

We would like to begin by thanking the Public Inspector for giving Broomfield Home-owners and Residents Association (BHORA) another opportunity to comment on the North Circular Area Action Plan (NCAAP). We would like to make one final comment although not expressed in the style required by the Inspector.

Since 2007 the community living on and around the A406 has taken part in each step of the North Circular Area Action Plan development. We have attended many public meetings, asked questions and submitted papers at each stage of the consultation process.

Back land development

At no point has the council taken on board any of the suggestions we have presented or dealt with any of the concerns we have expressed. This is clearly seen when discussing 'back land developments'.

The local community has said time and time again that it does not support the development of back gardens and building a row of terraced houses (or mews if you like) in place of the gardens and access roads is unacceptable in an already densely populated area. The head teacher of Broomfield School (next a back land development) has also argued against such local development however the council continues to promote back land development in the NCAAP zone. Back land development is not permitted in other parts of the borough.

School places

Whilst the London Borough of Enfield is very happy to hide behind the London Plan in its rush to build more homes in the area it appears to take no responsibility for the provision of school places required by the new families that will move into the area. When the Education Department presented at the meeting we were appalled to hear that the council would rely on other local authorities to provide primary school places. Whilst London Borough Haringey may be seriously considering increasing its intake at a local primary school can LBE really rely on this, what happens if this idea is shelved and then cancelled after the 2014 local elections? LBE will be very happy to take council tax off all new residents, will receive CIL and S106 money but it would appear that none of this money will be ploughed into local needs and requirements. We suspect that money raised will be spent on other parts of the borough!

Jobs

If LBE wants to create sustainable communities then the creation of quality meaningful jobs must be developed within the NCAAP zone. We would suggest that Notting Hill Housing Trust also build a new office block along the A406 into which LBE could move some council departments. This would help to boost the local economy with those working in the office using local amenities, should local amenities ever transpire.

Sustainable neighbourhoods

Page 23 of the draft submission is entitled 'our approach – building for sustainable neighbourhoods'. Unfortunately this document fails to address the heading of this section. We note that this section is not council policy but just a nice idea. **A rich housing mix** – our fear is that too many of the homes for sale will be 'buy-to-let' and we will then have to deal with the private landlord problems as highlighted by the council itself. **Provision of local shopping needs.** This document does not explain how the council will encourage quality retail to the area. All the new families in the area (plus present residents) will be expected to travel, by car, to supermarkets and retail parks to shop. This

does not create sustainable communities, will only congest the A406 further and reduce air quality further. **Good access to shops, services and places of employment.** See above. **Community infrastructure meeting local demands.** This document goes into great detail regarding housing but no detail regarding community needs. Where is the larger library for the larger community, sports centre, improved swimming pool facilities (the ladies changing room has a serious drainage problem), community hall etc? **High quality environment.** With parents having to drive to schools outside the borough (primary school children rarely walk to school on their own), shop outside the borough, use sports facilities outside the borough etc road congestion and air quality will deteriorate. This plan fails to highlight how the environment will be improved but as said, the document is able to go into great detail regarding housing.

The document entitled NCAAP only includes 'part 1 – housing', we now require:

Part 2 – Education

Part 3 – Jobs, employment and training

Part 4 – Retail

Part 5 – Leisure facilities

Part 6 – Protecting the natural environment and improving air quality.

For a local community full of ideas, willing to engage and help improve the area the whole NCAAP programme has been very disappointing and residents and traders see that they have wasted many hours engaging in the box ticking exercise of consultation. The LBE is determined to build as many houses as possible in our small, already densely populated area with no visible plans to improve the environment, school places or job prospects. This AAP is inadequate.

Prepared by Laura Davenport and Caroline Chenier for and on behalf of Broomfield Home-owners and Residents Association.