarios, that could jeopardise the outcome of the project do not yet appear to have been undertaken within available financial models.**

**RESPONSE: Sensitivity testing designed and approved by the Finance Team has been carried out and presented to Cabinet.**

REPLY:

The details of the sensitivity testing presented to the Cabinet were not shared with the MW Workstream so could not be scrutinised in more detail.

The parameters and variables being considered in the existing financial models are unclear - officers have said that the findings from the recently commissioned Edmonton Area Housing Market Assessment will not be available until autumn 2020 (see answer 2 to the MW Scrutiny team questions). The output from this exercise is important for the robustness of any sensitivity testing.

The Workstream note that the report for the September 2020 Cabinet Meeting states that “The returns estimated by the approved financial model for these two phases have not been achieved for this reason and this puts the overall viability for Meridian Water at risk unless the shortfall can be recouped in future phases to ensure that all the debt can be paid off by the end of the Meridian Water programme” and that “It has also meant that, once these two schemes have completed, a much higher level of debt will remain outstanding on them than originally expected”.

**ISSUE 6: London Affordable Rent (LAR) levels, combined with the housing benefit cap excluding certain households from renting a home at Meridian Water, are out of reach for most households.**

**RESPONSE: Our analysis indicates that LAR levels are below housing benefit caps for all unit sizes therefore will be affordable to those eligible for social housing.**

REPLY:

As was set out in the report (see 2.3.18 – 2.3.20), the Workstream recognised that London Affordable Rent (LAR) homes will be affordable to the majority of households. However, the Workstream questioned whether there may be households that would not be eligible for LAR

housing due to benefit cap rules. For example, parents with children in school who can get a part-time job for 5-10 hours a week but cannot work enough hours a week to escape the benefit cap (i.e. 16+ hours) because of childcare commitments. With Social Rent a parent can work enough hours (5-10) to reduce their benefit entitlement so they are not affected by the benefit cap.

The Workstream felt this required further investigation to identify the number of families in temporary accommodation and on the council house waiting list whose situation meant that they would not be eligible for London Affordable Rent due to issues linked to the benefit cap. Depending on the outcome, a number of Social Rent properties may be needed to reflect this.

**ISSUE 7: There is evidential risk that the redevelopment may result in fewer jobs for local people**

**RESPONSE: The Employment Strategy clearly targets an increase in jobs with local people the principal target.**

REPLY:

The proposed target is that 25% of the 6,000 new jobs that will be delivered over the next 25-years will be for local people. This means the majority of jobs are not targeting local people and local people are not the “principal target” (see report sections 2.5.3 to 2.5.9).

The potential hypothetical future employment for local people over the next 25 years would be 1,500 jobs, which needs to be set against the immediate job losses that the regeneration have and will generate, which is estimated to be 1,500 jobs.

Given the balance of actual job losses in the short term vs. the number of hypothetical jobs that may be created for local people over the next 25-years, evidence should be given of how local people will be the principal beneficiaries of the Employment Strategy in the short term, if at all.

Clarification should be provided regarding the following:

- Why does the Meridian Water website say that 10,000 (ten thousand) construction jobs are predicted, whereas other estimates are much lower (e.g. 1,000 – 1,500) – why are these estimates so different?
- The Employment Strategy says that 25% of construction workers will come from local employment. This is a reflection of Section 13 of the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document, approved November 2016, which is a standard that would apply to all such developments. Why is a Council led development not setting the bar higher than the standard metric?
- Section 13 of the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document, also says that a financial contributing should be made regarding the loss of jobs linked to a development (i.e. £4,500 per job lost) – please provide the evidence to show how this has been reflected in contracts.
- For locally employed labour, please set out how the development will ensure that workers are local and the controls that will be put in place to monitor displacement and additions etc. i.e. to ensure genuine employment gains are realised as opposed to movement within the local job market and to ensure local BAME communities are properly represented.
- How many green jobs will the scheme deliver?

**ISSUE 8: Planning Panels were not held for Phases 1 or 2 of the development, whilst plans for Phase 2 were agreed without public engagement**

**RESPONSE:** We carried out public consultation in relation to both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 planning applications. Events were held in a nearby community centre and were well attended by local people and councillors.

**REPLY:**

The consultation events were largely about sharing the vision for the scheme (i.e. the ambition) and gathering general initial feedback, whereas a planning panel would have been about the scheme's actual implementation.

The purpose of a formal planning panel is for the planning committee to receive a briefing on the proposals for Meridian Water, to provide local residents and other interested parties the opportunity to ask questions about the specific application, and for the applicants, officers and Panel members to listen to the reactions and comments. These views, and all the written representations made, can then be considered when determining the application.

The Workstream recognises that some consultation sessions were held with residents but nevertheless felt that improvements to local engagement could be made, especially given the scale of the development and the need to balance the council's role as master developer with retaining public trust in unbiased decision making. For a high cost, high impact development such as Meridian Water formal planning panels are important and a pre-requisite for transparency and public buy-in.

Responses from officers (See Ref: Question 69) have accepted that planning panels will be considered for future applications.

**INTRODUCTION:**

**ISSUE 9: End 1.3 - phase 2, which is for a further 2,300 homes is currently out for tender**

**RESPONSE:** This is not correct. Meridian Two, which will provide 270 homes at 100% affordable, has been out to tender and we are finalising contractual terms. The rest of Phase 2 will be tendered in sub-phases over the next few years

**REPLY:**

Correction acknowledged. End 1.3 should read ... "Meridian Two, which will provide 270 homes at 100% affordable, has been out to tender and the council is finalising contractual terms. The rest of Phase 2 will be tendered in sub-phases over the next few years."

The Workstream note that the report for the September 2020 Cabinet Meeting states that "in line with the authority given by Cabinet to proceed with the selection of Vistry Partnerships as the Meridian Two Developer (KD4952) based on a 100% affordable scheme only on the basis that the affordable element of future schemes within Phase 2 is reduced accordingly, Meridian Four will deliver 35% affordable units."

**SECTION 2:**

**ISSUE 10: 2.1.1. A lack of up-to-date evidence means that Enfield's housing needs have not been clearly identified and documented. For example, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has not been updated for five years....**

**RESPONSE:** The Strategic Housing Market Assessment is currently being finalised and is being used to inform masterplanning at Meridian Water.

REPLY:

The response confirmed the observation made in the report. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is not complete and decisions have been made without this essential insight.

Minutes from the Workstream meeting from 2 March states “Members commented that risk no 58 is a Strategic Issue and that a needs analysis is needed. They requested a draft copy of the updates to Enfield’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2015) report that is being produced to assess whether local people are able to be principle beneficiaries of the scheme.”

The interim findings of the SHMA were not shared with the Scrutiny Workstream.

**ISSUE 11: 2.1.2. There remains some serious knowledge gaps, for example we do not know:**

- **The number and size of affordable homes needed in Enfield to meet current demand (i.e. the backlog).**
- **The predicted number and type of additional affordable homes needed to meet new demand over the next 5-15 years.**
- **The household income distribution of key groups (e.g. the household income of those currently in the private rented sector or those living near Meridian Water).**
- **The ability for households, particularly those in the private rented sector, to meet the deposit requirements for the various ownership options.**

**RESPONSE: This is all addressed within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.**

REPLY:

No evidence was provided to scrutinise whether the serious knowledge gap has been completely eliminated.

The interim findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment that is still being finalised (reply to Q1), were not shared with the Scrutiny Workstream.

Responses to Questions 1 to 5 (see section below) acknowledges the existing knowledge gap due to the interim and incomplete state of the reports - Edmonton Housing Market Assessment (commissioned by the Meridian Water team - expected Autumn 2020), Local Housing Needs Assessment (being carried out for the Local Plan - expected Autumn 2020), Economic Development Strategy (led by the Economic Development Team) and Skills strategy (Led by Schools and Children's service).

The Workstream thinks that the percentage and number of homes ring-fenced specifically for Edmonton residents/key workers, both overall and for each phase of development needs to be more clearly set out in future reports and announcements.

**ISSUE 12: 2.1.10. Other evidence from published ward profiles shows that (Appendix A2.3):**

- **Upper Edmonton and Edmonton Green wards are among the 10% most deprived wards in England whilst Haselbury and Lower Edmonton among the 20% most deprived.**
- **Over 25% of households in these wards have an annual income of £15,000. The target house prices at Meridian Water are 30 times this figure.**

**RESPONSE:** London Affordable Rented homes and London Living Rented homes will be affordable for those on low incomes. There will be over 3,000 of these homes at Meridian Water.

**REPLY:**

Section 2.3.2 of the Scrutiny Reports shows that just 800 of the 3,025 properties in Phases 1 (725) and Phase 2 (2300) would be at London Affordable Rent levels. This means just 26% of the first two phases would benefit local people.

No evidence was provided to demonstrate the number of Enfield households in rented accommodation who would benefit from properties at London Living Rent levels. Given the annual household income levels of the above wards the numbers are estimated to be insignificant.

Based on London Living Rent (LLR) rates for Upper Edmonton, households will need an annual household income of between £27,000 and £42,000 to afford a LLR home. LLR homes will not be affordable to local people on the income levels set-out in the report. London Affordable Rent homes will be affordable to most on lower incomes, but the officers response mixes these with LLR homes, so it is unclear how many of these will be delivered.

As shown in the report a vast majority of the 2200 properties could be occupied by people from outside Enfield.

**ISSUE 13: • Over 65% of the residents in these four wards of working age have an education level of NVQ3 or below. As things stand most of the jobs at Meridian Water will be pitched well above this level making them out of reach for many Enfield residents**

**RESPONSE:** There will be a range of job levels offered at Meridian Water. However, the Council does want Meridian Water to provide jobs that pay higher salaries to support people out of deprivation. Training programmes will be offered on site to provide local people with new skills, as well as off-site working with schools and colleges.

**REPLY:** How much money has been set aside for this training? How and when will schools/colleges receive this money (it would need to be soon to prepare future local workforce)? How will you decide what skills are needed before the development is occupied by businesses? How will the performance of these programmes be measured?

**ISSUE 14: 2.1.12.Population projections: Population projections for Enfield are unclear and appear to be inconsistent. Estimates for the next 10-20 years need to be fully understood in order to properly plan housing delivery, school places needed, medical needs, GP demands and so on**

**RESPONSE:** Planning for schools, GPs etc in Meridian Water should be based on the population growth anticipated at Meridian Water and Edmonton – the scheme cannot accommodate health and education requirements due to population growth across the Borough, that must be provided locally within each Ward.

**REPLY:**

The response does not address the concern raised - greater clarity is needed for population projections for Enfield, and of course, given the context of the report, specifically for Meridian Water and neighbouring wards (and indeed adjacent wards in other boroughs).

The Enfield Draft Local Plan 2036 states in section 1.10.1 "Enfield is changing fast. Projection scenarios to 2036 show an increase of roughly 51,000 in population and an additional 31,000 households to Enfield's current 333,000 people and 130,000 households."

The response from the Greater London Authority on the Consultation on Enfield Towards a New Local Plan 2036 – Issues and Options states “Housing target: The draft new London Plan sets Enfield a 10-year net housing completions target of 18,760 units (1,876 per annum).”

[https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/PAWS/media\\_id\\_451875/enfield\\_local\\_plan\\_reg\\_18.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/PAWS/media_id_451875/enfield_local_plan_reg_18.pdf)

These contradictions should be explained.

**ISSUE 15: 2.1.19. Multiple property purchases: Existing contractual provisions permit property investors to purchase up to two properties on council-owned land in Meridian Water. This will limit the number of homes available for local residents and help drive up house prices**

**RESPONSE:** The limit of 2 purchases per person will reduce the amount of buy to let landlords purchasing at Meridian Water not increase it, hence it will increase the amount of homes available for local owner occupier residents.

**REPLY:**

The response does not address the concern raised - the concern is regarding the reasoning for setting a limit of 2 rather than 1. Setting a limit of 1 would make more homes available for local people. How will allowing investors the opportunity to purchase 2 properties rather than 1 increase the amount of homes available for local owner occupier residents? Clarity should be provided on how many owner occupier homes are planned for Meridian Water and how many of these could conceivably be purchased by buy to let landlords.

**ISSUE 16: 2.2.5. Increased PWLB interest rate: The Public Works Loan Board interest rate was increased by 1% in October 2019. Any such increases will have a serious detrimental impact on the level of the Council’s debt payments**

**RESPONSE:** There are other sources of funding available to the Council at interest rates which are cheaper than PWLB. The Finance Team is producing a funding strategy taking this into account. This is not a Meridian Water specific issue, although the interest rates assumed in the Meridian Water financial model prudently exceed the current PWLB rates to ensure the risk is minimised.

**REPLY:** When will the funding strategy be completed? Why has not been completed already when large sums of funds are already being committed?

**ISSUE 17: 2.2.7. Meanwhile use: Revenue is not a given and carries significant risks**

Long term meanwhile leases are being granted therefore the risks are reducing.

**REPLY:** The granting of leases does reduce risk, but significant risks remain – how have these risks been factored into the financial strategy?

**ISSUE 18: 2.2.9. Uncertain house prices: The impact of the downturn in the current economic situation may impact on house prices and revenue streams expected from the development**

**RESPONSE:** The financial model takes a prudent approach to house price inflation and reflects the fact that the market is cyclical and is sometimes in recession, sometimes in boom. Whilst the current situation may be indicating house price inflation will be low or neutral, the longer-term expectations remain as they always were.

**REPLY:**

The robustness of the financial model could not be examined by the Workstream as it was not shared. Neither were the assumptions and criteria made with regard to the ‘prudent

approach to house price inflation'. For example, have unexpected scenarios such as 'no-deal' Brexit or Covid-19 been considered and their financial consequences built into the model?

**ISSUE 19: 2.2.10.Overseas investors: Despite the Council's declared comments, as things stand, the development appears to be also dependent on sales to overseas investors**

**RESPONSE: Sales of individual properties to overseas investors is not acceptable at Meridian Water and was one of the main reasons why the current administration decided not to appoint a single developer for the whole of Meridian Water.**

REPLY:

The Council's Financial Viability Assessment that accompanied the Phase 2 application (which was subsequently approved) sets out the Target Market for properties which includes overseas investors.

"Investors are considered an essential element of the purchaser profile of any proposed development, to provide a revenue stream and maintain an optimum rate of sale. We would generally expect Meridian Water to predominantly sell to investors initially."

"Whilst investor purchasers are still active in London, we have seen a reduction in both international and domestic investors due to the recent stamp duty and taxation policy changes. However, due to the fall in the Pound since the Brexit referendum we have seen a small upswing of investors, in particular from the Middle East and China, coming to London to take advantage of the fall in the Pound."

The Workstream recognises that the council intends to prevent sales to overseas purchasers for a period of 12 months after practical completion of the whole phase and prioritise local buyers – but sales of properties to overseas investors, whilst restricted, do not appear to be prohibited/unacceptable (see officer response to Q8).

The Workstream has not seen any information to suggest that local owner occupiers looking to purchase full priced market rate housing will be eligible for a discounted rate. Therefore, it is likely that prices for the properties will reflect the maximum price achievable across the total addressable market, which will include owner occupiers, as well as investors from the UK and overseas. Whilst this approach would enable the council and/ or the developer to maximise its ROI, it may also mean that local people are priced out.

The officer's response above specifies "sales of individual properties" - will overseas investors also be prevented from investing in build to rent and co-living units (including any Purpose Built Student Accommodation ("PBSA") or Large Scale Purpose Built Shared Living)? If so, how will this work in practice given the type of institutional investors who are the main players driving this sector.

Planning – Planning Application Documents 19/02718/RE3 (Affordable Housing Viability Assessment) [https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/files/C9E6114245E42475F785213049D51A6A/pdf/19\\_02718\\_RE3-MWP2-9\\_Affordable\\_Housing\\_Viability\\_Assessment-2162493.pdf](https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/files/C9E6114245E42475F785213049D51A6A/pdf/19_02718_RE3-MWP2-9_Affordable_Housing_Viability_Assessment-2162493.pdf)

As stated earlier, a large proportion of the Phase 2 dwellings will be "build-to-rent", a housing type which is often associated with institutional investors.

The report for the September 2020 Cabinet Meeting states that "this form of income stream is very attractive to pension funds and long-term investors such as sovereign wealth funds and family offices who are seeking long-term stable cash flows". The Programme Director



has confirmed that UK and overseas investors will be able to buy property at Meridian Water, with some restrictions (see Q8-Q9 of Officer responses).

**ISSUE 20: 2.2.11. Mixed communities: The development requires a clear separation of affordable and private units to maximise revenue compromising the objectives of creating mixed communities**

**RESPONSE:** The development does not require and will not allow a clear separation of affordable and private homes. The scheme will be designed to create mixed and diverse, tenure blind communities.

REPLY:

The Council's Financial Viability Assessment that accompanied the Phase 2 application (which was approved in March 2020) says that its price estimates for unit values were based on "a clear separation of affordable and private units" "including separate entrances/ cores". This report also stated that "mixing affordable units in with private will dampen the schemes saleability" and "will negatively impact the sales values substantially".

The discrepancy between the officer response and the statements made in the Council's Financial Viability Assessment remain unexplained.

Planning – Planning Application Documents 19/02718/RE3 (Affordable Housing Viability Assessment) [https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/files/C9E6114245E42475F785213049D51A6A/pdf/19\\_02718\\_RE3-MWP2-9\\_Affordable\\_Housing\\_Viability\\_Assessment-2162493.pdf](https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/files/C9E6114245E42475F785213049D51A6A/pdf/19_02718_RE3-MWP2-9_Affordable_Housing_Viability_Assessment-2162493.pdf)

Furthermore, the report for the September 2020 Cabinet Meeting in regard to Meridian 3 suggests there will be some separation of homes, the report states says "this report therefore recommends that the two plots (Z05-03 & 05) are marketed to Student and/or Co-Living providers and the land disposed of as previously detailed whilst the third plot, Z05-02, be utilised for delivery of the majority of the Affordable Housing requirement generated by the Student and/or Co-Living uses" (see point 91).

**ISSUE 21: 2.2.12. Public land sell-off: The development will lead to further sell-off of public land which is already in short supply and as a public asset needs to be secured for future generations. Research shows increased need for local authorities to sell assets to balance books and Enfield is not immune to this**

**RESPONSE:** None of the Meridian Water land was owned by the Council until the Council began buying land to unlock new homes and jobs. The land will be leased to partners, we will not be selling off all the freeholds.

REPLY:

How much of the council owned land at Meridian Water will be sold off as freeholds and how much will be leased to partners? Are the leases currently modelled with bidders in procurement at 100 years or 250 years? If not what are the planned length and terms of leases?

**ISSUE 22: 2.2.13. Construction timescales: There is a risk to the timing for delivery of particular tenure types by the Council and its partners due to market saturation**

**RESPONSE:** The masterplan, phasing plan and financial model have all taken prudent market absorption rates into account when establishing the timescales for delivery. Mixing tenures between market sales, market rents and affordable units is designed to alleviate conflict whilst allowing continued delivery.

REPLY:

The links to the documents referenced have not been provided.

Section 2.2.13 should now read: “Construction timescales: There is a risk to the timing for delivery of particular tenure types by the Council and its partners due to market saturation, however the council hopes that the mix of tenures being delivered will help mitigate risks to construction timescales.”

**ISSUE 23: 2.2.19. Meridian Water Station Costs: Only verbal confirmation have been received that all is within budget and schedule**

**RESPONSE: The Meridian Water station was delivered by the Council on time and on budget in June 2019.**

REPLY:

**Correction Acknowledged.**

**ISSUE 24: 2.2.23 .....High reliance on these contributions may be perceived as influencing planning decisions related to undesirable developments across the borough in order to maximise CIL**

**RESPONSE: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) collected across the Borough is no longer just invested in Meridian Water. The Meridian Water financial model is not reliant on CIL contributions.**

REPLY:

The officer response to questions about CIL (see Q19-21) show that the amount of money to come from CIL from across the borough to pay for the first 5,000 homes, and the impact this will have on the rest of the borough, is still being investigated.

The amount of money that is expected to come from CIL payments in the Meridian Water financial model was not shared with the Workstream.

**ISSUE 25: 2.3.6. Council documents indicate that the initial target market for the homes will predominantly be investors.....**

**RESPONSE: None of the individual market sale homes will be targeted at investors.**

REPLY:

As described in Finding 3, the Financial Viability Assessment for Phase 2 says:

- We expect the buyer profile to comprise initially of investors, owner occupiers and some first-time buyers
- Investors are considered an essential element of the purchaser profile of any proposed development, to provide a revenue stream and maintain an optimum rate of sale.
- We would generally expect Meridian Water to predominantly sell to investors initially. These buyers would be looking to make a profit on any future uplift in values at the scheme and to take advantage of the regeneration effect.
- We would expect there to be a good rental demand at the development, providing high quality new build accommodation in a new and exciting location. We therefore envisage the development will appeal to private investors
- Bank of Mum & Dad: Parents providing financial assistance for their children, who are working or studying in London. They can often be buying to hold for the future, with a thought towards capital appreciation potential.

Other officer responses have accepted that investors will play a part in sales process (See Questions 8-11).

A large proportion of the homes for Phase 2 will be Build to Rent BtR units and is a product squarely aimed at the investor market. The Financial Viability Assessment for Phase 2 says “The finished BtR blocks are sold to investors at practical completion and purchaser’s costs are incurred”

The Phase 2 Financial Viability Assessment:

<https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=PVI4W6JNIL600>

As stated earlier, a large proportion of the Phase 2 dwellings will be “build-to-rent”, a housing type which is often associated with institutional investors. The report for the September 2020 Cabinet Meeting states that “this form of income stream is very attractive to pension funds and long-term investors such as sovereign wealth funds and family offices who are seeking long-term stable cash flows”.

**ISSUE 26: 2.3.13. The Workstream thinks the level of affordable housing at Meridian Water on public land should closely reflect the ambition of local residents**

**RESPONSE:** The level of London Affordable Rented homes being delivered at Meridian Water is well in excess of the number of people in Edmonton on the social housing waiting list.

REPLY:

The Workstream was not provided evidence to as to how this comment relates to the detailed findings set-out in the report (see AFFORDABLE TO RENT section 2.3.7 – 2.3.15). The housing crisis facing Edmonton residents extends beyond those on waiting lists for social housing. In addition to this, there are residents living in overcrowded dwellings, temporary accommodation and those who are rough sleepers and homeless.

**ISSUE 27: 2.3.17. Intermediate rents, at 80% open market rents, are unaffordable to a vast majority of Enfield residents including key workers (see Appendix A2.5). The estimated number of households that could benefit from this level of rent has not yet been quantified**

**RESPONSE:** Intermediate rents at 80% of open market rents are not being offered at Meridian Water.

REPLY:

**Correction acknowledged:** 2.3.17 should read: “The outline planning consent requires 12% Intermediate affordable tenures ie. shared-ownership homes. As described in section 2.3.16, a vast majority (95%) of people currently living in the rented sector in Enfield cannot afford. Intermediate rents, at 80% open market rents would be unaffordable to a vast majority of Enfield residents including key workers (see Appendix A2.5) and the decision has been taken that Intermediate rents at 80% of open market rents will not be offered at Meridian Water. ”.

**ISSUE 28: 2.4.3 ....The Workstream felt this was of particular concern given plans for other existing private landowners to build homes at the site, whereby the Council would have less control over the housing mix and tenure of these homes**

**RESPONSE:** The Council will have control through the planning system requiring 3<sup>rd</sup> party landowners to adhere to planning policy.

REPLY:

Planning guidelines are not always adhered to e.g. the planning applications for Meridian Water did not adhere to these.

The response given to Q35 is taken out of context and does not respond to the other serious issues raised in this section of the report.

The response also appears out of context. Section 2.4.3 are notes relating to the Workstream's concerns about the number of family sized homes being delivered set out in 2.4.1 and 2.4.2. The full text for 2.4.3 is given below.

2.4.3. The Workstream noted that:

- The Officers' Report for Phase 1 said that 4% of private units and 41% of affordable units will be 3+ bedrooms - lower than is required by CP5.
- The 2014 Development Management Document (DMD) supports CP5 (DMD 3) and also states that larger developments should meet the targets set by CP5.
- The DMD also states that where targets for family-sized homes are not met on larger sites then evidence will be required to demonstrate why these cannot be met. ***The Workstream was not provided this evidence for Phase 1 and 2.***
- The draft Local Plan 2018-2036, which is still to be adopted, states that "Enfield's draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2015) identifies a specific need in the borough for 50% of affordable rented and market housing respectively to be homes with at least three bedrooms suitable for families. This figure is supported further by Enfield's Local Housing Register which indicates a demand of 47.3% for family sized homes for affordable and social rented housing".
- The Phase 2 Viability Assessment allowed for 50% of LAR homes to be 3+ bedrooms, yet the application appears to have reduced this to 30%. The proportion of family sized intermediate units proposed is 30% despite the SHMA saying that only 15% of intermediate units should be 3+ bedrooms. ***The Workstream was not informed of the reasoning behind these changes.***
- There are 2,663 families with children living in temporary accommodation, which indicates the shortage of affordable family housing and demonstrates the consequences of under supply.
- 45% of homeless households in Enfield are classified as black/black British; 18% of households in Enfield are Black/Black British. The proportion of homeless households in Enfield classified as Black/Black British has almost doubled in 10 years from 25% to 45%, whereas greater London as a whole saw a much smaller increase from 22%-27% (10.1)
- There are over 5,300 households on council housing waiting lists. Wait times for 3+ bed properties are over 10-12 years due to under supply.
- 11% of households are defined as overcrowded, which equates to around 14,000 households.
- Research for the London Assembly shows that just one new 6-bedroom home can help take more than 36 people out of overcrowding because of the chain effect. Currently this cannot happen because the 1 and 2 bed homes being proposed do not create a chain and are too small for the vast majority of overcrowded households.
- The under delivery of 3+ bed homes may increase pressure to develop land in other less suitable areas and possibly the green belt land.
- The Workstream felt this was of particular concern given plans for other existing private landowners to build homes at the site, whereby the Council would have less control over the housing mix and tenure of these homes.

**ISSUE 29: 2.4.5. Loneliness: The Workstream are aware of the increasing concerns about the negative impacts of loneliness on health and social care, which have been further heightened by experiences of lockdown. In this context, the Workstream questioned whether it was appropriate or desirable for the scheme to be dominated by 1 bed units**

**RESPONSE:** Meridian Water is targeting 30% 1-bed homes leaving 70% of the units being larger. Furthermore 1- bed homes are generally occupied by two people. Community cohesion and addressing loneliness is a top priority; residential blocks can achieve these aims by including shared amenity facilities. For example, the Build to Rent and co-living blocks delivered in the early stages of Meridian Water will all include shared amenities.

**REPLY:**

The following evidence was not provided to the Workstream:

- The evidence that was used in deciding the target for 1-bed homes. Enfield Council's Core Strategy (Core Policy 5) requires that 20% of homes be 1 and 2 bed flats (for both market housing and social rented housing), which means the number of 1 bed properties is significantly in excess of what is required by the Council's adopted strategy.
- The evidence that Build to Rent and co-living blocks reduce loneliness.
- The initiatives and measures that are planned to address and monitor the issues of loneliness and community cohesion.

Note: just as 1-bed homes can be occupied by 2-people so can 2+ bedroom homes be occupied by one person.

**ISSUE 30: 2.4.8. The Workstream has raised questions about the population density currently proposed and remains concerned. Meridian Water will be 3-5 times more densely populated than neighbouring wards or indeed other town areas of Enfield (see table 2)**

**RESPONSE:** The neighbouring wards although urban in nature in some areas, achieve low public transport accessibility ratings and lower levels of accessible quality green space. The ambition for Meridian Water is a higher density environment with significant improvements in transport, accessible and quality green spaces and strong socio-economic infrastructure foundations for opportunities and growth.

**REPLY:**

The public transport rating (PTAL) for the Phase 2 Meridian Water site is currently 0-2 (the lowest) and is expected to reach 3 after work is completed. Neighbouring wards are far less densely populated yet have much better public transport ratings e.g. Edmonton Green, Bowes and Haselbury all achieve PTAL ratings as high as of 5 or 6a.

The ratio of public park access to people (i.e. the hectares of public park per 1000 population) for neighbouring wards are generally much better than will be achieved at Meridian Water.

Approximately 8 hectares (ha) of public parks are proposed for Meridian Water and there will be around 30,000 additional residents. By contrast, other wards have far lower populations (between 16,000 and 20,000) yet have far larger parks e.g. Pymmes Park, Firs Farm, Jubilee Park and Broomfield Park are all individually around 20 ha or more and serve far lower population densities. Smaller parks in the borough are larger than the combined parks being created at Meridian Water, for example Town Park (9.5 ha), Bush Hill Park (11 ha).

An ambition for Meridian Water is to deliver "park life on your doorstep". Concern remains that this ambition is not being properly delivered given the very high number of residents who will be living in the area.

- <https://www.goparks.london/map#xyz=15.18/51.637875/-0.067555>

The Workstream notes and welcomes the comments in the September 2020 Cabinet report that the new site-wide masterplan will include more usable amenity spaces and quality green spaces.

**ISSUE 31: 2.4.17. LBE Open Space and Sports Assessment update (2011) suggests 2.37 Ha/1000 residents as a target for parklands and open space (19). However, in order to meet this requirement Meridian Water would need 62.5 Ha of parkland and public open space, but as things stand just around 8 Ha is being proposed, which is well short**

**RESPONSE: 30% of Meridian Water will be provided as green open space which is considered best practice for a major development in London.**

REPLY:

A breakdown of the “green open space” that will be provided at Meridian Water has not been produced. Clear evidence that 30% is considered best practice for a major development in London has not been given.

The Council vision for Meridian Water is based around three pillars, one of which is “Park life at your doorstep”, the Workstream remains concerned that this ambition is not being fully delivered for the following reasons:

**The ratio of residents to public parkland will be worse than most neighbouring wards**

- To date, approximately 8 hectares (ha) of public parks have been proposed for Meridian Water, 2 ha at Brooks Park and 6 ha at Edmonton Marches - there will be an additional 30,000 people living at Meridian Water.
- By contrast, parks such as Pymmes Park, Firs Farm, Jubilee Park and Broomfield Park are all individually around 20 ha or more and serve far lower population densities (i.e. wards of between 16,000 and 20,000 residents). There are also additional smaller parks to further improve the ratio of residents to public park land e.g. Churchfield Recreation Ground, Churchstreet Recreation Ground, Craig Park, Kenninghall Open Space and Ladysmith Road Open Space.
- Individual parks in the borough’s urban centres are larger than the combined parks being created at Meridian Water, for example Town Park (9.5 ha), Bush Hill Park (11 ha).

**There are question marks about the usability of the public parkland that will be created.**

The Workstream questioned whether this space would be “open and inviting” and provide the sense of “escape” needed from high density living. The Workstream set out its main concerns at 2.4.19 of the report:

- the open space is in the shadow of the North Circular Road, so is likely to be noisy and polluted;
- the proximity of the incinerator raises concerns by some about odour and pollution;
- the large electricity pylons that cross the site do not add to the sites “tranquillity” and;
- the open space is liable to flooding and may become frequently unusable.

Council reports suggest that the parkland created at Meridian Water may be liable to flooding, that issues related to “windiness” will need to be addressed and that The Environment Agency classified the chemistry of Pymmes Brook as D (Bad) - as a result the Workstream had concerns about the actual amount of public park green space that will be usable for safely partaking in physical activities such as ball games, sports, etc. across different points of the year.

References:

*Windiness - See MWP2-2 Environmental Statement, p113*  
<https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=PVI4W6JNIL600>  
*Pymmes Brook - See MWP2-2 Environmental Statement, p137*  
<https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=PVI4W6JNIL600>

The Workstream was also concerned about a negative impact on the existing public parkland. The low amount of public parkland being delivered at Meridian Water, relative to the very high numbers of future residents, is likely to increase pressure on other local parks and neighbouring wards, many of which are already defined by the Council as having a deficit of parkland.

Furthermore, the Workstream was concerned that a lack of public parkland at Meridian Water will have a negative impact, due to increased pressure from recreational use on Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs), such as Tottenham Marshes and the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

The Workstream notes and welcomes the comments in the September 2020 Cabinet report that the new site-wide masterplan will include more usable amenity spaces and quality green spaces.

The Workstream thinks that the sports facilities that the scheme will deliver at each stage is unclear and should be more clearly set out (e.g. football pitches, skatepark, basketball courts etc.).

**ISSUE 32: 2.4.23. Enfield Council has conceded to the Mayor's request for SIL designation and adopted the Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan (ELAAP) on 29 January 2020 by limiting the number of homes on the development to 5,000, contrary to the stated aims of 10,000 new homes**

**RESPONSE:** The ELAAP, which originated under previous administration, only covers the first 12 years of development, during which time 5,000 homes are expected to be delivered, the balance will be delivered over the remainder of the Meridian Water programme.

REPLY:

It would be good to better understand the reasoning for not appealing against the decisions made by Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State that led to the reduced number of homes and jobs in the current ELAAP and if officers could set out their reasoning for not challenging this decision.

The previous administration took a stance for 10,000 new homes in discussions on ELAAP. The ELAAP agreed in January 2020 limited the number of home to 5,000.

The Workstream understood that the Council is working towards the de-designation of the SIL but was not provided with any information or evidence to indicate the likelihood of achieving this.

The Workstream requested information about the risks associated with not achieving the de-designation required but this analysis was not provided (see Q46 - What are the financial, planning and place-making consequences of not obtaining SIL re-designation? Please specify these in full including any risks).

The Workstream was of the opinion that the risks associated with not achieving de-designation need to be urgently assessed and reported due to the potential impact on the early phases of the regeneration.

## List of Questions from Workstream (8 June) & responses from Officers (30 July)

NOTE: The final report was published on 28 June before Workstream was disbanded.

| Questions to Officers (8 June 2020)  | Response from Officers (30 July)   | Workstream Comment  |
|--|--|---|
| <b>LOCAL PEOPLE</b>  |  |   |
| <b>1. When will the updated reports be available - SHMA , Skills Strategy &amp; Economic Development Strategy? Either in Draft or Full format?</b>                                 | Economic Development is being lead across the Council by the Economic Development Team and Skills by Schools and Childrens services. MW Team will contribute.  | Confirms evidence is lacking at present time.   |
| <b>1a. Please provide evidence of how the house size/tenure mix is being considered</b>  | This topic is currently being investigated by the Meridian Water team, which has commissioned an Edmonton Area Housing Market Assessment. The findings will be available in autumn 2020.   | This confirms the Workstream position and more evidence is required by officers on Phase 1 & 2. |
| <b>2. Who are the local target buyers for the private market homes and what is their expected income?</b>  | This topic is currently being investigated by the Meridian Water team, which has commissioned an Edmonton Area Housing Market Assessment. The findings will be available in autumn 2020.   | This confirms the Workstream position and more evidence is required by officers on Phase 1 & 2. |
| <b>3. What is the number &amp; size of affordable homes needed in Enfield to meet current needs (Backlog) and predicted future needs over the next 5-15 years?</b>                 | This topic currently being investigated through the work on the Local Housing Needs Assessment carried out for the Local Plan team. The consultants carrying out this piece of work are updating the first version of the assessment with updated figures on affordable housing need. The findings should be available in autumn 2020. | This confirms the Workstream position and more evidence is required by officers on Phase 1 & 2. |
| <b>4. What is the household income distribution of key groups (e.g. the household income of those currently in the private rented sector or those living near Meridian Water)?</b> | This topic is currently being investigated by the Meridian Water team, which has commissioned an Edmonton Area Housing Market Assessment. The findings will be available in autumn 2020.   | This confirms the Workstream position and more evidence is required by officers on Phase 1 & 2. |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>5. What is the ability for households, particularly those in the private rented sector, to meet the <b>deposit requirements</b> for the various ownership options?</p>  | <p>This topic is currently being investigated by the Meridian Water team, which has commissioned an Edmonton Area Housing Market Assessment. The findings will be available in autumn 2020.</p> | <p>This confirms the Workstream position and more evidence is required by officers on Phase 1 &amp; 2.</p> |
| <p>6. The objectives in the October Cabinet report say the target is 10,000 homes and 3,000 new high-quality jobs – but other documents say 10,000 homes and 6,000 jobs – which is correct?</p>  | <p>6,000 jobs, as per the recently adopted Meridian Water Employment Strategy</p>   | <p>Why is there a discrepancy in the Cabinet report?</p>   |
| <p>7. Given that the Financial Viability Assessment demonstrates that the profile of local households in the areas surrounding Meridian Water will be unable to afford or unwilling to move to the development, who, then, are these properties for?</p> | <p>The affordability of the different types of homes at Meridian Water is being investigated through the Edmonton Area Housing Market Assessment referred to in the response to question 1.</p> | <p>This confirms the Workstream position and more evidence is required by officers on Phase 1 &amp; 2.</p> |

| <b>Questions to Officers<br/>(8 June 2020)</b> | <b>Response from Officers<br/>(30 July)</b> | <b>Workstream Comment</b> |
|--|---|---------------------------|
|  |   |                           |
| <b>EXTERNAL BENEFICIARIES</b>                  |   |                           |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>8.Overseas investors:</b></p> <p>a. What specific measure will be put in place to restrict overseas investors from buying homes at MW?</p> <p>b. How long will these restrictions last?</p> <p>c. How will these restrictions be enforced?</p> <p>d. What impact would these restrictions have on prices at MW and the council's return on investment?</p> <p>e. Why does the Viability Assessment report state overseas investors as a target?</p> | <p>a. The development agreement for Meridian One includes a ban on marketing units overseas for 12 months after practical completion of the whole phase. This ban will be incorporated into all future development agreements. The Council also seeks to partner with developers who have a local focus rather than those who tend to look overseas for buyers – this is part of the reason why the deal with Barratt did not proceed</p> <p>b. 12 months after practical completion of the phase. If there are still unsold units available with no local demand after that length of time then the developer will need an alternative option otherwise the units could sit empty in perpetuity</p> <p>c. Through the contractual requirements of the development agreement</p> <p>d. The impact is more likely to be on rates of sale rather than prices. The industry norm is for 50% of units in a scheme to be sold off-plan. Our financial modelling assumes only 25% will be sold this way as most local buyers will require a mortgage and mortgages cannot be secured until circa 6 months prior to practical completion hence substantially reducing the pre-completion marketing period</p> <p>e. We are not aware of any reference to overseas investors being a target in any viability assessment report. If Members could be more specific we can respond</p> | <p>a. Inconsistent with what stated on Page 35 of report Hamptons International, London Residential Development, Market Report, Phase 2, Meridian Water, N18, March 2019</p> <p>b. Confirms units can still be sold to overseas investors and that they form part of the addressable market.</p> <p>d. Prices are likely to be impacted as units can still be sold to overseas investors and so they form part of the addressable market and hence influence pricing.</p> <p>e. For example, Page 35 of report Hamptons International, London Residential Development, Market Report, Phase 2, Meridian Water, N18, March 2019</p> |
|---|--|--|

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>9. UK investors</b></p> <p>a. What specific measure will be put in place to restrict UK investors?</p> <p>b. How long will these last?</p> <p>c. How will they be enforced?</p> <p>d. What impact would these restrictions have on the council's return on investment?</p> | <p>a. A limit of 2 units per purchaser will help to limit this along with a targeted marketing campaign agreed between the Council and the developer</p> <p>b. In perpetuity</p> <p>c. Through the legal conveyancing process</p> <p>d. The financial model does not reflect any specific reduction in value based on this limitation</p> | <p>a. Inconsistent with Page 35 of report Hamptons International, London Residential Development, Market Report, Phase 2, Meridian Water, N18, March 2019. Why is the restrictions set at 2 and not 1</p> <p>d. What does the model say if it is limited to 1 or zero or increased to 3 or 4?</p> |
| <p>10. If sales to investors are limited, who is going to buy homes in early stages of phase 1 and 2 (i.e. homes on a building site)?</p>  | <p>See response above, it is anticipated that sales will not be possible until units are within 6 months of completion in order for mortgages to be secured. This has reduced assumptions on sales rates</p>  |   |
| <p>11. Why are property investors permitted to purchase up to 2 properties – won't help this drive up house prices?</p>  | <p>It is unlikely to have any material impact on house prices</p>   | <p>Why are purchases not limited to just 1 property?</p>  |

| Questions to Officers<br>(8 June 2020)   | Response from Officers<br>(30 July)  | Workstream Comment   |
|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |
| <b>FINANCIALS</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Resilience</b>  |  |  |
| 12. What percentage of the land owned by the Council is being considered for sale to achieve a capital receipt?  | All of it  | This contradicts the response to the report, which said all will be retained by the council.   |
| 13. On income. There was under collection 2019-2020 of income  | The Meanwhile Income overachieved in 2019 /2020 by £200K   | We understand this was because of the capitalisation of security cost debt of £0.9m  |
| 14. What is the projection of income 2020-2021 against target?   | Current target is Net £1.3 million, Current projection in light of Covid 19 and associated rent holidays is circa £600k - £800k  | What is the impact of reduced income?  |
| 15. How much of the project is now being capitalised rather than met by the revenue budget?  | Treasury is currently advising on what elements of the project may be considered revenue.  | When will this be made public?   |
| 16. What are the estimated profits for each phase of the development as well as overall?<br><br>How will this money subsequently be spent, when and how? | The financial model which was approved by Cabinet in October 2019 showed an estimated NPV of £80M with an IRR of 4.69%.<br><br>However, projects of the scale and complexity of Meridian Water are highly likely to change and evolve over time and as such the returns currently shown in the financial model are better considered to be contingency against future risks and an assumption that the Council will ultimately break even is more prudent. | What is the breakdown for each phase?<br><br>A return of £80 million on a £6 billion project appears low and appears to be a small contingency |
| <b>Macro - issues</b>  |  |  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>17. Will the HIF money be compromised by changes which Covid 19 may inspire?</p> <p>Has the clawback arrangements for non-compliance by the council been settled with Government?</p> | <p>No. The funding is fixed for a set of defined infrastructure provisions which are not impacted by C19.</p> <p>Clawback exists in the agreement for a number of major default events. These are standard terms for government funding agreements. The main concern for clawback around non-completion by March 24 has now been extended to September 24.</p>                                      | <p>What are the consequences if the HIF payment is not made in full?</p>   |
| <b>Scenario Planning</b>   |   |  |
| <p>18. When is the social value model going to be completed?</p> <p>And how have the insights for decisions been made in the meantime?</p>   | <p>The full Edmonton data baselining exercise, needs analysis, household survey and subsequent Social Value Strategy is due for completion in winter 2020.</p> <p>To date, any decisions as to projects or expenditure relating to local communities and social value (though limited) have been driven by the expressed needs of the community and existing council knowledge and insight data</p> | <p>Confirms that there is no conclusive evidence yet that confirms the development benefits local people.</p> <p>Please provide links to the documents that set out the expressed needs of the community and knowledge and insight data used and the projects/expenditure these relate to.</p> |
| <b>Impact</b>  |   |  |
| <p>19. How much money is expected to come from redirected CIL payments, i.e. from building projects across the borough for the first 5,000 homes and for the whole scheme?</p>           | <p>This is still being developed</p>  | <p>Still a possibility exists that other boroughs will be impacted</p>   |
| <p>20. How will the rest of the Borough be impacted by the continual diversion of CIL?</p>   | <p>See Q19 response above</p>   | <p>Still a possibility exists that other boroughs will be impacted</p>   |
| <p>21. Should the Council review the decision on the application of CIL given the changed circumstances?</p>   | <p>Will be kept under review</p>  | <p>Still a possibility exists that other boroughs will be impacted</p>   |
| <p>22. Are S106 payments from projects across the borough also going towards funding MW?</p>   | <p>Only those that are relevant to the project in terms of the agreements made with the s106 contributors at the time.</p>  | <p>The response is unclear - will any S106 payments from elsewhere across the borough be used to fund MW?</p>  |

| Questions to Officers<br>(8 June 2020)  | Response from Officers<br>(30 July)  | Workstream Comment  |
|---|--|---|
|   |  |   |
| <b>HOUSING</b>  |  |   |
| <b>Number of homes and affordability</b>  |  |   |
| 23. What is the total number of homes that would be delivered in: MW Phase 1 and MW Phase 2   | a. Circa 950 – to be confirmed once Vistry submit their planning application in November 2020<br>b. Circa 270 – to be confirmed once Vistry submit their planning application in January 2021  |   |
| 24. For Phase 2, is the split of homes as follow Market sales (40%), Market rent (20%), Intermediate sales (12%), Private registered owned LAR (18%), Council owned LAR (10%)? If not, what is the split?   | The outline planning consent requires 60% market homes, 28% London Affordable Rent, 12% Intermediate affordable tenures. How this is delivered will be subject to a series of Cabinet approvals over the next 1 – 2 years  | Please provide the evidence to show that 28% of LAR properties will meet local needs.         |
| 25. What is the same split for MW Phase 1?  | The Council has changed this under the terms of the Development Agreement with Vistry to require 50% market homes, 25% London Affordable Rent (all transferred to the HRA) and 25% Intermediate Affordable tenures   | Please provide the evidence to show that 25% of LAR properties will meet local needs.         |
| 26. Please provide the development plans for Meridian 2 i.e. the 250 affordable homes announced at the end of last year.  | We anticipate signing the development agreement with Vistry by Autumn 2020. They will then commence working up their reserved matters application with a view to submitting this in January 2021 and starting on site in August 2021. First home should be completed in early 2024 |   |
| 27. It appears that 250 affordable homes for Meridian 2 were included in the Phase 2 application - have these affordable units therefore been double counted in the reporting of affordable housing numbers (i.e. as part of the affordable housing percentage for M1 900+ homes and as part of the affordable housing % for P2 2,300 homes)? | It is correct that Meridian Two is part of the Phase 2 outline planning consent and therefore the affordable units form part of the affordable units within that   | Have these also been reported as part of the affordable housing percentage for M1 900+ homes? |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| 28. Is the Enfield definition of Affordable homes being considered in MW schemes (1/3 of local median household incomes)? Or is it only definitions in the London Plan considered?   | Where LAR and LLR are offered this is as per the GLA definitions and published levels.  | What work has been done to assess affordability to local people of LAR and LLR?           |
| 29. Who is the development partner for Meridian 2? When was this agreed?   | Vistry are the selected partner the contract is being developed and we are targeting signing by Autumn 2020   |   |
| 30. How viable are each tenure for the residents in terms of rent or mortgage? Why the limit to larger homes?  | Assuming by viable you mean affordable, this topic is currently being investigated through the Edmonton Area Housing Market Assessment.   | Misses the core policy target for family size homes                                       |
| 31. What is the estimated number of households London Affordable Rent levels combined with the housing benefit cap?  | Please can you clarify this question as it is not clear what you are asking.  | See section 2.3.19 of the main report   |
| 32. Is the Council led development of a rented housing scheme (i.e. option 3 from the Phase 2 Business Case) still being considered and if so, when will the detailed analysis be ready?   | In October 2019 Cabinet approved a Detailed Delivery Plan to be prepared covering the two options recommended for further consideration. This Detailed Delivery Plan will be brought back to Cabinet in September |   |
| 33. The largest undersupply in the Borough is for houses below £350k, but the lowest priced homes at MW would be as high as £345k, whilst most will cost far more. Median household incomes in the local area are between £26,000 and £30,000, whereas the lowest priced open market flat at Meridian Water would require an income of £59,000. Likewise, a 25% stake in the lowest priced a shared ownership flat would require an income of £44,000. What is the evidence that any of the properties will benefit Enfield residents, let alone Edmonton residents? | The affordability of the different types of homes at Meridian Water is being investigated through the Edmonton Area Housing Market Assessment referred to in the response to question 1.                          | Confirms that there is no evidence at present that the development benefits local people. |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>34. Given the unaffordable PRS homes, will this not exacerbate the housing crisis and worsen the temporary accommodation crisis? How will this be mitigated?</p> | <p>Please see the response to question 33 above. Regarding the temporary accommodation crisis, the most recent overview of the council's response to this is summarized in a forthcoming cabinet report prepared by the housing team (KD 4682). The Meridian Water team is working closely with housing colleagues to ensure a coordinated approach.</p> | <p>There are no quantifiable targets as to how MW will help reduce temporary accommodation in Enfield.</p> |
|---|--|--|

| Questions to Officers<br>(8 June 2020)  | Response from Officers<br>(30 July)   | Workstream Comment   |
|---|---|--|
|   |   |  |
| <b>LAND &amp; PLANNING</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Housing Mix</b>  |   |  |
| <p>35. Is the delivery of family sized homes as a percentage matching the needs of the borough?</p>   | <p>The housing mix for those parts of the site with outline planning permission was developed to comply with existing planning policy, placemaking objectives and development viability. The site-wide housing mix, for those areas of the site without an existing planning consent, is being tested in the development of the new masterplan working closely with the emerging Local Plan and the evidence base behind this. Further information will be summarised in cabinet report on the new masterplan when it is completed.</p> | <p>The development does not meet the Core strategy (CP5) targets for family sized homes.</p> <p>Without the completion of the SHMA the needs cannot be known.</p> <p>Decisions for phases 1 &amp; 2 have been made without these essential insights.</p> |
| <p>36. Was building fewer units overall considered to deliver more 3+-bed housing, given the comment in Meridian Water Scenario Testing analysis conducted by Karakusevic Carson, stating that "there may be value, in all sense of the word, in a development that realizes slightly fewer homes"?</p> | <p>We are not aware of the context of this quote</p>  | <p>See section 2.4.7. of the main report and p18 of <a href="#">elaap-meridian-water-scenario-testing-planning.pdf</a></p>   |
| <b>Open Spaces</b>  |   |  |
| <p>37. Will the pylons remain e.g. that cross Edmonton Marsh or will they be relocated underground?</p>   | <p>It would be preferable for the pylons to be underground, however the viability of this is being appraised as part of the Masterplan V2 work</p>  | <p>This should have been considered as part of the Phase 2 planning application</p>  |



|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 38. To what extent is Edmonton Marshes liable to flooding? Does this impact its usefulness as an open space?  | The redesign of Edmonton Marshes to be used for flood attenuation and a valuable amenity space is part of the HIF funded scope.  | This does not adequately answer the question.<br><br>Furthermore, what analysis has been done of the wind and air quality of Edmonton Marshes?  |
| 39. Please specify how much open space the development will deliver in total (including parkland) at 5,000 and 10,000 homes.                              | Meridian Water will aim to deliver 30% of publicly accessible open space which is higher than the comparable new large scale development schemes in London and considered best practice.   | This does not answer the question – the question specifically asked about the figures for 5,000 and 10,000 homes.<br><br>Please provide links to the documents that show 30% is considered best practice.   |
| 40. Please specify how much parkland the development will deliver.  | The publicly accessible greenspace coverage is circa 22ha. The number could vary subject to Masterplan V2 outputs.   | This does not answer the question. The question is how much parkland will be delivered by the regeneration itself, not how much is greenspace is publicly accessible.<br><br>Please provide a breakdown of the 22ha of publicly accessible green space and links to document where this is evidenced. |
| 41. Given the amount of people who would live at the site will the development ultimately increase or reduce open space provision compared to population? | The density of the scheme is being reviewed as part of masterplan V2 process. Meridian Water will deliver more highly accessible and quality green spaces compared to similar scale and density new large scale developments in London | This avoids answering the question.   |
| <b>Density</b>  |  |   |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>42. Please provide evidence to support the density levels proposed for a site of this scale.</p>  | <p>The density level currently achieved is comparable to award winning Woodberry Down scheme in Hackney which ranges between 184 to 377 dph</p> | <p>The response above said the density of the scheme is being reviewed.</p> <p>Note: Woodberry Down is high density but is much smaller than MW (26 ha vs. 85 ha at MW), so not the same scale. Our concern is not about pockets of high density but the high density on such a large scale in an outer London borough.</p> <p>Woodbury Down - high-density housing here is supported by excellent public transport link (rated PTAL 5-6a vs. a target of 3 for MW). The development is close to large parks (Finsbury Park is 46 ha) and Woodbury Wetlands. Homes at Woodberry currently range from £550k-£1.5m</p> |
| <p>43. On density. Given the impact of Covid 19, is the density now appropriate and is the open space fit for purpose?</p>   | <p>The density levels are being reviewed as part of masterplan v2 process which C19 impact is a scenario to be further tested</p>               | <p>Our analysis shows that it will be: See MW Workstream report sections 2.4.8 – 2.4.13</p> <p>The Workstream were pleased to see the changes being considered as a result if the pandemic (as noted in September 2020 Cabinet Report), including changes to open space provision and would also like the impact of the safety of communal entrances to be considered during the Master planning</p>   |
| <p>44. Meridian Water will be the most densely populated area in London and 3-5 times more densely populated than neighbouring wards and nearly 4 times the Enfield average, yet without the supportive infrastructure, how will this impact sales to any prospective purchaser?</p> | <p>Meridian Water will not be the most densely populated area in London.</p>  | <p>Please see section in the report with detailed evidence justifying findings.</p> <p>If there is contrary evidence to this please provide it with reference and method of calculation.</p>   |
| <p><b>SIL Designation</b></p>  |   |  |
| <p>45. When will the SIL re-designation be decided?</p>  | <p>The new Local Plan is looking at the matter of SIL release</p>   | <p>Please be more specific in terms of dates</p>   |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>46. What are the financial, planning and place-making consequences of not obtaining SIL re-designation? Please specify these in full including any risks.</p> | <p>The Council is concentrating on working with the GLA to ensure full SIL release. This is expected to be achieved through the Local Plan process over a period of time</p>  | <p>This is recognised, but as the question states - what are the risks associated with not achieving this?</p> |
| <p>47. How does the decision to relinquish the de-designation of SIL that limits the development to 5,000 homes enable MW to deliver the 10,000 homes?</p>       | <p>The ELAAP only covers the next 10 years of development and concentrates on the West Bank of the Lee Navigation as that is where Phase 2 is located and which is deliverable quickly as the land is entirely owned by the Council. It also covers the IKEA and Tesco land where it is important there is planning policy in place to oversee their proposed developments. The emerging Local Plan covers the timeframe up to 2036 and will aim to secure the release of further SIL. The full 10,000 homes will not be delivered until circa 2045 by which time a further Local Plan(s) will be in place allowing completion of the whole MW scheme</p> |  |

| <b>Questions to Officers<br/>(8 June 2020)</b>  | <b>Response from Officers<br/>(30 July)</b>  | <b>Workstream Comment</b>   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  |   |
| <b>JOBS</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Local Employment</b>   |  |   |
| <p>48. What evidence is there that there would be the consumer demand to support the retail units/offer proposed at MW? (particularly in light of the challenges faced in Enfield's other main shopping centre areas)</p> | <p>A Commercial / Ground Floor Strategy is being developed for approval late in 2020/ 21 which will set out the evidence base.</p> | <p>This confirms there is as yet no evidence, despite the employment strategy being agreed.</p> |
| <p>49. To what extent will the retail offer at MW be solely targeted at people living within MW? Will the retail offer at MW detract from the retail offer in other local shopping areas (e.g. Edmonton Green)?</p>       | <p>See above</p>   | <p>This confirms there is as yet no evidence, despite the employment strategy being agreed.</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>50. How many of the 1,500+ expected job losses are people living locally?</p> <p>What will be the effect of these job losses?</p> <p>When would the job losses happen (i.e. approximate month and year)?</p> | <p>The 2016 ELAAP states that the MW development will create a starting deficit of 1500 jobs further it suggests that these jobs would constitute displacement of 100 Office Jobs, 1,100 Industrial, 200 Retail and 100 Admin, Support Services, Health and Public Section. A total 1,500 jobs displaced. A large portion of the displacement calculated happened through the subsequent clearance of the Stonehill Estate during the displacement of Industrial uses conducted by HSBC Pension fund when they owned the site. The Council bought the Stonehil site in June 2017. The jobs were lost before this time, during HSBC's Pension funds time. The Meridian Water project will from now aim to create 6000 new high quality jobs.</p> | <p>The first two parts of the question have not been answered.</p>   |
| <p>51. This development may reduce rather than increase employment for local people, especially in the short-term as lost jobs would not be replaced for 10- 20 years, what is the plan to mitigate this?</p>   | <p>The development of meanwhile and construction jobs and the creation of skills academies for construction.</p>  | <p>How many jobs have been created fro local people so far, and how many will be create for local people over the current ELAAP?</p> |
| <p>52. What steps have been taken to understand the impact of local job losses and what actions have been taken to mitigate any negative impacts?</p>   | <p>From 2017 there have been very few job losses.</p> <p>Meanwhile uses, the development project with Bloq's and the Construction opportunities and skills academy will help to both mitigate job losses but encourage new jobs for local people</p>  | <p>There appears to have been no work undertaken to understand the impact of local job losses</p>                                    |
| <p>53. What evidence is there that the main target employers (e.g. life science companies, higher education) would want to be located at MW?</p>  | <p>We are currenly exploring opportunities for a strategic occupier. No options for this are one the Table.</p>   | <p>This confirms there is no evidence despite the employment strategy being agreed.</p>  |
| <p><b>Attractiveness to potential employers</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p>54. Please provide PTAL ratings for the proposed development at different stages.</p>  | <p>TBC</p>  | <p>When will this be available?</p>  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 55. The preferred employment scenario cannot be delivered without increasing housing density – hence, what is the plan? Reduce employment or increase housing density?  | Commercial Ground Floor and Employment density are all being reviewed in light of Master plan 2 and Covid 19 impacts  | Why was the Employment Strategy agreed without first reviewing employment density?   |
| 56. Has the Employment Strategy been updated to fully account for the changing nature of work, especially office work (e.g. more people working from home and employers reducing office space requirement), especially post Covid-19? | It does take account of the changing nature of work. But has yet to be updated for the impacts of Covid 19            | Please show how it has done this   |
| 57. Given predicted permanent changes in office based employment and retail patterns, given covid 19, are the projections of employment opportunities realistic?  | We will keep under review but current thinking is that permanenet office space will alter to be come sort term hires  |  |
| 58. Will the employment strategies requiring an attractive environment be realistic and how will the over supply of space in central London impact?   | Not sure this can be answered   | Please look at the requirements of target employers (e.g. knowledge economy) who are seeking parkland environments and assess whether MW will meet these requirements. |
| 59. Will a rebalancing of the UK economy reduce relocations or expansions of enterprises to London?   | Not sure this can be answered   | Are developers looking to reduce office development in London and increase elsewhere?  |
| 60. What is the predicted total floor space of retail by 2025?  | To be confirmed as part of the emerging Commercial and Ground Floor Strategy  | Unknown  |
| 61. Precisely which jobs will be lost on MW?  | See anwer to Q50  |  |
| 62. Why was Upper Edmonton the only ward regarded as affected by the employment strategy?   | The employment Strategy will be for all residents of Enfeild with a particular focus on the residents of Edmonton     |  |
| 63. What was the assumption on the price per Sq foot for retail and non retail space?   | This will be market led at the time we go to the market but we are looking at options for a creative enterprise zone. |  |
| 64. How sustainable are Building Bloqs?   | Currently sustainable and the move to a new premise will allow them to expand membership                              |  |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 65. Is there a risk assessment for the employment strategy? | Baselining employment putting KPI's and measuring processes in place with associated risk assessment will happen during 20/21 |   |
| 66. What is the current footfall at the station?            | There is no accurate data collected on this but Network Rail have said footfall exceeds expectations.                         | How do Network Rail know this if there is no accurate data collected? |

| Questions to Officers (8 June 2020)   | Response from Officers (30 July)  | Workstream Comment   |
|---|---|--|
|   |   |  |
| <b>SCRUTINY</b>   |   |  |
| 67. Please provide an example of an outer London Borough who has completed a similar development.   | Wembley Park in Brent is Quintain's 85 acre development in North West London. To date there has been a £1bn investment, which will create 7,000 new homes in the area, a new 7 acre park and 8,640 new jobs in addition to the construction jobs. | <p>Wembley Park is 32 ha vs 85 ha for MW. Wembley Park is a new "neighbourhood", MW is of a scale bigger than many London wards.</p> <p>Wembley Park is not delivering "Parklife on your doorstep" and has an excellent PTAL rating of 5-6a vs, a PTAL of 3 at MW.</p> <p>It's reported that Wembley Park is the largest private rental sector development in the UK and specifically markets homes to private and institutional investors</p> |
| 68. Can we have a list of all posts engaged on MW split by permanent, fixed term and consultants, and the value of external contracts for services on MW to include BUT NOT AN EXCLUSIVE LIST architecture, design, scientific and technical advice, planning advice, procurement and legal advice, employment and skills, placemaking, | This can be provided following the finalisation of a restructure report and contract register.  | When will this be happening?   |
| 69. Why were Planning Panels not held for Phases 1 and 2 of the development which would have been a good opportunity to engage with the public?   | A number of consultation events have been held for both the Phase 1 & 2 application, planning panels will be considered for future applications.  | Consultation events perform a very different function to planning panels. Future usage of planning panels is welcome.  |

## Appendix 1: Chronology

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| 02 Mar        | Penultimate Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream meeting (face-to-face)  |
| 08 Jun        | Detailed list of questions from Workstream to Officers due to inadequate evidence obtained from previous Workstream meetings & delays due to Covid-19.   |
| 17 Jun        | Final Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream meeting (virtual)   |
| <b>29 Jun</b> | <b>Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream - Final report released to the public via Council scrutiny officers</b>  |
| 01 Jul        | Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream disbanded following Full Council meeting and restructuring of OSC committee   |
| 30 Jul        | Responses to list of questions from 8 June received from Meridian Water Programme Director   |
| 11 Aug        | At Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting, officers agree with Chair of Workstream to send possible dates for a meeting with officers on the Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream report. Meeting not yet arranged. |
| 27 Aug        | Response on points of accuracy on the Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream report from the Programme Director  |
| 08 Sep        | Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream - Final report from June 2020 - officially released on-line on Council web-site   |
| 08 Sep        | Response from The Leader released online with an Appendix to Leader's Response   |
| <b>15 Sep</b> | <b>Public reply to the Response from The Leader and Programme Director submitted by Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream Chair at Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee meeting</b>                                      |

## Appendix 2: Ambitions of Meridian Water

The Council's ambitions for the regeneration of Meridian Water are:

- To ensure that local people are the principle beneficiaries of the new homes and jobs that will be created
- To build 10,000 new mixed-tenure homes
- To create a place where local residents and Londoners can afford to live
- To create 6,000 new jobs and 10,000 construction jobs
- To generate higher skilled, higher paid employment opportunities for local people
- To deliver new schools, health services, community facilities, parks, leisure and culture facilities
- To create a beautiful new environment with fantastic transport connections
- To create world class public spaces
- To be the greenest development in London and deliver the highest quality of design and environmental sustainability standards throughout the development
- To create a true 24-hour neighbourhood – a new destination to enjoy nightlife, music, theatre, cinema and much more, all year round

The delivery of these ambitions is based around three pillars:

1. Park life at your doorstep
2. Your place to make and create
3. Mixing uses and animating streets

The role of the Meridian Water Scrutiny Workstream was to assess whether these ambitions were being realised, and to identify areas of concern so that these can be addressed.