

Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan Examination

Jacqui Glover – Programme Officer

Mobile: 07790 930827

Email: EdmontonLeaside.Examination@enfield.gov.uk

Martin Jones
Celeste Giusti
Darren Richards
Greater London Authority

18th July 2018

Dear all,

Further to the submission of the Edmonton Leaside Area Action Plan (AAP) 2018, on which you submitted formal comments in July 2017. The plan is due to be examined at a formal hearing on the 9th to the 12th of October.

The Inspector appointed to examine the plan has asked me to contact you requesting your attendance at the hearing. Furthermore, whilst recognising that the evidence of the Greater London Authority (GLA) is not limited to the following matters, and taking into account both parties commitment to continued dialogue, to assist the examination, the Inspector has requested that the GLA and the Council prepare a joint Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) outlining the main areas of agreement and dispute in relation to the following matters:

Issue: Whether the preparation of the Plan has complied with the duty to co-operate imposed by S33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended. Whether all the other legal requirements of the 2004 Act 9as amended) and the 2012 Regulations have been met.

- i. Is the evidence base in relation to housing and employment up to date?
- ii. Are there any important developments/changes since the submission of the Plan?

Issue: Whether the policies in the plan accord with the aim of the Framework, to contribute to a strong, responsive and competitive economy?

- i. Are the proposed employment projections at Meridian Water justified and based on sound evidence?
- ii. What would be the effects of the loss of 9.5 hectares of land designated as Strategic Employment Land (SIL) on employment in the Borough and on the wider area?
- iii. How could its retention support Meridian Water?

- iv. Could these effects be mitigated by the other SIL designations proposed in the plan? How are these justified?
- v. Does the plan appropriately recognise the potential contribution of jobs from retail?
- vi. Does the plan take appropriate measures to support employment uses within the plan area, including those outside Meridian Water?
- vii. Are the employment policies in the AAP consistent with the aims and objectives of the Local Development Framework?
- viii. How will the plan respond to the business needs of existing businesses, within the Plan area?
- ix. Does the Plan adequately reflect the need to protect key wharfs and the road access to them?
- x. Would the wording proposed in policy EL2 be an effective means of achieving the aims and objectives of the Plan?

Issue: Whether the policies in the Plan are consistent with the aim of providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations.

- i. Is the level of housing development which is proposed in the AAP justified and based on sound evidence? Is it consistent with local and national policy?
- ii. Is the proportion of affordable housing proposed consistent with other local and national planning policy. What justification is given for any departure from it?
- iii. Is the housing mix consistent with other local and national planning policy? What justification is given for any departure from it?
- iv. Would the wording proposed in policy EL1 be an effective means of achieving the aims and objectives of the Plan?

Issue: Whether the Plan would secure high quality and inclusive design, which would protect and enhance the built, natural and historic environment.

- i. Would the policies in the plan provide homes fit to live in for existing and future generations? Does the Plan reflect local and national guidance in this regard?
- ii. Are the policies in the plan (EL9, EL10, EL11 and EL12) appropriate and achievable in relation to:
 - a. tall buildings
 - b. active frontages
 - c. the provision of open space
 - d. the integration of river and canal corridors
 - e. design for health and well-being

Specifically, in relation to the comments provided on behalf of Transport for London:

Issue: *Does the plan provide an appropriate framework for movement throughout the plan area in accordance with the aim of the Framework to maximise sustainable transport solutions?*

- i. Are references to uplifts in PTALs realistic given that transport improvements of train services are not committed?
- ii. How can the implementation of improved public transport links to and through the plan area be best secured?
- iii. Does the Plan make adequate provision for east west movement by public transport/bus routes through the site? How will this be supported? Does it recognise the needs of existing occupiers, including bus operators?
- iv. Does the Plan provide for appropriate levels of parking and for the needs of cyclists and pedestrians?
- v. Does the plan appropriately take account of the potential of CrossRail2?
- vi. Should specific transport projects to deliver public transport improvements be included in Part D of the Plan?
- vii. Would the wording proposed in the relevant Plan policies be an effective means of achieving the aims and objectives of the Plan?

The SoCG should be submitted along with any Hearing Position Statement by Tues 18th Sept 2018.

Should you have any queries for the Inspector regarding the above please contact me on:

Telephone: 020 8379 2099/07790 930827 or by email to:

EdmontonLeeside.Examination@enfield.gov.uk

Yours sincerely,

Jacqui Glover

Programme Officer

Edmonton Leeside Area Action Plan Examination

Copy also sent to:

James Gummery, Strategic Planning & Design, Enfield Council