

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT FORUM HELD ON TUESDAY, 27TH JULY, 2021

**MEMBERS:** Councillors Katherine Chibah (Associate Cabinet Member (Enfield West)) and Lindsay Rawlings, Cllr Saray Karakus, Cllr Mahmut Aksanoglu

**Officers:** May Hope (Plan Making Manager), Edward Jones (Principal Planner), Natalya Palit (Area Plans Manager), Hanan Osman (Senior Planner), Tom Rumble (Urban Design Lead and Deputy Team Leader (Urban Design)), Michael Kennedy (Senior Urban Designer), Helen Murch (Head of Strategic Planning and Design), Koulla Panaretou (Governance Officer)

**Also Attending:** Neil Paddon-Smith, Chris Horner, Robert Wilson, John West, Dave Cockle, Dennis Stacey, Juliet Barnet, Carol Fish, Denise Gandhi, Paul Hutchinson, Andrew Newman

### 1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair, Cllr Katherine Chibah, welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologies for absence were received from Cllr Saray Karakus, Cllr Mahmut Aksanoglu and Ann Bishop-Leggett.

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest registered in respect of any items on the agenda.

### 3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the Environment Forum held on the 29<sup>th</sup> June 2021 were agreed.

### 4. LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

A presentation was received from members of Strategic Planning in respect of the consultation taking place on Enfield's Local Plan, with focus on environmental policies and design and character policies.

Strategic Planning and Design Officers were keen to hear from the local experts in attendance to help shape and refine the policies.

The process (set out by Government) at Enfield is currently at Stage 1 - the plan preparation stage is known as Reg 18 and involves collecting evidence about the borough's needs and using this to identify issues and ways that they could be addressed through the plan whilst testing options. Reg 18 can be

## **ENVIRONMENT FORUM - 27.7.2021**

repeated several times until it reaches Stage 2 known as Reg 19, a draft plan which can be published, hopefully by the summer of 2022.

Therefore, focus on the following policies were received:

### **Climate Change**

The following issues were suggestion for inclusion in the Plan:

Overheating resulting in fewer or no trees  
Tree preservation  
Biodiversity  
Green space preservation  
No more flooding  
More reuse of building materials in new builds  
Less Pollution and vehicle, waste and rubbish dumping  
Green space preservation  
U.H.I  
Build for a Lifetime - high quality buildings  
Embodied carbon  
Compliance of enforcement  
Embedding Principles  
Education  
Rewilding  
Air Quality  
Should all policies relate to refurbished developments

### **Blue and Green Enfield**

The following points were received:

Paving over front gardens - policy and enforcement issue (why allow paving over)  
Positives include water gardens  
Degradation of boundary walls etc  
Loss of verges for crossovers  
Good example boundary ditch nature area  
Further work needed eg Salmons Brook link  
Better links with Lea Valley Park Authority and Thames Water  
Lack of attention to agriculture  
Conflict between Blue & Green and the proposed development north of Enfield Road and Crews Hill.  
Enhancement of Green Space et Trent Park and commercial activities  
Enfield Chase - historical landscape

## **ENVIRONMENT FORUM - 27.7.2021**

SPG3 - offsetting is in developers' advantage  
Use of buy-out verses offset eg Tottenham Hotspur Training Ground

### **Design and Character**

The following points were received:

Take note of public interest as public need to decide what they want  
Not just residents, focus must be for all users  
Importance of mixed use - walkable facilities - large scale design, social infrastructure and public space  
Remove obstacles (eg. Nursing Homes)  
CIC needs to go to comms where development is

### **Character**

Reflect existing character  
Problems with height and loss of greenery  
Densify in ways which respects character

### **Policy Responses:**

Categorisation of change for example Hadley Wood should not be a focus for change and change should be slow

Generally positive but concerns about individual decisions

Contradictions such as Heritage and Environment verses development pressure.

### **Anything Missed:**

How to involve the public with site briefs and area-based design coding.  
Hierarchy of assets and character needs to be discussed.

### **Environmental Protection**

The following points were received:

Couldn't read any of the post it notes - sorry

### **Transport**

The following points were received:

## ENVIRONMENT FORUM - 27.7.2021

Sustainable active polices and active travel.

### How:

walk to school, quality of schools,  
employment close to home  
Can commuting be reduced  
Offices, workshops, industry in suburbs  
Work hubs  
Emphasis on school zones, LTN's  
Car sharing/Car Club  
Enforcement of planning matters eg. Car free development  
Arnos Grove to Grovelands - alternative routes.  
Need to repair potholes  
Maintain cycle safety  
Footways need better design  
Better cycle parking at key transport hubs  
Scooters - safety only in cycle lanes  
Reduce public transport fares.

### Heritage

How to treat heritage as a whole?

If we must lose some, might be better to lose some fewer good ones and have greater protection for "gems" rather than degrade all assets.

### Priorities:

Protection - threats to landscapes, places, buildings and settings from schemes  
Heritage at risk register  
Not all assets on the lists  
Weighting given in practice - but more weighting is needed  
Conservation/protection - keep what is in good condition  
Interest in local lists and put on national lists

### Policy Response:

GPR (Ground Penetrating Radar) used for archaeology purposes  
Street naming and intangible heritage - can we link in policy  
Pre-application consultations with stake holders and link with process  
Loss of areas of special character such as landscape at Enfield Chase  
Make character of growth clearer.

### Anything Missed:

Character appraisals  
Need to make clear that local views are not just the ones in the map  
How does heritage inform new design?  
Enforcement

## ENVIRONMENT FORUM - 27.7.2021

Design briefs for sensitive sites

Gatekeeping of sites and the heritage value - if something credible then policy can be triggered

Area of arch interest to be revised

Development with heritage setting - should have condition to prevent PD (or article 4)

Policies need to be strong on "intangible heritage" with an interpretable way finding for local stores to make place

Edward Jones thanked everyone for their contributions and asked if there were any further questions, which were received as follows:

1. Dennis Stacey asked who challenges the majority of land on the local plan. The borough is over developed but the NPPF says we have to establish needs and plan for those needs.

In response it was noted that housing needs approval from a panel of inspectors and the Mayor of London and then finally judged by a governing body (inspector) for final decision. These inspectors can direct us to do certain things.

2. Clarity was sought on the "Character of Growth" report.

In response it was noted that all the Borough was looked at and the purpose of the study was to see how much is valued in certain areas and how much change is needed. This area can be revisited later on in the year if necessary.

3. Results of the consultation were explained. Staff will go through each consultation and where significant change of direction is needed, then each representation will be looked at. If the Mayor of London chooses not to proceed then the consultations will start again, until the inspectors find an acceptable version.

4. It was confirmed that Enfield are not losing residents as envisaged through the recent census. The population is not growing but it is not declining either. The London Plan has been adopted not just about population numbers but providing housing for those who are living in the Borough.

### 5. **WORK PROGRAMME 2021-2022**

The amended work programme was agreed.

### 6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Forum received a request from Dennis Stacey (Bush Hill Park Conservation and Study Group) to invite Andy Higham (Head of Development Management) to a future meeting to provide an update on enforcement.

## ENVIRONMENT FORUM - 27.7.2021

The Chair agreed to speak to the Cabinet Member for Licensing & Regulatory Services, Cllr George Savva. **ACTION: Cllr Katherine Chibah**

### 7. DATES OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2021.

Dates for future meetings are as follows:

Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2021  
Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2021  
Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> November 2021  
Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022  
Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2022  
Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> March 2022

The meeting ended at Time Not Specified.