

# Consultation Statement

## Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) (“the Act”) The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) (“the Regulations”)

### Making Enfield: Enfield Heritage Strategy 2019-24

#### Introduction

The statement relates to consultation undertaken for *Making Places: Enfield Heritage Strategy 2019-24*

The existing Council Heritage Strategy, **A Living Landscape**, was published in 2008. The Strategy included a characterisation of Enfield's natural and built heritage, key objectives relating to projects for Forty Hall and the museums and archives services and broader aspirations around heritage engagement and participation.

The new Heritage Strategy expands on existing policies embedded in the Core Strategy and Development Management Document to identify opportunities and priorities that can be used across the Council for the next five years and as the Borough undertakes a review of its Local Plan. The new Heritage Strategy cover the whole of the Borough of Enfield.

Enfield's Core Strategy (2010) and Development Management Document (2019) set out Council policy on heritage. Council Core Policy 31 is concerned with Built and Landscape Heritage. It says that the Council will work to pro-actively preserve and enhance all of the Borough's heritage assets. The Development Management Document (2014) policy DM44 'Conserving and Enhancing Historic Assets' is read in conjunction with this. The Council is preparing a new Local Plan in expectation of exceptional growth. Recognising these unprecedented circumstances, the Council is able to use the Supplementary Planning Document to guide how heritage informs growth, place-making and town centre intensification, as well as regeneration and investment. It also provides a strategy and series of initiatives to address current heritage issues such as Heritage at Risk, inclusivity and interpretation, conservation area management, public realm improvements and pedestrian and cycle routes.

#### Purpose of the report

This Consultation Statement has been prepared in line with Regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which states that, before a council adopts a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it must produce a statement setting out:

- The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;
- A summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
- How those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document

## Draft Heritage Strategy (Dec 2018)

The draft of ***Making Enfield: Enfield Heritage Strategy 2019-24*** SPD was developed from collaborative workshops and pre-consultation engagement with local stakeholders, including the Conservation Advisory Group, representatives of The Enfield Society, the Enfield Archaeological Society, conservation area study groups and other community organisations across the Borough. These sessions shaped the content and priorities set out within the Strategy document.

The Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee approved the draft Heritage Strategy for public consultation at its meeting of 24<sup>th</sup> October 2018. Public consultation ran from 5 December 2018 to 28 February 2019.

All those on the Local Plan consultation database were notified, which included almost 2,000 consultees drawn from the following:

- Statutory consultees
- The local business community
- Community support groups
- Disability groups
- Education organisations
- Environmental groups
- Ethnic groups
- Health organisations
- Heritage protection groups
- Housing developers
- Local residents and interested parties
- Infrastructure providers
- Leisure groups
- Planning Interest groups
- Political groups
- Registered Housing Providers
- Religious groups
- Residents Associations
- Transport organisations
- Young people

Consultees were informed of the consultation by letter or email. The draft SPD was published on the Council's website and paper copies were made available for viewing in the Council's hub libraries and at the Civic Centre. An online consultation platform for the draft new Local Plan enabled respondents to comment on the Heritage Strategy directly by responding to a particular question and there was the same option in a paper questionnaire. The Council's Facebook and Twitter campaigns specifically highlighted the consultation. Flyers advertising the consultation were distributed around Council buildings. A copy of the consultation letter can be found at Appendix 1. A copy extract from the Local Plan questionnaire can be found at Appendix 2.

Consultation sessions for the draft Local Plan and Heritage Strategy were held across the Borough during the at area formal consultation period, where stakeholders were able to raise issues, ask questions and highlight omissions. These included:

- drop-in sessions at the Civic Centre, Edmonton Green library
- officer presentation to Conservation Advisory Group (CAG)
- officer presentations to Jubilee, Joint Enfield West, , and Joint Enfield North ward forum meetings
- officer presentation and meetings with representatives of the Hadley Wood and REACT Edmonton neighbourhood forums
- officer presentations at other community group meetings including Greenbelt Forum, Racial Equalities Council, faith groups meetings
- a workshop session run by officers with the Enfield Youth Parliament

At these events many residents took the opportunity to raise questions and key concerns as well as propose new inclusions.

## **Consultation responses and issues raised to the Draft Heritage Strategy: *Making Enfield: Draft Heritage Strategy 2019-2024 (2018)***

2.1 A summary of the main issues raised by the representors are outlined below. A full summary schedule of the 35 written representations is available in Appendix 3. There were 40 individual responses relating specifically to the Heritage Strategy through the Local Plan consultation, also indicating support for heritage management. Over 100 responses were received to the related general heritage question on the Local Plan consultation. These also registered support for 'a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture.'

The comments have all been considered and changes made to the draft for the adoption version, where considered appropriate.

2.3 Of the 35 written representations received during public consultation, respondents were made up of the following:

- 14 individuals
- 1 LBE Councillor
- 1 Resident Associations (Fox Lane and District Residents' Association)
- 4 Statutory organisations
- 2 Other heritage organisations (Canal & River Trust, Museum of London)
- 7 Local heritage interest / Study groups
- 2 Neighbourhood Forums
- 4 landowner interests

The 40 responses to the Heritage Strategy question on the Local Plan digital engagement platform were from individuals, some indicating membership of one, or more local groups and organisations.

### **Key themes arising from public consultation**

A number of themes emerged during consultation, from written representations and consultation events. Below is a list of the most-mentioned themes:

- *Balance between conserving heritage and pressure for growth, including heritage-led regeneration*
- *Design quality in conserving heritage*
- *Importance of green spaces & waterways*
- *Greenbelt as heritage*
- *Parks maintenance and management*
- *Trees – in Parks, private and street trees*
- *Heritage at Risk*
- *Significance of undesignated heritage assets*
- *Importance of local heritage groups*
- *Funding*
- *The future of Broomfield House and Park*
- *Condition and management of Grovelands Park*
- *Role of cycle and pedestrian routes – access and interpretation*
- *Structuring and timeframes for objectives*
- *Heritage value of public houses*
- *Importance of Museums and role of education*
- *Importance of Local Studies Library and Archive*
- *Significance of archaeology and recording*
- *Enviro-crime*
- *More support for non-Council museums*
- *Importance of industrial past*
- *Need for a Heritage Champion*

- *Importance of place names*
- *Importance of views*
- *Crews Hill uses*
- *Education role at Forty Hall*
- *Vacant shops and shopfronts*
- *Conservation areas, boundary revisions and management*
- *Supplementary Planning Document status*

## **Key themes:**

### **A new Heritage Strategy**

There was clear support for the new Heritage Strategy, with a number of comments concerning the document as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), including whether its scope is too broad to sustain it as SPD. Two comments received through the online platform suggested a lack of support for the new Strategy. Below are some of the most repeated themes that emerged both from the written comments and engagement at consultation events.

### **Balance between growth and heritage**

Concerns were expressed about how the balance between the pressure for growth and heritage would be resolved, with some calls for a Heritage Champion to maintain the profile of heritage at a high level. There was some concern that heritage will lose out to the imperatives of growth. Place name continuity was also mentioned and the loss of pubs. Alongside a concern with growth was a concern that views and the setting of heritage assets should be properly considered. Further concerns around town centre intensification and tall buildings are mentioned below.

### **Green spaces and waterways**

Enfield's green spaces and waterways are clearly valued as part of the Borough's heritage. Aspects of the Borough's green spaces and waterways were a recurrent theme, including mentions under Heritage at Risk, cycle and pedestrian routes, Green Belt, conservation areas, Parks maintenance and event management, waterway management and interpretation and trees. Some respondents considered the Green Belt designation to be part of the Borough's heritage.

### **Heritage at Risk**

A number of comments reflected concerns about Heritage at Risk and more particularly registered parks, including at Grovelands, Trent and Broomfield. A number of representations were concerned with the future of Broomfield House. Vacancy and enforcement (or Envirocrime) were also mentioned.

### **Design quality**

Different aspects of design quality re-occurred through consultation. Pressure for growth was reflected in comments on a need to push the balance in favour of heritage, concerns about town centre intensification, tall buildings and setting and enforcement action. Support was given to the new Place and Design Quality Review Panel and there were mentions of the need for more specific design guidance.

### **Education and engagement**

There was also overlap in representations on education and engagement, reflected in comments on museums and exhibitions as well as the role of local groups. Particular comments related to the loss of an education officer post at Forty Hall. There were comments on the proposed non-Council museum at Trent Park and the lack of a permanent art gallery in the Borough was noted .

### **Document aims and objectives**

Comments on the scope of the document varied, the aims and objectives being perceived both as too ambitious and not ambitious enough. Timescales were mentioned, primarily in terms of timescales for delivery within the document lifespan being under-ambitious.

## **Public realm**

Aspects of the need for public realm improvements were mentioned, including the importance of street trees.

## **Conservation area boundaries**

Some comments related to the frequency of conservation area boundary reviews and the role of Article 4 Directions in their management.

## **Pedestrian and cycle routes**

The provision of heritage-centred pedestrian and cycle routes was raised in a number of comments, in terms of both existing and potential initiatives. This was seen as having potential to enhance the setting of the historic environment as well as contribute to education and engagement with the Borough's built and natural heritage assets.

## **Local heritage and local heritage groups**

The importance of local heritage assets was recognised in a number of comments, as was the role of local heritage and 'friends' groups and how best to support their functions. There was an expressed desire for meaningful engagement in decision-making as well as for support for groups in developing heritage initiatives.

## **Response to comments received during consultation**

All comments received in response to the consultation were considered and changes made to the draft document. The table attached at Appendix 3 summarises comments and sets out what changes were made in response.

Appendix 1: Sample letter of consultation

Appendix 2: Extract from Local Plan questionnaire

Appendix 3: Table summarising comments and changes made to consultation draft

## Appendix 1 Sample Consultation Letter



Please reply to: Strategic Planning and Design

E-mail: [localplan@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@enfield.gov.uk)

Phone: 020 8379 3866

Textphone:

Fax:

My Ref:

Your Ref:

Date: 5 December 2018

### **CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT NEW LOCAL PLAN 2036 AND HERITAGE STRATEGY**

Dear consultee

I am writing to advise you that the Council has published Enfield's Draft Issues & Options Draft Local Plan and a draft Heritage Strategy for public consultation.

The draft new Local Plan (LP2036) and draft Heritage Strategy will be the subject of a 12-week period of formal public consultation from Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2018 until Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2019. Representations on these documents should be received no later than 5pm on Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2019.

#### **Towards a New Local Plan 2036**

Enfield's new Local Plan will be the key planning policy document for the borough. Once adopted, it will contain policies that, together with the London Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and any related policy and guidance documents, will be used in determining planning applications and will shape how the borough will accommodate development and regenerated over the next 15 years.

This Issues and Options Local Plan sets out options for accommodating development over the next 15 years, through "good growth" principles as endorsed by the Mayor of London. Good growth is about ensuring that the positive benefits of growth, regeneration and investment reach all residents of Enfield.

This is the first of two formal stages to be consulted on as part of the new Local Plan. The document is available to view [www.enfield.gov.uk/newlocalplan](http://www.enfield.gov.uk/newlocalplan)

#### **Draft Heritage Strategy consultation**

The Council is also consulting on Making Enfield, a new Heritage Strategy 2019-25. How we manage heritage will shape how we grow, make new places and enhance the areas we already have.

Our plans are set out in **Making Enfield** which is a new Heritage Strategy for the next five years. **Making Enfield** was developed in collaboration with community groups from across the Borough. It will be a Supplementary Planning Document to the Local Plan.

The draft of *Making Enfield: Heritage Strategy 2019-25* is available to view:  
[www.enfield.gov.uk/heritagestrategy](http://www.enfield.gov.uk/heritagestrategy)

#### Public drop-in sessions

Drop-in sessions will be arranged for January and February 2019 and dates will be confirmed and posted on the Local Plan webpage.

#### How to respond?

Make comments to the draft new Local Plan and draft Heritage Strategy using one of the methods below:

- **Engagement Website:** [www.enfield.gov.uk/plan1](http://www.enfield.gov.uk/plan1)
- **Email:** [localplan@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@enfield.gov.uk)
- **Post:** Strategic Planning and Design, ENFIELD COUNCIL, FREEPOST, NW5038, EN1 3BR

Please mark comments as either 'Local Plan' and/or 'Heritage Strategy'.

Comments on the draft new Local Plan can also be made:


Should you have any queries relating to these consultations you can telephone the Strategic Planning and Design team on: 020 8379 3886.

Representations cannot be made anonymously. Please provide your full name and contact details. Please note that representations will be made publicly available, along with your name.

Hard copies of the draft Local Plan and Heritage Strategy will be available to view on request at the Civic Centre, and in the borough's libraries.

Alternatively, hard copies of the draft new Local Plan and summary version, and the draft Heritage Strategy can be made available on request by contacting the Council, either by telephone, via email or by post (see contact details above).

Yours faithfully,



Neeru Kareer  
Head of Strategic Planning and Design

**IMPORTANT** – Enfield residents should register for an online Enfield Connected account. Enfield Connected puts many Council services in one place, speeds up your payments and saves you time – to set up your account today go to [www.enfield.gov.uk/connected](http://www.enfield.gov.uk/connected)

## Q4

### Enhancing Heritage & Culture that define Enfield now and, in the future

- a)** Do you agree that heritage and culture are important to creating a sense of place over the lifetime of the new Local Plan? Yes/no/not sure - Please give us the reasons for your response.
- b)** Heritage in planning is understood to include buildings, built and natural landscape and archaeology. The Council has a duty to preserve or enhance designated and/or undesignated heritage. The Plan will prioritise enhancing the borough's heritage and cultural diversity. Do you agree that the options presented here would allow for enhancement as well as preservation? Yes/no/not sure – please let know the reasons for your response.
- c)** Quality of design is key to successful placemaking. To what extent do you agree with this statement? A lot/some/not much/I don't think that design is important. Please let us know the reasons for your response.
- d)** Councils can publish Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) to add more detailed guidance relating to policies contained within their Local Plan. The Council is consulting on a draft Heritage Strategy alongside the new Local Plan, which eventually will be a SPD. Are there issues affecting heritage that you think would benefit from being discussed in this? Please state.
- e)** Is there one change that the Council could make to improve Enfield's heritage that would significantly improve placemaking and may have been overlooked? Please state and let us know the reasons for your response.
- f)** The Plan needs to provide policies that provide an appropriate balance between growth, enhancing valued character and preserving heritage. Is this:
- About right?
  - High quality design of new development can achieve all three objectives
  - Too much in favour of protecting heritage and existing character
- Please let us know the reasons for your response.

## Appendix 3: Table summarising consultation comments and changes to draft Heritage Strategy

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
<b>H01</b>	Individual CY	6.12.18		
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcomes intention to improve Broomfield Park</li> <li>2. Who's leading on ideas about Broomfield Park – much that is useful in Conservation Management Plan? Want to be involved.</li> <li>3. HLF key to unlocking other funding</li> </ol>	<p>Parks not a statutory service</p> <p>Conservation Plan in place</p> <p>Will remain as an Aim</p> <p>NHLF offers potential for community to develop bids – will encourage liaison of Trust with NHLF</p>
<b>H02</b>	Natural England	18.12.18		
			No comment	n/a
<b>HS03</b>	London Parks and Gardens Trust	9.1.19		
				n/a
			Welcomes Heritage Strategy and its having SPD status	n/a
			<p>Consultation comments (HS03, HS34)</p> <p>To fulfil SPD function needs to clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How relates to local plan policy</li> <li>- Detailed guidance on planning apps</li> <li>- Detailed guidance on design principles</li> </ul>	<p>Text added at p6 to clarify how SPD relates to Local Plan policy</p> <p>Document hierarchy map added p.6</p>
			Improve awareness of history of Broomfield Park and how that has influenced its current form	Work with Trust/Friends and Parks Dept to scope interpretive material for Broomfield Park as set out at 1.3.3 and A3
			Welcomes Forty Hall visitor management plan to increase enjoyment and understanding	Noted

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Protection of LBE and HLF investment	
			Trent Park residential development will see increased pressure on park.  Residential developments in/near parks should be linked to contributions to future park maintenance.	Insert text at 1.5.6 to include parks in statement regarding CIL/S106. Liaise with CIL/S106 officers and Parks team to identify potential projects
			Objectives have too long a time frame or no specific timeframe. Consider subdividing objectives into more immediately-realizable tasks	Noted. Timescales have been developed to reflect available resources
			Strong support for improving understanding of green spaces and compiling a list to assess relative value. Suggest could be volunteer-led using Local List as model.	Add sentence to p 32 A7 'Scope potential for volunteer-led project'
			Should include Local List as appendix	Already reference to 2.3.8 to Local List being available on Council website.
			Notes of 5 registered parks & gardens: 3 on HAR register 2 affected by major development  LBE not a 'good record'	Parks' maintenance is not a statutory Council service.
			Editing	Resolved
			Summary of statement of significance could usefully be included for each of the Registered parks/gardens.	Insert sentence at 2.3.14 to point to Historic England information on Registered parks and gardens
			Maintenance budget for Council-run parks of high heritage value?  The 'elephant in the room'	Insert sentence at 2.3.13 to stress that Parks' maintenance is a non statutory function
			Evaluate maintenance cost of historic parks (not just Registered ones) and find way of quantifying diverse benefits	[p32 after O17 insert new Aim] [Aim] Understand the works required to improve the condition of the Council-owned Registered Parks on the HAR Register

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
				[Task]Scope putting in place Management Plans for all Council-owned Parks on the HAR Register [Department] Place [Output] In collaboration with Historic England scope Management Plans for all Council-owned Parks on the HAR. Identify funding.
			Include criteria for evaluating commercial events in historic parks	
			Clearer guidance relating to Development Management on development affecting parks and their setting	
			No mention of Myddelton House gardens despite major investment	Not Council-owned. Mention of landscapes at Myddelton,Capel Manor and West Lodge arboretum inserted at p.59
<b>HS04</b>	Chair of The Enfield Society	30.1.19		
			Paving replacement in practice not consistent with conservation standards	Liaison with Highways (Alex Zorbas) Paving revised?
<b>HS05</b>	Individual JMP	4.2.19		
			Commends Local List	Noted
			Notes Edmonton Cemetery House being refurbished	
			Drill Hall in Old Park Ridings should be recognised as a valuable community resource	[Insert] 'Many historic buildings play a role in supporting community functions, including listed properties such as Millfield or Salisbury House and unlisted ones such as the Drill Hall in Old Park Ridings.'
<b>HS06</b>	Meadway Conservation	7.2.19		

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
	Area Study Group			
			A useful document 'working towards' protection & enhancement of the borough's heritage	Noted
			Allotments not mentioned. Important to the character and setting of Meadway CA and well-used. Valuable for public enjoyment of open space.  Concerned that could be vulnerable to pressure for new housing.	Insert new para 'Allotments' at p.60. Allotments contribute to the open character of the Borough and setting of a number of historic buildings and conservation areas, including Meadway. There are 39 identified allotment sites across the Borough, of which 2 are privately owned'.
			Concerned that Grovelands Park on HAR list. Should be objective rather than aim to improve the Park's condition.	Objectives and aims are separated according to resources available. Park maintenance is not a statutory Council function but the Aims reflect an intent to tackle HAR issues.
<b>HS07</b>	Individual DP			
		4.2.19	Written to object to changes to education service at Forty Hall – letter relevant to Strategy	Education Officer post part of HLF funded package which ended 3 years ago. Now made Education Packs available for teachers online. Closer working relationship Forty Hall and the Museums and Local Studies team. Community engagement work will continue to be delivered with that team around Council collections.
			Highlights a number of extracts from the draft document that refer to the importance of access, education, interpretation and engagement with museum and local studies collections.	

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<p>Objects to the loss of the Museum Education Officer at Forty Hall. These functions will not be fulfilled as a consequence.</p> <p>Long term importance of school age access to educational provision at Forty Hall. Early engagement will mean its more valued long-term.</p> <p>Recognises strain on Council resources but also points to importance of maintaining experienced staff/teams</p> <p>Physical engagement with Forty Hall and Dugdale museum collections means will increase a sense of place attachment.</p> <p>Special events at Forty Hall encourage a sense of local pride</p> <p>Without educational events Forty Hall will just become a monument, venue for hire</p>	
<b>HS08</b>	Friends of the Lakes Estate Conservation Area	11.12.19		
			Note involvement with project. Detailed comments and notes on omissions.	Noted
			Doesn't 'address the practical role' of various owner groups (including the Council), developers and estate agents in protecting and managing heritage	Insert 'property owners' into para 1 and 'and street trees' to 2.3.13. Parks service responsibilities are already referred to through the document, particularly at 2.3.13

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Envirocrime not mentioned. Not sufficiently resourced to be effective. Very important role in heritage management.	Insert new para 1.3.15 to refer to ongoing intent to take action against Envirocrime and new objective on p.32
			Improve communication with property owners in Conservation Areas so aware of 'obligations and responsibilities' and are supported when planning works/maintenance	Proposals in the document support increased engagement through Aims and Objectives for Promotion and Inward Investment
			Council should give more support to local groups in trying to raise awareness of conservation in absence of resources to produce detailed design guidance.	As above. Objectives and aims relating to engagement with local groups are also in the document at 1.2.4 and associated objective/aims on p30 . There is and Aim relating to Design Guidance on p.31
			Welcome Article 4 Directions and notes they are 'resource intensive'.  Better information for residents would improve planning applications.	Presumably refers to 1.3.11 which states that consideration will be given to the Enfield Town model. No definite proposals for new Article 4 Directions otherwise. Noted.
			Council has invested hours of officer time in Heritage at Risk – so wasting resources –  where a more decisive approach would have kept community engagement.	Noted
			Support a commitment to design quality across all the borough, not just CAs.	Noted. Supported by PQDP
			Broomfield House situation is a consequence of 30 years of Council lack of leadership and indecision.  Welcome end to uncertainty re future of the house.	Noted.
			1.3.3 Regret Council stewardship has resulted in Broomfield Park being on HAR register	Noted.

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<p>1.3.4 Want more Council consistency on 'similar' planning apps/enforcement issues.</p> <p>Council should tackle issues emerging from 5 year CA reviews</p>	<p>The proposed design guidance (p31 objective) should help to achieve a degree of consistency.</p> <p>Interim reviews of CAs are in place, reported back to the CAG, with identified actions required.</p>
			<p>1.3.7 Regret Council stewardship has resulted in Grovelands Park being on HAR register.</p> <p>Future attempts to generate revenue/funding should be consistent with heritage status of landscape</p>	<p>Insert new Aim to agree a protocol for events in historic parks</p>
			<p>Should be consistent with London Plan, B:LBE 'Local plan' and Lakes CAA in valuing green spaces and street trees.</p> <p>Street trees important across the CA</p> <p>Street trees also important other CAs and outside CAs.</p> <p>What is the Council doing to protect street trees and other trees in CAs?</p> <p>Seems easy to get permission to fell trees and no scrutiny in Lakes CA. Are replacements routinely planted?</p> <p>Street trees should be a priority in 'Landscape and greenspace' and 'action plan'.</p>	<p>Sentence inserted at 2.3.13 re Street Trees</p> <p>Reference to London Plan at 3.1.2</p> <p>New aim inserted p32</p>
			<p>1.6 Objectives/aims just a wish list if no identified resources.</p> <p>Shows a 'lack of commitment' if no timescales.</p>	<p>Resources are limited. Objectives are limited to those items where funding can be identified at present, but some aims are expected to be delivered in the five year life of the document.</p>
			<p>Should recognise role of all heritage stakeholders in CAs, not just Council.</p>	<p>The document places emphasis on the role of the community and volunteer sector.</p>

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Increasingly important if 'reducing Council input.	Para 1 on p.9 has a new sentence relating to property owners.
			Rather than 5 yearly CA reviews should instead have action plans coming out of CAMPs providing engagement and training across CAs with target groups – planners, planning professionals, architects, building companies, suppliers, residents.  Friends groups in relation to the Parks service should be highlighted.	Improved engagement is a feature of the Strategy. Aims relating to capacity building across the Council and communities are at p.35. CAMPS are currently reviewed on an interim basis with actions coming out of that review. An emphasis on partnership underpins a number of objectives and aims.
<b>HS09</b>	Individual DH	17.2.19		
			Summary of achievements in Heritage Strategy a credit to the team.  Recognises improvements at Trent Park landscape and Forty Hall as particular examples	Noted
			Support much including emphasis on heritage encompassing both built and natural environment	Noted
			Support vision	Noted
			Support references to protecting landscape and green spaces including reference to 2011 Characterisation Study, particularly as these affect Hadley Wood.	Noted
			Support focus on high quality areas including 'well-managed' rural landscapes	Noted
			Importance of high ground and associated long view in north west of borough.	Noted
			Reference to South Herts Landscape assessment extends to south of Potters Bar/Trent Park/parts of former Chase.	Noted although not part of the new Strategy
			Hadley Wood almost unique in north London because 'suburban, semi-rural character' surrounded by Greenbelt that includes common land and woodland	Noted. The character of Hadley Wood CA is summarised in the current appraisal.
			Recognise importance of CAs and listed buildings	Noted

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Support prioritising projects including Broomfield, Lee Valley industrial heritage	Noted
			Note recognition of Hadley Wood Neighbourhood Forum and commitment of Council support	Noted
			Welcome the idea, discussed at a meeting with officers, for nuancing proposals to recognise the distinct character of different parts of the borough	Noted. Scope for Local Plan area-specific policies. New Aim on p.32 for small-scale improvements
			Would like to see whether CA 'protections, checks and balances' could be applied to all of Hadley Wood Neighbourhood Planning area whilst still supporting development	For the Neighbourhood Plan
			Could improve local environment/heritage access if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- completed Waggon Rd E-W cycleway</li> <li>- provided footpaths for all streets in Hadley Wood</li> <li>- potential public footpath routes through to Highstone/A100 if could collaborate with adjoining boroughs</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	No current plans to extend this route. Reference to pedestrian and cycle routes as aim on p.36
			Importance of green space provided by private gardens in Hadley Wood.  Draft London Plan emphasis on small sites and need to ensure against net loss of biodiversity and green cover.  Should be given more weight in Local Plan and Strategy.	Noted. Importance of green spaces recognised in the document.  New para at p20 on heritage value of a range of green spaces
			Principal concern: how planning balances growth against Strategy aspirations.  Experience suggests that character/environmental protection a secondary concern in planning decisions  'Test' how indicative Strategy/Local Plan policy interact	Progress will be monitored through an annual review of the document and delivery of identified objectives in the Strategy.  Consultation on the Heritage Strategy alongside that for the Local Plan is

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<p>Should have a separate implementation plan for both Strategy and new Local Plan</p> <p>How will progress on Strategy objectives be monitored?</p> <p>How will differing policies be balanced?</p>	<p>indicative of an intention that heritage should inform growth.</p> <p>The document as SPD will be linked to Core Strategy and DMD policies and will be a material consideration in planning applications.</p>
			Would welcome feedback	Noted
<b>HS10</b>	Historic England			
				n/a
			NPPF para 185 requires Local Plans to include a positive strategy for the 'conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats'.	Additional reference at p69 to HEANs and Good Practice Advice.
			<p>Welcome proposed update of Strategy. Provides valuable evidence and shows a positive approach to managing the historic environment.</p> <p>'Pleased to note' objectives and aims and recognition of heritage at risk issues.</p>	Noted
			<p>HAR includes 'significant' number' including high grade assets and landscapes.</p> <p>Need for 'focused and sustained positive management' to resolve issues.</p>	Noted advice on HAR
			Objectives and aims include many 'by 2024'. Concerned that this implies that they are ongoing rather than expected for completion. More detailed phasing for key projects could be included in an expanded appendix.	There is a distinction drawn between objectives and aims that are 'ongoing' at p29 1.6.2-3
			<p>P31 should have more detailed objectives for Broomfield Park to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- completion of management framework</li> </ul>	P31 is an Aim, which reflects the current availability of resources.

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identification of prioritised key projects</li> <li>- identification of funding sources</li> </ul>	Add to Aims on p31 to include completion of management framework and removal from HAR list. Priorities should flow from this document. Investigation of funding options is already in the Aim.
			<p>P32 Grovelands Park</p> <p>Should include completion of Management Plan</p> <p>Where assets on HAR register should recognise why and identify removal from list as key aim</p>	Add to aim on p32 to include text on working to remove the Park from the HAR list.
			Site allocations could be included in the Strategy to identify assets, their significance and opportunities for enhancement and dealing with risk.	
			<p>P58 on Archaeology</p> <p>Enfield due for review by GLAAS 2024. Should refer to updated Greater London Archaeological Priority Area Guidelines and commitment to best practice in GLAAS guidelines.</p>	<p>Reinstate missing [Objective]Improve understanding of the significance of Enfield's archaeology</p> <p>[Task] Support the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) in their review of [change to] the Borough's archaeology [end change] and support local archaeological societies</p> <p>[department] Place, Resources, GLAAS, Enfield Archaeological Society</p> <p>[Output] [insert] Work to meet best practice as set out by GLAAS and make review and information about local archaeological societies available through the Council website.</p> <p>g objective at bottom of p.34</p>

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			1.2.7 support review of Local List but should be supported by stated approach to managing locally listed heritage assets	Core Strategy policy 31 (to which this is SPD) sets out that the Council will pro-actively preserve and enhance all of the Borough's heritage assets' and does not distinguish between designated and non-designated assets.
			1.3.7 Grovelands Park Key priority should be resolving HAR status – physical erosion' -rather than improving interpretation	Text inserted to 1.3.7 to say working towards removal from HAR register
			1.3.12 Welcome commitment to best practice for Council-owned portfolio.  Should consider quinquennial/regular reporting	Noted.  Resource implications.
			1.5.7 Cycle Enfield is not mentioned.  Should include a commitment to ensuring this 'responds to local character and heritage' and ensure it improves access to heritage.	Cycle Enfield is mentioned at 2.1.9  Insert text at 1.5.7 to emphasise opportunity to integrate pedestrian and cycle routes and access to heritage and interpretation.
			Draft London Plan includes aspiration for Mayor's Heritage Strategy for London alongside economic and housing growth. Should include a commitment to reviewing Strategy in light of Mayoral one.  Should also include commitment to partnerships for economic, social and environmental objectives in NPPF 2.8	Insert sentence re 'economic, social and environmental' benefits of heritage at Executive summary
			Funding: HLF now HLHF GLA funding streams for regeneration.	Name changes through the document  References added on p69 to funding streams

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Potential for Historic England funding for HAR and historic high streets.	
			Welcomes intention to update the Heritage Strategy. Principal concern is for a 'stronger framework' for objectives and aims.  Happy to discuss further.	Noted
HS11	London Museums Development Manager Museum of London	19.2.19		
			Overall 'thorough, insightful and well written'.  Could have greater impact if made more concise with clearer conclusions for each main section. eg museum/local studies repetitive in places	
			p.5 Exec summary focus on 'heritage as understood through the cultural practices of different and diverse groups is spot on' – needs more than 'traditional' focus.  The 'general emphasis on place making is also spot on'.	Noted
			1.2.4 Consider potential burden on Council services of local groups needing support for making funding apps  Refers to NLHF 'tranches of funding' for organisations like museums, which community organisations can then bid for. Could allow museum/archives service to 'prioritise themes'.  'More manageable' way to work with communities	Noted  Document developed with input from Museum and Local Studies/Archive services

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			1.2.6 Welcomes social media proposals so museum able to be more spontaneous in engagement with audiences	Noted
			1.4 should be specific about relating to Archives accreditation	Text of 1.4 clarified
			1.4.8 Recognise this as important. Amend para to include 'and improved interpretation of existing collections'.	Text changed as suggested at 1.4.8
			1.5.4 Note change of name for NHLF and update on funding programmes. Mention Enfield one of 3 priority boroughs in London.	Name change. Text replaced to reflect new NLHF Strategic Funding Framework 2019-24
			2.1.17 Needs more on how heritage and stories of diff groups will be reflected.	Additional sentence added on the type of projects that could be adopted
			3.1.5 Additional text to say Arts Council Enland (ACE) "and its Museum Development programme"...	Text added
<b>HS12</b>	Individual D	23.2.19		
				n/a
			Nothing on public houses. Mentions hope for 'reinstatement' of The George, Enfield.	Reference added at p19 to public houses For consideration in Local Plan
			Should have more on role of local groups official and informal.	Text added at 1.2.6 re sharing information on local groups. Some groups already specifically mentioned in the document (TES, Enfield archaeological society)
			New development should reflect existing context and be in-keeping	New development is subject to design scrutiny by CAG and PQDRP as appropriate
			Should include 'lessons learnt' from existing Strategy	What was more or less successful in the previous Heritage Strategy is reflected in para 2.2.3-4
			1.2.7 Potential for public input?	Local heritage review was volunteer-led and subject to public consultation
			1.2.8 When?	No set timeline. An aspiration. Text changed at 1.2.8 to reflect this
			1.5.7 'Excellent... must be built on'	Noted

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			1.5.8 Potential tie-in with work experience/ school or college projects?	The document was consulted on with EYP and Southgate College. The Museum service works closely with schools. Small scale projects such as the planting of Monmouth Road Green are run with school volunteers where possible.
			P32 information boards could be used in parks for local history information	This sort of initiative underpins Aims on p35-6
			P32 Should 'capture information' from older residents. Possible school/college role	The Aim on p34 regarding reminiscence projects captures this
			P33 Could Middlesex Uni students do digitization work?	The Local Studies and Archive service is trying to develop its volunteer capacity as reflected in the Aim on p35
			P33 Asking whether schools go to museum	There is a strong programme of educational visits to the museums
			2.1.18 Importance of protecting greenspace against housing, eg Crews Hill	Greenspace at Crews Hill does not have formal heritage designation but does fall within the Greenbelt.
			2.1.12 new housing should use names associated with Enfield and its heritage	Noted  Comment seen by Highways team.
			2.1.15 Crews Hill should be 'protected'.	As above. No formal heritage designation. Falls within the Greenbelt.
<b>HS13</b>	Secretary, Southgate District Civic Trust	23.2.19		
			Agree with 'much in the draft strategy' but some concerns.	Noted
			Too vague because does not include time frames	Time frames for objectives are within the five years of the document lifespan unless

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
				otherwise stated. This reflects resource availability.
			Should be more prescriptive for planners and developers.	This is set out in the Objectives and Aims on p31
			Nothing on parks management	Park management is referenced through the document including Objectives and Aims on p31-2 and the Parks & Open Space Strategy on p72
			Nothing on creating heritage of the future	Design quality is the first priority on p20 and Objectives on p31. Sentence added at p20 1.3.1 on link between design quality and heritage of the future
			<p>Does not indicate responsibility for tasks.</p> <p>Should set out what policies used for ‘unsympathetic developments.’</p> <p>Omissions – no mention of parks or open space management</p> <p>No strategy for creating heritage and conservation areas of the future</p> <p>Re NLHF on Enfield - would be helpful for identified person from Enfield to support local groups applying for grants.</p>	1.5.4 has been amended to refer to Enfield as a funding focus area. NLHF has an officer identified to support bids in the area
			Want more weight to heritage assets and settings in decision making (both Dev Management and Strategic Planning. Cites The Fox as bad example.	Noted. Weight is given in accordance with policy and guidance as set out in Objective 3 on p31

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Welcome use of Local Studies and Archives Material. 'This is welcome as a sense of community and pride in the town centre'. Not clear how this differs from the Conservation Area Masterplan'?	Noted.  The Heritage Strategy is quite distinct from the Enfield Town Masterplan. The aspirations for the use of the local studies library and archive are Borough-wide
			Broomfield preferred option welcomed but timescale too long	The timescales reflect what resources are available
			Welcomes Place and Design Quality Panel. Raising design quality across the Borough important. PDQT should work with civic groups and not just CAG. Need to be more incentive/pressures on developers so schemes go to PDQT early in process.	The PDQP is independent of the CAG and other groups. Developers are encouraged to engage early in the development process.
			Pleased to note CIL and S106 aspirations. More transparency needed on CIL and S106	CIL and S106 spending is subject to scrutiny. Information on the CIL is on the Council website.
			No mention of a Heritage Champion – major concern. A Heritage Champion would help communities' focus and liaison with them and give weight to heritage team. Would help protect heritage of all borough's communities and 'drive' some of the Strategy proposals.	Aim added on p36 to have a new Heritage Champion
			Notes no art galleries. Would welcome range of initiatives to encourage studios/exhibition spaces, including for empty shop units.	Noted. Question on shop uses for the Local Plan.
			Southgate regeneration/public realm improvements welcome but nothing specific. Should have town centre plan including relocating library, mix of uses other than café/restaurants, market space, more green space, trees and planting and youth facilities. Public realm	Noted. Public realm improvement projects are customarily referred to the CAG and local study group for consultation.

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			improvements vital but no details, nor of whether other stakeholders/partners will be involved. SDCT would like to be	
			Support recognition of CAG and welcome annual networking event  Want more targeted 'discussions with local societies, particularly SDCT'.	Noted  Proposed annual event is indicative of intention to improve engagement and support for local groups whilst recognising available resources
			Should have CAG type meetings for large schemes outside CAs	Noted. PDQ Panel now in place
			Would like Place Director to talk to joint meeting of local organisations.	Noted
			Groveland Park – welcomes mention of re green spaces and interpretation but should have time frame.  Management plan not been implemented.  No similar strategy for other parks or plans for trees. Would like specific plan for 'continuous replacement and maintenance of trees'.	Resource dependent  Parks Strategy referred to in body of text  Street tree protocol
<b>HS14</b>	Individual JS	24.2.19		
			1.5.1 'Delighted' by recognition of education as central to museum function.	Education Officer post part of HLF funded package which ended 3 years ago.

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<p>Cut to Education officer post at Forty Hall for financial reasons mean that the current wide-reaching educational offer at Forty Hall will be reduced.</p> <p>This will have adverse effect on both engagement across the Borough and the Learning Outside the Classroom award.</p>	<p>Now made Education Packs available for teachers online.</p> <p>Closer working relationship Forty Hall and the Museums and Local Studies team</p> <p>Community engagement work will continue to be delivered with that team around Council collections.</p>
HS15	Meadway Conservation Area Study Group (MCASG)	25.2.19		
			Comments of 7 Feb for both Strategy and Local Plan	Noted
HS16	Individual DS	25.2.19		
			<p>Notes participation in project. Satisfied with substantial content and scope. Professionally produced.</p> <p>Concerned that Strategy over promises on what resources allow to be delivered.</p>	The document has been referred across departments and objectives are structured to reflect what can currently be delivered from within existing Council resources
			<p>Not enough emphasis on funding heritage.</p> <p>1.5.6 only refer to funding and is 'cautious' and 'aspirational'. No reference in Executive Summary</p>	New reference to HLF funding priority area at 1.5.5 and p69
			Enfield needs senior level Heritage Champion with significant influence. Should help identify sources of funding. Too much heritage policy currently bottom-up.	Aim added on p36 to have a new Heritage Champion
HS17	REACT Edmomton	25.2.19		
			Notes attendance at REACT meeting. REACT catchment area has 3000+ residents. These comments on their behalf.	Noted
			Heritage 'not just bricks and mortar'. Should have 'a crucial influence' on the Local Plan and developments in the east of the Borough -particularly Meridian Water.	New Aim re heritage in east of the borough linked to development schemes at p31

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Heritage should not divide but 'play a strong part' in all developments, ensuring high quality new build.	Commitment to design quality at 1.3.1 and p31 is applicable across the Borough
			Comments relevant to Local Plan	For Local Plan
			Would like an update after the end of consultation	Noted
<b>HS18</b>	Chair Enfield Town Conservation Area Study Group			
			Welcomes Strategy as 'attractive, informative and celebratory description of the History of the borough and the current state of its heritage'.	Noted
			Comments on para 1.3 relate to group's stated interests	Noted
			Strategy doesn't address the 'most challenging threats' to heritage, particularly high density development. Local Plan focus on development in town centre and around stations also coincides with many conservation areas. Huge pressure for development as a consequence.	1.3 reflects on the pressures for increased density and heights on historic town centres and the importance of design quality to ensuring this is managed.
			Notes emphasis on importance of new design. 2024 too long a wait for Design Guidance 'will be much too late'. Points to Southgate tall buildings application in 'patently inappropriate' location. Householder Design Guidance which will be used for what Local Plan identifies as small sites and infill, has no timescale. Both sets of design guidance need much higher priority.	Objectives and Aims are given timeframes that reflect currently available resources.
			Note 'it is accepted that' inappropriate development damages the economic viability of heritage assets. Three tall buildings inside Enfield Town CA have done that.  Sets out policies for assessing tall buildings and notes that Enfield has failed to map appropriate locations as intended by Core Strategy policy 30. Draft London Plan also requires in/appropriate sites for tall development.	P32 New objective relating to views analysis for tall building proposals in, or adjacent to designated historic assets

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<p>Enfield failure leaves areas 'unacceptably vulnerable', particularly in, or affecting setting of CAs.</p> <p>Enfield Town Masterplan didn't deal with tall buildings as should have; just higher density.</p> <p>Strategy should have an objective to map where is in/appropriate for tall buildings in CAs and affecting their settings and guidance on number of floors. This should be subject to public consultation.</p>	
			<p>Disappointing that no specific objectives or aims relate to Enfield town.</p> <p>1.3.10 queries what 'ongoing work in Enfield town' is. Public realm improvements promised from Cycle Enfield not happened. No particular projects come out of the Masterplan.</p> <p>Strategy should include specific objectives relating to public realm enhancements and the Market</p>	<p>Enfield Town Masterplan and Cycle Enfield projects led to th the successful Liveable Neighbourhoods bid.</p> <p>Aim revised on p32 to concentrate public realm improvements in historic town centres.</p>
<b>HS19</b>	The Enfield Society Architecture and Planning Group	28.2.19		
				Noted
			Says that Heritage Strategy 'is not part of the Local Plan' but important that they are connected so 'protecting Enfield's heritage is not overlooked'.	Noted
			Welcomes the draft Heritage Strategy. Notes TES involvement in the project. New Strategy will help developers understand the importance of Enfield's	Noted

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			heritage at a time of growth. Draws together otherwise confusingly disparate information.	
			Notes Museum, Archive and Local Studies and Forty Hall to be used to build understanding of the Borough's heritage.  Need sufficient resources and 'community involvement', particularly at Forty Hall. Extend opening hours and 'increased community use'.  Not realising full community potential of both Forty Hall and Dugdale Museum.	Management of the museums is subject to available resources.  There is a commitment in the Objectives on p33 to broadening engagement.
			Dugdale Centre museum exhibitions 'very positive' contribution to community involvement with heritage. Should do more to link Dugdale and Forty Hall museums to local ones (non-Council), RSA, Whitewebbs, West Lodge Arboretum, planned Trent Park museum.	The document focus is primarily on Council-run museums and heritage assets but these are mentioned at p.58 and 2.3.28
			Empty shop units could include displays 'signposting the various heritage assets and resources'	Text inserted at 1.5 regarding opportunities for promotion through empty shop units and development sites.
			Support for Place and Design Quality Panel. Developers should have encouragement/incentive to submit early, particularly important in CAs/areas of historic interest.  Notes poor quality design 'adjacent to' conservation areas and historic buildings, affecting their setting.	Noted
			Should use 'planning gain' money to offset impact on a CA/historic site for heritage as well as for housing, schools and community facilities. Heritage previously missed out.	Proposals for CIL and S106 are set out at 1.5.6 and the Objective on p35

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			2.4 refers to Heritage at Risk. This needs to be given greater priority.	Proposals for properties on the HAR Register reflect available resources.
			Where concerns are raised about heritage assets (both designated and not) these need to be prioritised. Listed building enforcement should be prioritised.	Insert new para 1.3.15 to refer to ongoing intent to take action against Envirocrime and new objective on p.32
			Too many objectives have 5 year period for delivery Make shorter time for developing resources at Museum and Forty Hall.	Timescales reflect available resources
			Broomfield preferred decision should be prioritised.	
			Needs planning for long term tree replanting, particularly in parks with mature trees to maintain stock for the future. Eg. Jubilee Park	The Aim on p32 regarding a study of the relative heritage value of the Borough's green spaces will meet some of this.
			Need for review of all tree species and condition across the parks on a planned basis.	Parks is a non-statutory function but there is a new Aim proposed to produce detailed management plans for the Registered Parks
<b>HS20</b>	Individual BJ	28.2.19		
			Support for valuing and protecting Enfield's heritage. Question in relation to Strategy questions use of word 'appropriate' (used in another clause of the question).	
			Strategy should include Greenbelt as core part of Enfield's heritage.	Crews Hill and market gardening are mentioned at 2.3.38.
			Crew's Hill is an 'historically important market gardening area' and should not change to become residential	Greenbelt is mentioned at 1.3.9, 2.1.8.  There is an Aim on p32 to review the relative heritage value of the Borough's green spaces

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<p>'Vision' is contradictory. Needs clarity on 'scope' of change and 'more robust' in how will conserve heritage and borough character and oppose bad design.</p> <p>Need to keep historic place and pub names.</p> <p>Should be explicit policy to protect 'character' and names of historic pubs.</p>	<p>Reference added at p19 to public houses</p> <p>Emphasis on design quality at 1.3.1</p>
			<p>Should include the commitment to 'design quality underpinning place-making through conservation of the historic environment'</p> <p>Design quality crucial to placemaking</p>	<p>Emphasis on design quality at 1.3.1 and p31</p>
			<p>5 year review of CAs is unclear about whether relates to reviewing boundaries (not supported) or meeting Article 4 Directions.</p> <p>Needs to be clarified so 'the landscape heritage is not put at risk from developer pressures'.</p>	<p>Local authorities are required to review their conservation areas and put in place proposals for their management.</p> <p>Article 4 Directions are separate and relate to withdrawing permitted development rights. They are reviewed at the same time as conservation area appraisal and management proposal documents.</p>
				Noted
HS21	Chairman, Enfield Archaeological Society	28.2.19		
			<p>Notes participation in project. 'Overall we feel that it is a comprehensive and attractively produced document which we hope will fulfil its aims of cherishing, conserving, promoting and celebrating the Borough's heritage'.</p>	Noted
			<p>Welcomes commitment to supporting local groups</p>	Noted

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<p>P33 welcome intention to improve understanding of Enfield's archaeology and commitment to working with GLAS through development process.</p> <p>p.30 Also welcome push for increased contributions to GLHER, providing staff training and increasing public awareness of it.</p> <p>'Excellent' that Strategy will be material consideration in planning applications.</p>	Noted
			Strongly support recognition of importance of museum and archives collections and their services and role in place making	Noted
			2.3.11 pleased to see Archaeological Priority Areas map but would be useful to have these named with brief synopsis of key information as for Conservation Areas (2.3.6)	Table added
			Notes effective use of images through the Strategy. Could also include an image from the Digging up Britain's Past series at Elsyng Palace.	Noted.
			Concerns about resource implications, particularly noting the emphasis on education 1.5.1 but cutting of 'most significant' heritage attraction, Forty Hall post and so tours of Elsyng Palace.	<p>Education Officer post was part of HLF funded package which ended 3 years ago. Now made Education Packs available for teachers online.</p> <p>Closer working relationship Forty Hall and the Museums and Local Studies team</p> <p>Community engagement work will continue to be delivered with that team around Council collections.</p>
			1.2.4 Note intention to put information about sources of funding on website	Noted
			Note intention to meet with local groups for information sharing	Noted

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
HS 22	Individual JB	28.2.19		
			Why is Strategy not supporting the proposed Trent Park Museum given potential community and public benefits.	The proposed Trent Park museum is mentioned at p63, 2.3.28 alongside other Non-Council museums
HS23	Cllr Rawlings			
				Noted
			1.2.6 make sure online content is easily accessible	The Museum of Enfield page is readily accessible from the Dugdale site
			1.2.7 local list should be more than buildings	Landscape, sculpture and blue plaques are also included on website
			1.2.8 notes importance of local studies library 'especially for people researching ancestry'.	1.2 Add text on importance of telling own stories, include ancestry and Local Studies Library and Archive
			1.3 role of estate agents>?	Noted
			1.3.6 needed quickly	Trent Park permission has landscape scheme agreed with the Council. Liaising with Parks officers about Strategy proposals
			1.3.12 questions whether best practice sufficient	'Best practice' reflects available resources
			Notes a lot of mentions of 'need to secure funding'	This reflects resource currently available
			1.4.1 Agrees with this but asking how much already digitised.	Over 3,000 digitised images are available online
			1.4.2 Does this include schools?	Education/engagement is for all
			1.5 Extend Open House inclusions. Consider 'view from outside' options.	Open House has particular criteria for entries though could consider advertising heritage walks at the same time.
			1.5.4 Whilst Forty Hall is important shouldn't distract from other heritage	Noted. The Museum service at Forty Hall is recognised in the document as well as aspirations for the wider landscape, hence apparent imbalance in focus

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			1.5.6 Need to think creatively	Noted
			P30 GLHER training should extend to CAG and Councillors	Text added to Objective to include CAG and Councillors
			Should be more than annual contact with HAR owners	Where cases are live there is more regular contact. This is a minimum
			Could use weekly/monthly paper article to highlight vulnerable local heritage	Text added p.30 to Objective liaise with Comms team on best way to get message about Local Heritage at Risk across
			Estate agent role in developing householder design advice	Objective on p31 concerns design guidance
			Views across Forty Hall landscape already compromised by Spurs development	Noted. The intention is to protect existing retained views.
			p.32 Agree with items 4 & 5	Noted
			p.35 Annual networking should be meaningful with proper agenda	Noted. Networking opportunities will be supported by presentations/useful information as appropriate
			Could consider giving pedestrian priority on 'shared heritage routes'	Aims on p35-6 relate to pedestrian and cycle routes and p32 to public realm improvements. This idea could be discussed with the Highways/T&T teams as part of this.
			Role of volunteering in helping with mental health	Noted. There is an aim relating to volunteering on p33 and p35
			p.36 consider interpretive boards, particularly at Elsyng	Noted. Parks team advised. There is an Aim relating to heritage interpretation at p36
			A lot of objectives have 'by 2024'	Reflects what resources are available
			Heritage about 'what was there' as well as surviving physical fabric. Interpretive boards needed, particularly in the east (industry). Important for understanding areas and 'how they are made up now'. Eg. Thorn EMI where now Morrisons at Z10/Southbury Road junction.	Noted. As above there is an Aim re interpretation at p36 and Objective relating oral histories on p30
<b>HS23</b>	Canal & River Trust	28.2.19		

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
				Noted
			Policy should protect 'smaller heritage features' of waterways	Text added at p61 2.3.21 to recognise smaller features of waterways
			Welcome the recognition of the significance of Enfield's waterways.  1.3.9 Support partnership working	Noted
			Note p.32 commitment to improving understanding of the waterways and support partnership working for this	Noted
			2.1.11 should recognise 'the fundamental role that navigable waterways historically played in the development of the settlement' and role of Lee Valley in industry	Text added to 2.1.11 to reflect role of navigable waterways in shaping borough and River Lee to industry
			In terms of zone characterisation should consider Lee Valley as a linear zone with associated 'receptors' eg CAs	For Local Plan
			Lee Navigation 'legible stratification' and experienced by users much as always was – 'open, living museum' of 'waterway vernacular'. Fragile nature of setting requiring careful management.	Insert text at 2.1.15 regarding continued use of Lea Navigation as a 'living museum'
			P22 correct naming	Correct naming
HS25	TfL Planning Development Manager, Commercial Development	31.1.19		
			Supports objective on informed conservation practice	Noted
			Supports 'holistic approach' to integrate heritage assets into new development	
			Supports objectives for heritage-led regeneration and reference to regulatory and planning functions.	Noted

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<p>Ref to NPPF and development in CAs that can 'better reveal their significance.</p> <p>Piecemeal development and clutter round stations could be improved by 'sensitively designed new development'.</p> <p>Refers to development proposal sites at Cockfosters and Arnos Grove designed to 'conserve and enhance'.</p>	
			<p>Supports CA review at 5 year intervals and long-term management of Trent Park landscape.</p> <p>Suggest Cockfosters Station car park should come out of Trent Park CA as does not 'conserve or enhance' the character of the CA, isn't part of the open space and .</p>	Noted. Proposed boundary revision to be considered at next CA review (2020 on 5 year plan).
			Should use Local Plan or CAA review to take the car park out of the CA	Noted
				Comments noted but CA boundary revisions are beyond the scope of the Strategy document.
<b>HS26</b>	Highways England	27.2.19		
			No comments	Noted
<b>HS27</b>	Individual UJ	27.2.19		
			<p>Q4 Question 4 – a) Yes! b) The options are not clear, but I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture. d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.</p>	Noted – Local Plan comments

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			<p>Greenbelt should be included as heritage in Strategy, including Crews Hill – important historically for market gardening.</p> <p>Vision of ‘heritage for change’ a contradiction</p> <p>Supports protecting heritage against poor design</p> <p>Supports preserving historic place names</p> <p>Should be a separate policy to protect pubs</p> <p>Importance of good design across the board for all placemaking</p> <p>Questions review of CA appraisals every 5 years – boundaries (not supported) or Article 4 Directions? Should be clarified to ensure protection of landscape.</p>	
				<p>Crews Hill and market gardening are mentioned at 2.3.38.</p> <p>Greenbelt is mentioned at 1.3.9, 2.1.8.</p> <p>There is an Aim on p32 to review the relative heritage value of the Borough’s green spaces</p> <p>Reference added at p19 to public houses</p>
				For Local Plan
				Emphasis on design quality at 1.3.1

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
				<p>Local authorities are required to review their conservation areas and put in place proposals for their management.</p> <p>Article 4 Directions are separate and relate to withdrawing permitted development rights. They are reviewed at the same time as conservation area appraisal and management proposal documents.</p>
<b>HS28</b>	Individual CJ	27.2.19		
			Greenbelt should be included as heritage in Strategy, including Crews Hill – important historically for market gardening.	<p>Crews Hill and market gardening are mentioned at 2.3.38.</p> <p>Greenbelt is mentioned at 1.3.9, 2.1.8.</p> <p>There is an Aim on p32 to review the relative heritage value of the Borough's green spaces</p>
			<p>Vision of 'heritage for change' a contradiction</p> <p>Supports protecting heritage against poor design</p> <p>Supports preserving historic place names</p> <p>Should be a separate policy to protect pubs</p> <p>Importance of good design across the board for all placemaking</p>	Reference added at p19 to public houses
				Emphasis on design quality at 1.3.1

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Questions review of CA appraisals every 5 years – boundaries (not supported) or Article 4 Directions? Should be clarified to ensure protection of landscape.	Local authorities are required to review their conservation areas and put in place proposals for their management.  Article 4 Directions are separate and relate to withdrawing permitted development rights. They are reviewed at the same time as conservation area appraisal and management proposal documents.
				Noted
HS29	Forty Hill and Bulls Cross Study Group			
				Noted
			Cottage ornee at Forty Hall?	Change to 'ferme ornee'
			p.21 should mention Elysyng Palace SAM management in terms of best practice	Sentence added to para 1.3.5 on p21 regarding best practice in management of Elysyng Palace
			Pre Hlf photo of Forty Hall – should reflect changes	Sourcing image
			1.3.8 editing	Edited
			P22 want more on protection – Article 4 for new build and green spaces between building	Potential for Local Plan to include policies on side extensions. Design quality and guidance referred to as Objective and Aim p31. Article 4 Directions are resource-intensive.
			Number objectives/aims	Document revised to include numbering
			P32 both hill and hall	Edit to correct typo p32
			P32 should include ancillary structures for waterways	P61 2.3.21 see above. Text added re small elements of waterway structures.
			Separate objective to maintain Forty Hall, review CMP and maintain landscape and house with house rooms kept open	Objective on p32 to maintained Council-owned properties to best practice

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
				standards and further aims and Objectives pp33-4
			Mention role of Friends Groups in accessing funding	Friends groups mentioned
			Should have objective to produced streetscape manual	Existing streetscape manual
			Should be environmental damage minimisation objective	Beyond document scope- covered by other Council policy
			2.3.10 Typo	Corrected
			2.3.12 Naming	Corrected
			2.3.15 Typo and unfinished sentence	Sentence finished
			2.3.18 Final sentence?	Edited
			P61 'Cockfosters' typo	Corrected
			Council should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- set out ambition to list buildings 'as necessary'</li> <li>- record and conserve public monuments and sculpture</li> <li>- say how will conserve/enhance the streetscape</li> <li>- have policy to protect against infill/backland development in CAs</li> </ul>	Listing by Department with advice from HE  Local list already includes sculpture and blue plaques
<b>HS30</b>	<b>Individual RHI</b>	<b>27.2.19</b>		
			1.5.2 Unaware of museum website	Website presence well-established. Dugdale website has helped to raise profile
			1.5.7 Meaning of 'smart access'?	Noted
			2.3.14 Meaning of 'registered' park	Formal designation
			2.3.12-15 All parks should have a management plan but resources mean 'no plan for anything other than immediate management of its parks'.	Reference to management plans for parks at 2.3.15
			2.3.20 Omitted Adath Yisroel Cemetery	Added Adath Yisroel cemetery
			2.3.24 Not seen a Council newsletter?	Newsletters available via sign up

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Parks festivals programme?	Festivals programme is referred to in the document but the detail is beyond its scope
<b>HS31</b>	Turleys	27.2.19		
			Comments to be read alongside those for Local Plan	Noted
			Parallel Call for Sites submission re 116 Cockfosters Rd	Noted
			Overall support re plan making and development control	Noted
			Notes vision statement is for heritage forming part of growth and its management	Noted
			Support objectives and aims eg review of local list and CAs	Noted
			Proposals 'have merit' in giving greater clarity but methodology should be made clear and be sufficiently robust. Refer to HE Advice notes 1 and 7	Inserted text and diagramme pp6-7
			Objective re Development management is in line with national/regional policy. See Local Plan comments	Noted
<b>HS32</b>	Turleys (Blackrock. NEAT)	28.2.19		
			Notes intention that should be an SPD	Noted
			Not appropriate for effective SPD – too high level and much includes non planning matters	Clarify document and policy heirarchies. New text at pp6-7
			Land use objectives need to be more securely tied to Local Plan document policies	Noted. Clarify document and policy hierarchies as they relate to the current LDF and note that these will be revised once the new plan is adopted.
			p.23 diagram should include Cienworld as tall building in an area appropriate for tall buildings, reflecting existing evidence base.	Reviewed map – Cineworld is marked as a tall building

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
HS33	Individual BF			
			New Strategy 'largely a statement of facts'.	The Strategy includes tables of actions for the Council in the form of objectives and aims.
			Summarises content from here on.	
HS34	Fox Lane & District Residents' Association			
		Feb 2019	<p>Welcome the Heritage Strategy</p> <p>Are active in monitoring CAs, local green space and heritage assets</p> <p>Need commitment to heritage to sustain stewardship for future generations</p> <p>Disappointingly few resources apparently available</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The new Strategy is intended to set out how the Council will use the limited resources available and also identify alternative sources of funding.</p>
HS35	Bidwells H & Q			
		28.2.19	Supports focus on industrial heritage in Local Plan and notes this as the key feature of the draft Strategy	Strategy is for more than industrial heritage, but noted.
	SUMMARY RESPONSES			
HS36	SUM002 – DS individual			
		24.1.19	Need for Enfield Society to be central to proposals in Heritage Strategy	A representative of The Enfield Society been involved at all stages of the process, from first workshops through to focus group on first draft
	COMMONPLACE RESPONSES			
HS37	CP_003			

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			'Big discussion' needed – saving 'important' assets	Heritage Strategy and Local Plan provide that forum
HS38	CP_007 Individual			
			Quality of design	Noted. Objectives and Aim on p31 refer to design quality
HS39	CP_012 Individual			
			Links heritage to revenue generation – should be maximised	Noted. Objectives and aims on p37 develop promotion and external funding
HS40	CP_019 Individual			
			Potential for viewing spot on Ridgeway	Noted the quality of the views referred to. Highways implications.
HS41	CP_020 Individual			
			Green belt	Reference to the Green Belt through the document
HS42	CP_027 Individual			
			It's not Enfield any more	
HS43	CP_029 Individual			
			As above, over development of residential properties	
HS44	CP_030 Individual			
			How the Council can meaningfully and practically support Asset of Community Value applications and community enterprises who want to support the few remaining heritage buildings in borough	
HS45	CP_043 Individual			

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Turning more shops and offices into housing – how will be make sure developers conserve the architecture where needed?	
HS46	CP_064 Individual			
			Take pride in the rich heritage this borough has to offer.  Trent Park is listed as an “at Risk” heritage site. Consider Park maintenance and suitability for major events.  Should be reference to proposed Trent Park museum – missing from document	Noted Park maintenance referred to p32  Proposed museum already referenced at 2.3.29
HS47	CP_067 Individual			
			Loss of pubs and shopfronts  Enfield characterised by variety of architectural styles and dates  Should be more control of shopfront alterations	Reference added at p19 to public houses For consideration in Local Plan  Text inserted at 1.5 regarding opportunities for promotion through empty shop units and development sites.
HS48	CP_125 Individual			
			Concern re character of Crews Hill as a destination.  Be careful of Enfield Town development.	Noted  Enfield Town Masterplan in place
HS49	CP_143 Individual			
			Comment not relevant to document content	n/a
HS50	CP_166 Individual			

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
			Proliferation of town centre phone boxes damaging to character	Was Permitted Development but this has now been withdrawn
HS51	CP_182 Individual			
			Concern re anti-social behaviour, litter and Pymmes Park	
HS52	CP_185 Individual			
			Antisocial behaviour and envirocrime should be central themes	New objective on envirocrime
HS53	CP_193 Individual			
			Include green spaces and Green Belt as one aspect of 'heritage'.	Green Belt referenced through document Objectives and aims on green spaces p32
HS54	CP_200 Individual			
			Should rescind permissions for inappropriate uses in the CAs	Outside document scope or Council control
HS55	CP_214 Individual			
			High rise as proposed by Southgate Office Village scheme inappropriate and damaging to character of the area	
			High rise not suitable for north of the Borough	
HS56	CP_215 Individual			
			Document needs clear, unifying narrative with 'key touchstones' of local heritage. Should be less wide-ranging.	

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
HS57	CP_217 Individual			
			Should identify key views as well as those less sensitive to change	Map with key views at fig 26
HS58	CP_230 Individual			
			Importance of green spaces – ‘green lungs.’	Noted
			Enfield’s museums, libraries and archives need to be protected and freely available to all residents.	Aims and objectives relate to both
HS59	CP_293 Individual			
			Comment on being unaware of consultation and too late to comment in depth	Noted. 12 week consultation.
			Importance of local heritage	
HS60	CP_300 Individual			
			Importance of design quality	Objectives and aim relating to design quality p31
			Council should be responsive to comments and not pursue quickest/cheapest option	
HS61	CP_304 Individual			
			Vehicle priority in Winchmore Hill CA area – should be more for pedestrian/cycles to enhance setting	Aims on p35-6 relate to pedestrian and cycle routes and p32 to public realm improvements.
			Need for interconnected cycle routes	

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
HS62	CP_336 Individual			
			Should consult with secondary schools to raise heritage awareness	Consultation event run with Enfield Youth Parliament
HS63	CP_341 Individual		No reference to transport manufacturing heritage  Comment on woodland and issues with envirocrime	New objective on envirocrime p32
HS64	CP344 Individual			
			Loss of trees and planting from Highmead estate redevelopment. Importance of retaining and replacing planting	Noted. Aim for public realm improvements p32 and CiL/S106 p37
HS65	CP_345 Individual			
			Not supported	Noted
HS66	CP_384 Individual			
			Loss of pubs should be resisted where local support	Reference to pubs added at p19  For Local Plan
HS67	CP_392 Individual			
			Green spaces and preservation of character in particular areas.  Increased importance of small as well as larger green spaces at time of growth	Noted  Objectives and aims p32 relatet to range of green spaces
HS68	CP_400 Individual			
			Concerns about HAR and envirocrime  Neglect should not be justification for demolition	New objective on envirocrime added p32  NPPF states position on neglect and demolition

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
HS69	CP_407 Individual			
			A plan to restore Broomfield House	Objective p32
HS70	CP_413 Individual			
			Over-development in Hadley Wood is totally changing the character of the area.	Noted.
HS71	CP_432 Individual			
			Not supported	
HS72	CP_462 Individual			
			Comment not relevant to document content	
HS73	CP_470 Individual			
			The role of the market square in preserving the character of Enfield as a market town should be given a higher priority.	Within the Enfield Town CA  Considered as part of the Enfield Town Masterplan
HS74	CP_471			
			Importance of contextual design – either traditional or contemporary	Objectives and aim relating to design quality on p32
HS75	CP_472 Individual			
			Importance of the quality of development on the edges of Enfield Town CA	Noted. Effects on setting considered under objective on p32
HS76	CP_474 Individual			
			Pressure for development is at the cost of heritage. Cites Chase Farm as an example	Objectives and aim regarding design quality on p.32.  Strategy document is a statement of intent

Ref	Name	Date	Summary of comment	Action
HS77	CP_488 Individual			
			Importance of non-designated shopping parades. Supportive of "Reimagining Palmers Green" initiative . Equally applicable in other parts of the borough.	Noted.