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Area Action Plan
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LEE OR LEA?
Historically, the river has been called the "Lea", "Lee" or "Ley". The "Ley" spelling is seen in medieval documents but subsequently passed from common usage. Currently, "Lea" and "Lee" are the generally accepted spellings, with "Lea" used in reference to the original natural river and "Lee" referring to the canalised parts, such as the Lee Navigation. However, both spellings are often used. For the purposes of consistency and to avoid confusion, this report uses the spelling "Lee" when referring to the waterways in the area.

NOTE ON THE MAPPING
All mapping in this report is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Enfield Licence No. LA086363.
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Figure 1: Location of Study Area
01 Introduction

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1.1.1 The Central Leeside Area Action Plan is a joint Local Development Document being prepared on behalf of the two north London boroughs of Enfield and Haringey. Once adopted, the Area Action Plan will form part of the Local Development Framework within each of the boroughs, shaping the future development and regeneration of the Central Leeside area.

1.1.2 As outlined within the Enfield Local Development Scheme\(^1\), the purpose of the Area Action Plan is to provide a planning framework for development and regeneration in the Central Leeside Business area. Whilst the area is identified as a Strategic Employment Location in the London Plan, the area currently suffers from poor environmental quality and infrastructure and is subject to pressures for other land uses. The Enfield Local Development Scheme states that the AAP will ensure:

- The coordination of regeneration initiatives underway in the different estates;
- That new developments are properly coordinated with the transport infrastructure; and
- That opportunities for sustainable forms of freight transport in the area are fully exploited.

1.1.3 In addition, the Brief for the commission provided by Enfield Council establishes a series of objectives for the Central Leeside Area Action Plan. Several of these objectives relate to the economic development of the area, including the safeguarding of existing viable employment uses, the preparation of a future strategy for employment, improvements to management arrangements in the industrial areas, and the encouragement of inward investment. There is also a specific aim to develop an access strategy for the study area, with particular regard to estate accessibility, Angel Road station and the North Circular, as well as pedestrian and cycle access to the Lee Valley Regional Park. In addition, the Area Action Plan must seek to protect and enhance existing environmental assets within Central Leeside, including the Lee Valley Regional Park and the waterways. In other words, the overall quality of the public realm and image of the study area must be improved. Finally, the Brief establishes objectives in relation to social infrastructure, in order to effectively support both existing and future residential communities.

\(^1\) LB Enfield, April 2006, Local Development Framework. [Draft]
Local Development Scheme 2006-2009
The Baseline Report

1.1.4
This document pulls together the baseline studies undertaken as the first stage of the Area Action Plan for Central Leeside. The findings will be used to inform the creation of a set of issues and options and, later, the selection of preferred options for the area. In line with the regulations set within Government Guidance, the creation of the Area Action Plan will be subject to consultation. At this baseline stage the work has been informed by a combination of desk-top analyses and investigations supplemented by informal discussions with Stakeholders, including landowners, business representatives and agencies such as British Waterways, Thames Water, and the Environment Agency. Subsequent stages will involve a more comprehensive approach to consultation.

1.1.5
The document has been produced by a consultant team comprising Urban Initiatives, Urban Delivery and JMP for the purposes of discussion with Enfield Council (the lead organisation) and Haringey Council. The next steps in the process are set out in Figure 2. Following the production of the Area Action Plan and associated summary documents as required by the regulations at Stage 5 both Councils will then take the document through the adoption process.

1.1.6
The key findings of the Baseline Report are summarised in the section below. These are elaborated upon in the main body of the report which is presented in seven further sections. These are:

- Overview and analysis of the study area;
- Policy Context;
- Demographics;
- Social and Community Infrastructure;
- Property Market;
- Transport and Movement; and
- Conclusions and Summary of Findings.

---

2 DCLG, September 2004, PPS12: Local Development Frameworks
Figure 2: Work Stages

Stage 1: Baseline
Stage 2: Issues and Options
Stage 3: Preferred Option
Stage 4: Exhibition
Stage 5: Submission AAP
Stage 6: Examination in Public
Stage 7: Adoption

Stakeholder Engagement
Informal Consultation
Formal Consultation
Statutory Consultation
1.2 SUMMARY OF ISSUES

1.2.1
Table 1 below sets out the main findings emerging from the evidence base. These will inform the generation of issues and options during the next stage of the study process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Findings / Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Area</strong></td>
<td>The area is defined by its large areas of employment land and waterways. Access to the waterways is however limited and potential exists to use the waterways both more efficiently and innovatively. The Regional Park is also an important asset, although it is largely hidden from view, is inaccessible and thus under-utilised. In addition, other areas of open space are of a poor quality. The area is orientated on a north-south basis, with barriers to east-west movement. In particular the eastern most railway line forms a major barrier to movement due to the lack of crossings along its length.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Context</strong></td>
<td>The North Circular Road (A406) dissects the study area, running on an east-west axis. Whilst the North Circular provides good accessibility to the area by road, the quality of the surrounding environment is poor and in need of improvement. The area is important within the strategic context and opportunities at the strategic level need to be reconciled with need at the local level. The special character of the Montagu Road Cemeteries Conservation Area must be protected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central Leeside falls within the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough Growth Area and Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area. The area is thus an opportunity for regeneration and change. The area contains large areas of strategically important employment land. Much of this is protected from change to other uses, although opportunities for change and development does exist on some sites. Parts of Upper Edmonton, Edmonton Green and Jubilee wards (and a small part of Edmonton) are identified as an ‘Area for Regeneration’ within the London Plan. The London Plan states that these areas should be a focus for action and investment. |

Policy and environmental constraints restrict the development potential of the area, particularly in the vicinity of the Lee Valley Park and watercourses. The floodplain is a major consideration for future development opportunities. Other constraints include open space designations, water resources, and sites of nature conservation value. Regenerating residential areas and centres is an important policy strand, contributing to the Sustainable Communities Agenda. Efforts should focus on improving the quality of life for existing as well as new residents.

Table 1: Summary of Baseline Findings / Issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Findings / Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>The population is imbalanced, with a high proportion of young and elderly, compared to Enfield, Haringey and London more widely. The area suffers from deprivation, particularly in terms of the quality of the housing stock, child poverty, educational attainment and employment. There is a high proportion of minority ethnic groups in the area. In particular, the study area has a higher proportion of individuals of black British ethnic origin (Caribbean/African/other). Rising crime and disorder is a key concern for residents. Life expectancy is below the Enfield Borough average Unemployment is higher than the Enfield Borough average Employment in the area is predominantly low-wage, low skills. The forecast changes to the employment base are likely to exacerbate this. Efforts are required to (1) diversify employment (2) provide choice, quality and flexibility in terms of floorspace (3) improve educational attainment and (4) ensure the resident population has access to higher paid and higher skilled jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Community Infrastructure</td>
<td>Education facilities are increasingly under pressure as a result of rising demand for places. The Primary Care Trust is in the process of spreading facilities across the wider area to enhance better local access. The area is deficient in terms of open space. Access to and the quality of this space is also poor. Targeted improvements are required. Retail uses are located adjacent to the North Circular and are largely retail parks rather than local shops. The general environmental quality, however, is poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Market</td>
<td>The study area is an important location for industrial activity. Much of the building stock, however, is of poor quality and there is increasing pressure for retail and residential uses. The area requires a coherent framework of actions that can improve the quality of existing employment estates and support the growth of higher value added activities and enhanced employment densities. There is likely to be continued pressure from the private sector to establish a large, modern retail park at this location as a result of its excellent accessibility and the presence of a key anchor (Ikea). The average sales prices of residential stock within the study area is significantly lower (around 20-30%) than the equivalent averages for LB Enfield and Haringey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Movement</td>
<td>There is high dependency upon car use. There is good access to the east-west strategic highway network, although no direct connection to the M25. Restricted local highway network, with particular barriers to movement including the rail corridor, North Circular and Waterways. There are some restrictions to freight access due to highway congestion leading to the M25, although there is direct access to the M11. There are no local freight initiatives. Public transport accessibility is poor: rail services are infrequent and patronage is low. There are a lack of bus services within the study area, and poor penetration of these into the employment areas. Some services do though connect with the main town centres nearby. The walking and cycling network is incomplete and there are significant barriers to movement caused by road, rail and the waterways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

1.3.1
A key aim for any Area Action Plan is to ensure that it contributes to sustainable development. Sustainable development is about ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations: it is about considering the long term social, economic and environmental issues and impacts in an integrated way. To help ensure that the Area Action Plan is sustainable, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is being undertaken independently. The SA process enables the likely economic, environmental and social effects arising from the Area Action Plan to be predicted. This is currently at the ‘Scoping Report’ stage, key findings from which are presented in Table 2. Future stages of the SA and Area Action Plan will be undertaken in parallel, ensuring that the preferred option contained within the Area Action Plan is produced with regard to the principles of sustainable development.

1.3.2
In addition to these issues, the consultation responses to the Scoping Report have highlighted several other key issues:

- Flood risk, both as a result of fluvial flooding and surface water flooding;
- The importance of areas of archaeological interest;
- The importance of wealth creation as an economic priority;
- The importance of energy efficiency and quality, as well as ensuring the provision of adequate utilities infrastructure to service development; and
- Accessibility to open spaces.

1.3.3
In response to the first of these issues, Enfield Council is seeking to undertake a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in order to inform the Area Action Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Environmental** | Cheshunt Pits and Walthamstow Reservoirs are part of a Special Protection Area (although outside the Borough)  
William Girling and King George’s Reservoirs are designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)  
Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation represent a valuable ecological resource  
There is a need to conserve and enhance biodiversity  
There is a need to identify, monitor and actively manage sites of biodiversity importance  
There is a need to protect and enhance the historic environment  
Urgently need to divert waste from landfill – reduce waste generated, re-use, recycle and recover energy from waste [in that order]  
The ‘proximity principle’ will be implemented in relation to waste  
There is an urgent need to address the causes of climate change  
Open spaces need to be provided/protected in order to promote health/well-being, support urban renewal, encourage social cohesion and also benefit biodiversity  
There is a need to reduce pollution from industry and enhance local, air and water quality  
Central Leeside is largely within Flood Zone 3 (High Risk)  
Traffic-sourced PM10 and NO2 are a particular problem in Central Leeside  
There is a need to improve noise environments especially for housing, schools, hospitals and other noise sensitive uses; protect and enhance the tranquility of open spaces, green networks and public realm  
New development must be energy efficient, minimise trips generated by vehicles and avoid adding to congestion |
| **Social** | It is essential to provide for the needs of all the community, including needs relating to age, sex, ethnic background, religion, disability and income  
There is a need to improve the condition of the housing stock in parts of Enfield and Haringey  
Homelessness is an increasing problem in Enfield and a key issue throughout Haringey  
Affordability of housing is a key issue in both Enfield and Haringey  
Health and regeneration necessary, along with addressing inequality, improving the health of black and minority ethnic people  
Relatively young population in Enfield, with highest growth projected among the youngest age groups  
Most deprivation in south and south eastern parts of Enfield (i.e. Central Leeside area); need to narrow the gap between Central Leeside and elsewhere in Enfield/Haringey  
Crime and the fear of crime are of high concern in Central Leeside, which has the highest rates of crime in Enfield  
Need to create safer communities in Central Leeside (and Haringey as a whole)  
There is a need to address accessibility to jobs, health, housing, education, shops, leisure and community facilities (both in terms of location and physical access) for all members of the community  
Need to improve level of services  
Need to raise achievement in education |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Need to reduce congestion on the roads and reliance on the private car. Improving cycle and pedestrian network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to improve access to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orbital routes through the Borough are in need of improvement (including access to the M25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic importance of employment land in the Upper Lee Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment among people of working age; in particular in Ponders End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High levels of deprivation in the eastern half of the Borough; Ponders End is among the 10% most deprived super output areas (SOAs) in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to consider sustainable drainage and utility provision for new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a need to live within environmental limits, ensure a strong healthy and just society, achieve a sustainable economy, promote good governance and use sound science responsibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a need to integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic importance of the employment land in the Upper Lee Valley and Central Leeside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to reduce congestion on the roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to improve access to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orbital routes through Enfield and Haringey are in need of improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Relevant Sustainability Issues for Central Leeside (Source: Scott Wilson)
Contrasting character of the study area
Figure 3: Study Area
2.1 OVERVIEW OF AREA

2.1.1 Central Leeside is located within the Upper Lee Valley, immediately to the south of the North East Enfield Area Action Plan area. The area comprises strategically important employment land. Indeed, Central Leeside business area itself is designated as a Strategic Employment Location in the London Plan (and more particularly as one of three Preferred Industrial Locations in Enfield), as well as at a more local level within both Enfield and Haringey’s adopted UDPS\(^1\).

2.1.2 The study area encompasses substantial portions of three wards in Enfield (Lower Edmonton, Edmonton Green and Upper Edmonton), together with two further wards in Haringey (Northumberland Park and Tottenham Hale). More specifically, the Area Action Plan study area is bounded to the east by the Lee Valley Regional Park and Lee Valley Reservoirs and to the west primarily by the B137, and by Dysons Road, Middleham Road and Grange Road. To the north the study area extends to include Picketts Lock Leisure Complex and is bounded to the south by Nothumberland Park and Marsh Lane (Figure 3).

2.1.3 Central Leeside has the potential to benefit from considerable employment and industrial growth in the future, capitalising upon its strategic location within the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough (LSCP) growth corridor and the Upper Lee Valley. Indeed, the Upper Lee Valley is defined in the London Plan as an ‘Opportunity Area’ and is a priority for regeneration by the London Development Agency (LDA).

2.1.4 In addition to these strategic opportunities, Central Leeside must capitalise on a series of more local initiatives, including the redevelopment of Tottenham Hale International and the regeneration of the Lower Lee Valley in preparation for the Olympics. Whilst several of the industrial estates within the area (Eley’s, Montagu, Harbet Road and Claverings estates) have benefited from a programme of improvement in recent years, much of this growth and improvement has been incremental and uncoordinated. An integrated strategy is therefore needed to ensure that the potential for employment growth is maximised, helping to address both the poor quality of the environment and the socio-economic deprivation that exists within the area.

2.1.5 The Lee Valley Regional Park (to the east of the study area) is of regional importance for nature conservation and recreation. William Girling and Lockwood Reservoirs are designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and are of regional importance to the development of water sporting excellence. In addition, Banbury Reservoir is designated within the Waltham Forest UDP\(^2\) as a Principal Site of Nature Conservation Importance. The overall landscape character of the study area is essentially urban, although views towards the north east exhibit more rural influences. Despite the extensive areas of water enclosed within the reservoirs, public access to the water is restricted and the high reservoir embankments mean that this potentially valuable landscape resource remains for much of the time hidden. The principal residential areas are separated from the reservoirs and margins by transportation corridors and employment uses. Nevertheless, the fringes of land along the reservoir boundaries are of value to the promotion of the Regional Park as a Green Chain.

2.1.6 The River Lee Navigation runs north south along the eastern edge of the study area. At present, however, the waterway has very little prominence within the area. Development largely turns its back to the waterway, whilst pedestrian and cyclist accessibility is severely restricted by the large industrial estates bordering the waterways.

2.1.7 The Central Leeside study area is dominated by two main roads: the A1055 runs north to south and the A 406 runs east to west. In terms of rail provision, the West Anglia Route runs parallel to the A1055 with two stations in the study area: Angel Road and Northumberland Park. This railway provides links to Liverpool Street and Stratford in the south and to Hertford East and Stansted in the north. To the west of the study area is the Liverpool Street to Cheshunt line, which has four stations serving the Central Leeside area: Edmonton Green, Silver Street, White Hart Lane and Bruce Grove. The level of service to all of these stations is generally poor and many services, particularly on the West Anglia Route, are non-stop within the area.

---

1. LB Enfield, 1994, UDP; LB Haringey, 2006, UDP
2. LB Waltham Forest, 2006, UDP
2.1.8
As a result of these major infrastructure connections running through the area, Central Leeside is divided into large discrete parcels of land which are poorly connected and the land uses are highly segregated. Whilst the North Circular (A 406), for example, provides good accessibility to the area by car, public transport accessibility is limited. Angel Road station, in particular, is difficult to access, suffers from infrequent rail services and offers an unwelcoming environment for passengers. In addition, the efficiency of bus services and the desirability of walking and cycling are hindered by the predominance of north south connections (both road and rail) which create significant problems in relation to east west movement.

2.2 STRATEGIC LOCATION

2.2.1
As noted above, the study area falls within the wider Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area, which is a major area for regeneration, change and development in London and identified as such in the London Plan. The Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area also forms part of the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough Growth Area. This is one of the four Growth Areas identified by the Government for major growth and development within the South East of the country. The others being the Thames Gateway, Ashford and Milton Keynes South Midlands (Figure 4). The Central Leeside area is thus important in terms of wider regeneration and development objectives, contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Communities Plan.

2.2.2
The Central Leeside area is strategically positioned within the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough corridor. The North Circular (A 406) runs east-west through the area and main line rail services provide connections to the City, Stansted and Cambridge. Services also operate between the area and Stratford. It is thus well located and related to change and development at Stratford and the wider Thames Gateway Growth Area, particularly in terms of the Olympics development area (Figure 5).

2.2.3
The area is also important economically. It currently performs an important role in terms of employment land for London and has the potential to play an enhanced role in the higher added value economy of the ‘Golden Triangle’.

2.2.4
The concept of the Golden Triangle (see Figure 6) is based on the widely acknowledged assumption that economic development in the Greater South East (GSE) region underpins and drives the economy of the UK. The GSE area is loosely bounded by Cambridge, Oxford and along the Thames Valley to London. It is within this area of the UK that the majority of the country’s innovative firms are located (financial engineering activities in the City of London, science based innovative companies with protected intellectual property in Oxford and Cambridge and larger corporate operations spread the length and breadth of the Thames Valley / M4 corridor).
2.2.5 If the UK is to ‘out-innovate and out-perform its competitors’ as demanded by the Chancellor and maintain and strengthen its position in an increasingly knowledge soaked and global competitive economy, it is important that attention is devoted to an understanding of what actions are required in order to secure and enhance the economic success of the Golden Triangle.

2.2.6 If the development of the Golden Triangle is to expand and strengthen, the extent to which the whole of the Upper Lee Valley area can take an active role should be fully explored. Geographically the area benefits from an excellent strategic position close to both the City of London and Cambridge and its hinterland (Stansted and the many rural-based science parks). This position is strengthened further still as a result of its direct rail connection with Cambridge, Stansted and London Liverpool Street and accessibility to the Thames Valley via the M25. However, the step-change required to facilitate the transition of the Upper Lee Valley economy from its existing base to one that engages in high-value added and knowledge-based innovative activities should be recognised as significant and only likely to be achieved in the medium to long-term. Planning and Economic Strategies have a part to play in facilitating this shift but should be recognised as only relatively small elements in a larger package of measures needed to bring about such changes.

2.2.7 The sub-regional development framework for North London recognises the strategic positioning of the area and notes that with the right planning and investment ‘North London has the opportunity to act as a strategic hub between growth areas and to benefit from the improvements in accessibility, quality of life and economic performance that such a position could offer’.

---

3 Exerts taken from an Open Letter to Martin Wolf of the Financial Times which was a response from Dr Nicholas Miles, Director of the Oxford to Cambridge Arc to his article ‘Keep the goose fat to feed the regions’, 02/03/07

4 GLA, May 2006, North London Sub-Regional Development Framework
2.3 Historical Context

Overview

2.3.1 The history of the area is inextricably linked with the industrialisation of the country and construction of the rail and canal networks, forming a basis for employment and essential services for the rapid growth of London.

2.3.2 Although built primarily as arteries for commerce and trade, the creation of a canal system resulted in a network of linear wetlands that provide habitat for a range of wetland species and, in recent years, an increasingly important amenity and recreational resource. The riparian environment of the Lee Valley began to be created in the early 1600’s with the construction of the New River, bringing fresh drinking water from Hertfordshire to a reservoir in Islington. As the population of London expanded so did the demand for more drinking water, resulting in the construction of additional wells, reservoirs and pumps. Although updated over time, its system of reservoirs and filter beds continue to provide drinking water for London.

2.3.3 At the same time as providing drinking water for London the Lee Valley also helped to feed the capital, with nurseries and market gardens located here. The availability of the water and fertile land, together with the network of canals resulted in the development of large glasshouses. This saw the northern end of the Lee Valley providing a major supply of cheap food for the capital and the Country as a whole.

2.3.4 The London canal network was cut between 1767 and 1830 to provide a transport link both across London and between London and the industrial towns of the Midlands and the north. Although initially a success, their importance waned with the advent of railways in the latter part of the 19th Century.

2.3.5 The development of the railway network in the mid nineteenth century opened up the area. The first railway line reached Enfield in 1840 with the opening of the first section of the Great Eastern line from Stratford to Broxbourne. In the 1850s, the Great Northern Railway opened the main line from London to Peterborough. The contrasting policies of the two railway companies were to have vast and largely unforeseen consequences for the area. The Great Eastern specialised in exceptionally cheap workmen’s fares and, wherever it went, attracted working class commuters in large numbers. The Great Northern, by way of contrast, was very much a first class season ticket line. This was to accentuate the social differences that were already emerging between the eastern and western sides of the area.

2.3.6 However, services to stations within the area were poorly used; passenger patronage being low as many most people lived in close proximity to their place of work. In particular the stations at Edmonton and Angel Road were poorly used, with development instead centred around the historic Hertford Road, along which the North London Suburban Tramway Co ran horse trams as far as Ponders End. Angel Road today remains as one of London’s most inaccessible stations.

2.3.7 The long strip of land between the railway and the Lee Navigation became the ideal location for industries seeking to benefit from the large and growing market on their doorstep. The proximity of the capital was particularly beneficial for food and consumer industries and was the ideal springboard for the emerging technological revolution and many examples of discovery, invention and entrepreneurship took place here.

2.3.8 Substantial housing development accompanied the growth in industry. This was comprised largely of workers housing arranged along and between the north south through routes with a string of shops and services along the main roads. This pattern remains the same today save for some mid twentieth century interventions.
Figure 7: Historic Context
Sub-Areas

2.3.9
For the purposes of this section of the report the area has been split into three sub-areas: (1) Pickett’s Lock; (2) Angel Road; and (3) Northumberland Park and Tottenham Marshes (see Figure 7). Important aspects are set out below. This review and the associated historical mapping highlights the historic dependence of the Central Leeside area on both the waterways and north south rail connections, a dependence that arguably still exists today. In addition, the growth of the area reflects the historical development and expansion of London which has been based around the evolution of a series of small towns and villages. The centres still have an important role as a focus for community services, activity and identity and also as centres for local employment in retail, leisure and cultural activities.

Picketts Lock

2.3.10
Pickett’s Lock (Figure 8) is situated to the west of the River Lee Navigation. The Canal as we know it dates from 1770, when John Smeaton supervised its construction. In 1855 the River Lee Water Act specified a minimum depth of 3ft 9in throughout the Navigation, and as part of these improvements Pickett’s Lock was rebuilt, enabling a second Edmonton lock to be closed. Indeed, the historic development of Pickett’s Lock has been driven by improvements to transport infrastructure, in particular the tramway and the Great Eastern Railway to the west of the study area. Such improvements resulted in considerable population growth and housing development. Thus, by the 1890s terraced housing of varying quality was being built, not just along Hertford Road itself, but also around two subsidiary arteries, Town Road and Bounces Road. At this time, Pickett’s Lock was also a major centre for market gardening, with several nurseries and greenhouses. During the 20th Century, however, farmland gave way to industrial estates. Indeed, in 1877 much of the 220 acre Cuckoo Hall Farm, previously dedicated to Horticulture, was taken over as a sewage farm. Yet despite Edmonton’s population explosion, much of the land within the study area, particularly to the east of the railway line and to the west of the River Lee, remained as open space, given it’s low-lying nature and liability to flooding. Housing development within the area was therefore not as prolific as expected.

Figure 8: Pickett’s Lock, Historical Mapping
Angel Road

2.3.11
Much of the area around Angel Road (Figure 9) is low-lying and subject to flooding. As such, the area has historically been underdeveloped. One of the few buildings to be developed in the area was Cook’s Ferry Inn. Built circa 1800, travellers would wait at the Inn for the boat to cross the River. Not until the middle of the 19th Century was the River Lee bridged. As improvements were made to water navigation within the area, industrial growth adjacent to the River was encouraged. The Angel Works, for example, was established in c.1860 by Ridley, Whitley and Co, and employed up to 900 in the manufacture of floor cloths. By the end of the Century, however, the works were in decline and closed c.1914. More interesting is Eley’s Cartridge Works, which has given its name to the industrial estate that stands there today. The Works originated in Central London and moved to enlarged premises at Angel Road during the 1890s. After the war, Eley’s, along with other firms, became part of Explosive Trades Ltd. However, the need for ammunition had slumped, and the Angel Road factory closed in 1921. The other significant factory within the Angel Road sub-area is the gas works. The works increased significantly in the 20th Century, amalgamating with the Enfield Gas Co. in 1913.
Adjacent to the western boundary of the study area lies Montagu Road Cemetery, which occupies a triangle of land between the Great Eastern Railway line, Salmons Brook and Montagu Road (Jeremy’s Green Road). The original Cemetery was opened by the Western Synagogue in 1884 and utilised a small proportion of this triangle of land. The remainder of the land was acquired by the Jewish banker and philanthropist Samuel Montagu. Montagu presented a proportion of the land to the Federation of Synagogues as a burial ground, and part was sold to Henry Harris, who later gifted the land to the Maiden Land Synagogue in 1897. Montagu was MP for Whitechapel and wanted to use the strip of land south of Salmon’s Brook to encourage Jewish families to move out into the suburbs. In 1898, therefore, he proposed that part of the land be used for 700 houses with low rents and small gardens. Montagu argued that priority should be given to those currently living in Whitechapel, which suffered from considerable overcrowding. In 1899 the proposal was rejected and Montagu subsequently gave £10,000 towards LCC housing on the White Hart Lane Estate in Tottenham. The plot was gradually used for further burial use, much of it by the Federation of Synagogues Burial Society, although about six acres, bounded by Montagu Road and the Salmons Brook, was acquired for the Tottenham Park Cemetery Co. in 1912. In recent years this section has been used primarily for Islamic burials.

Northumberland Park (Tottenham Marshes)

The area around Northumberland Park (Figure 10) is characterised by the Tottenham Marshes. Prior to the construction of the Reservoirs in 1893 the Marshes were used for common grazing much of the year, then left to grow for hay between spring and summer, although the land was often subject to flooding. During the 1920s and 1930s part of the marshland close to the reservoirs, including Wild Marsh, became popular for recreation, and in 1972 the land was purchased by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. Development to the west of the marshes was driven by the construction of the Great Eastern Railway line to Broxbourne in 1840. Two years later Marsh Lane station was built, today known as Northumberland Park. Whilst the opening of the station resulted in some new development, this was limited as a result of the station’s poor positioning in relation to the centre of Tottenham. Consequently, rail services for Northumberland Park station were poor, and remain so today. Despite such poor rail connections, there were at one time two important houses in the area, namely Willoughby House, on Willoughby Lane, and Asplins Farm, the latter of which served to emphasise the area’s continuing importance as a market garden centre.

Figure 10: Northumberland Park, Historical Mapping
Conservation Areas

2.3.14

Although there are no conservation areas within the study area, the Montagu Road Cemeteries Conservation Area, which borders the western boundary of the study area, is particularly worthy of note. A Character Appraisal has been undertaken for the Conservation Area, which aims to define the qualities that make the area special. The table below provides a summary of the key issues raised within the Appraisal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montagu Road Cemeteries</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All three cemeteries within the Conservation Area are large open areas, which provide the potential to act as quiet ‘green lungs’ within an urban area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The two Jewish cemeteries, and Tottenham Park cemetery which now has predominantly Muslim burials, are a focus for religious groups within the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chapel at Tottenham Park is a building worthy of repair and enhancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The cemeteries complement the section of Salmon’s Brook Walk, a public trail through the area, and provide open (although partially obscured) views from the footpath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tottenham Park cemetery, despite its dilapidation, has an attractive and lively character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The different cultural traditions of the Jewish and Muslim communities result in strong visual contrasts within the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Conservation Area is currently of minimal standard for designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designation was undertaken particularly to recognise the cultural value of the cemeteries in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration and enhancement measures are needed if continuing conservation area designation is to be justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative, more appropriate methods for ensuring security are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A more positive approach is needed for signage at the entrances and in the local area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Summary of Conservation Area Character Appraisal

5 The Paul Drury Partnership for LB Enfield, 2005, Conservation Area Character Appraisals
This section of the report will present an urban design analysis of the Central Leeside study area, structured as follows:

- Form and structure;
- Neighbourhood centres;
- Land uses; and
- Green structure.

**Form and Structure**

**2.4.1**
The Central Leeside area is characterised by strong structuring routes, including the A1055 which runs north to south; the North Circular (A406) which runs east to west; and the West Anglia Route which runs parallel to the A1055 with two stations in the study area: Angel Road and Northumberland Park.

**2.4.2**
As a result of these major infrastructure connections running through the area, Central Leeside is divided into large discrete parcels of land which are poorly connected and the land uses are highly segregated. Main land uses comprise the Lee Valley Park, extensive areas of employment land along the A1055 and residential neighbourhoods to the west of the West Anglia Route. The area is orientated on a north-south basis, forming barriers to east-west movement.

**2.4.3**
The Lee Valley Park and its waterways and reservoirs are the main assets of the area. These are largely hidden and fronted by insensitive development. In particular, large industrial estates as well as the A1055 and West Anglia Road act as a strong barrier between the Lee Valley Park to the east and the residential neighbourhoods to the west.

**Public Realm**

**2.4.4**
The area is generally characterised by its poor quality environment and lack of pedestrian amenities. As with the road layout, the pedestrian network lacks continuity, permeability and accessibility. The walking and cycling network is incomplete, with significant barriers to movement created by the railways, North Circular, A1055 and waterways.

**2.4.5**
The West Anglia Route forms the major barrier to movement due to a lack of crossings along its length. Indeed, between Ponders End and Angel Road Station there is only one overbridge crossing the West Anglia Route. Crime and fear of crime are further concerns along footbridges and under- and overbridges. Direct pedestrian links exist between Angel Road and Edmonton Green shopping centre, following the route of a dis-used railway line. This however suffers from a lack of overlooking (and thus safety) and poor legibility at Angel Road (Figure 11).
2.4.6 The overall quality of the public realm is low. In particular, streets to the east of the A1055 lack strong and live frontages that assist overlooking. There is also a need to reduce congestion and noise levels to increase pedestrian amenities.

2.4.7 The River Lee Navigation runs north-south along the eastern edge of the study area bordered by a national trail / long distance route. These are however disconnected and largely inaccessible. At present, the waterway has very little prominence within the area. Development largely turns its back to the waterway, whilst pedestrian and cyclist accessibility is severely restricted by the large industrial estates bordering the waterways.

Neighbourhood Centres

2.4.8 Neighbourhood centres and facilities are located outside and to the west of the study area along Hertford Road and Fore Street, which constitutes the community spine of the wider area (Figure 12). However, there exists a conflict along these routes between the quality of centres and the volumes of traffic along it. The main neighbourhood centre - outside of the study area - is Edmonton Green Shopping Centre.

2.4.9 Due to its small resident population and large parcels of employment uses, the study area lacks community services and facilities. A primary school, high school and post office can only be found south of Ponders End. However, the area comprises recreation centres along the waterways of the Lee Valley Regional Park, such as Pickett’s Lock, the Lee Valley Watersport Centre and Stonebridge Lock. However, access to all of these facilities is limited. In particular, the new Athletics Centre in Picketts Lock is a high quality facility serving a large catchment area. Both local and wider sub-regional links to this are lacking though, especially by public transport: bus services are infrequent and connections from the nearest rail station (Ponders End) are illegible.

2.4.10 Superstores, such as Ikea and Tesco, have recently clustered along the North Circular between the A1055 and Hall Lane. These superstores consist of large retail sheds surrounded by extensive areas of surface carparking. This layout does not create a sense of place and lacks strong frontages and clear movement patterns.
Figure 11: Pedestrian Routes
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Figure 12: Node Points
Land Uses

2.4.11 Central Leeside is divided into large discrete parcels of different land uses which are highly segregated (Figure 13). Land uses comprise the Lee Valley Park, extensive areas of employment land along the A1055 and residential neighbourhoods to the west of the West Anglia Route.

2.4.12 Employment uses are dominated by industrial and distribution activities. The study area also includes a Sewage Works (Deephams) and a Refuse Incineration Plant.

2.4.13 The area contains large swathes of strategically important employment land, much of which is protected from release to other uses.

2.4.14 Superstores have been concentrated along the North Circular between the A1055 and Hall Lane. The surrounding quality of the superstores, including the pedestrian environment, however, is generally poor.

2.4.15 Residential neighbourhoods are only found to the west of the ‘barrier’ constituted by the A1055 and West Anglia Route. Much of the housing stock is of poor quality.

Green Structure

2.4.16 The Lee Valley Regional Park and the reservoirs, canals and rivers are a special feature of the study area (Figure 14). The park offers an outstanding landscape with its water bodies and large ecological resource. However, this asset has not been exploited. The Regional Park is largely hidden from view, inaccessible and underutilised.

2.4.17 Access to the waterways is limited. Despite the extensive areas of water enclosed within the reservoirs, public access to the water is restricted and the high reservoirs are hidden behind embankments.

2.4.18 The quality of the surrounding area, however, is poor. The area is poorly overlooked by adjacent development and pedestrian and cycle access to the River Lee Navigation is limited, particularly given the large industrial estates bordering the waterways. Only two public footpaths cross the Lee Valley Regional Park connecting the study area with the residential communities of Walthamstow. From the west the Lee Valley Regional Park can only be accessed from Pickett’s Lock Lane, Harbet Road, Leeside Road and Marsh Lane. Thus, the main residential areas are separated from the park by transport corridors and employment uses.

2.4.19 The Park and waterside will need to be enhanced, and the waterside opened. Improved access to the Lee Valley Regional Park should be promoted and better east-west green connections to link with surrounding communities and the wider fabric created. The unique assets of the area – the Lee Valley Regional Park and its watercourses – should be enhanced and made accessible to all.

2.4.20 Although the area comprises the Lee Valley Regional Park – an open space of metropolitan scale – it is deficient in terms of small scale open spaces within the urban fabric, such as pocket parks. Green open areas of interest outside the study area are the two Jewish cemeteries and Tottenham Park cemetery. These cemeteries complement the section of Salmon’s Brook Walk, a public trail through the area, providing a direct link to Edmonton Green Shopping Centre.

2.4.21 Generally, recreational open spaces in the study area suffer from poor edge conditions and unsuccessful public and private interfaces (Figure 18). Industrial estates largely turn their back to the waterways of the Lee Valley Regional Park and pocket parks are bounded by large walls and fences of residential units lacking natural surveillance.
Figure 13: Land Uses and Services
Figure 14: Green Space Network
2.5 SUMMARY

2.5.1
The Central Leeside area is characterised by its large industrial estates, waterways and the Lee Valley Regional Park.

2.5.2
The study area is dominated by the A1055, the North Circular and the West Anglia Route. Whilst the North Circular (A 406) provides good accessibility to the area by car, there is poor public transport quality throughout the area. A significant proportion of train services on the West Anglia Route are non-stop within the area. Angel Road station, in particular, is difficult to access, suffers from infrequent rail services and offers an unwelcoming environment for passengers. The bus network is mainly focused along the A1010 (Hertford Road / Fore Street) with services to Edmonton Green / Ponders End and South Tottenham / Tottenham Hale. Generally, the area to the east of the A1055 has poor public bus services. Furthermore, the efficiency of bus services and the desirability of walking and cycling are hindered by the predominance of north south connections (both road and rail), which create significant problems in relation to east west movement. Improved transport accessibility is required at local level, particularly in terms of east-west connections between residential areas, employment land and the Lee Valley Park.

2.5.3
As a result of these major infrastructure connections running through the area, Central Leeside is divided into large discrete parcels of land which are poorly connected. Land uses are highly segregated and comprise the Lee Valley Park, extensive areas of employment land along the A1055 and residential neighbourhoods to the west of the West Anglia Route. The area contains large swathes of strategically important employment land which is protected from release to other uses. However, land in these areas could be used more intensively and efficiently.

2.5.4
The Lee Valley Park and its waterways and reservoirs are the main assets of the area. However, large industrial estates as well as the A1055 and West Anglia Road act as a strong barrier between the Lee Valley Park to the east and the residential neighbourhoods to the west. The Park and waterside could be enhanced, and the waterside opened. Improved access, particularly pedestrian and cycle access to the Lee Valley Regional Park should be promoted and better east-west green connections to link with surrounding communities and the wider fabric created.
03 Policy Context

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1
The Central Leeside AAP will be prepared to comply with current and emerging national, regional and local policy tiers. This section of the baseline report therefore establishes the policy context for the area and includes the consideration of relevant documents and their objectives for the study area, as well as development opportunities and constraints.

3.2 ENFIELD’S POLICIES

Shaping Enfield’s Future: The Triple Arc Vision

3.2.1
Shaping Enfield’s Future is an overarching vision for the delivery of economic, social and environmental well being in Enfield. This builds on the Enfield Strategic Partnership’s Sustainable Community Strategy, which seeks to improve the quality of life for local people.

3.2.2
Shaping Enfield’s Future vision is based upon enhancing the three main characteristic areas in Enfield: (i) Green Enfield; (ii) new Enfield; and (iii) Heart of Enfield (Figure 15).

Green Enfield

3.2.3
Green Enfield is defined as the green arc that wraps around the northern and eastern edge of the borough, providing an extensive countryside fringe to Enfield. The aim is to make more of the natural resources located in the north of the borough and along the Lee Valley corridor.

New Enfield

3.2.4
New Enfield is defined as an arc with Edmonton and Central Leeside as its epicentre, extending northwards along the Lee Valley through Ponders End and Brimsdown to Innova Park (i.e.: North East Enfield) and west along the North Circular (A406) to Bowes Park and Arnos Grove. This arc contains the most deprived parts of the borough, but is also the area with the greatest development potential as it contains a significant number of opportunity sites such as vacant or under-used industrial sites. Major roads and railway lines provide barriers to movement that cut the arc off from both Green Enfield and the Heart of Enfield. This arc also contains the largest concentrations of manufacturing and logistics firms along the Lee Valley corridor. The aim here is to create distinctive, balanced communities, building upon its assets: local heritage and proximity to parkland and waterfront areas.

Heart Of Enfield

3.2.5
The Heart of Enfield is defined as the centre and west of the borough, which is largely comprised of attractive suburbs punctuated by a series of town and village centres located close to tube and railway stations. The aim is to retain and enhance the pleasant suburban townscape.

Figure 15: The Triple Arc
Enfield’s UDP

3.2.6
Enfield’s UDP was adopted in March 1994 with amendments in both 1997 and 1999. The UDP provides a framework for development, development control and conservation within the London Borough of Enfield, and sets out the Council’s policies and proposals for development and other use of land.

3.2.7
Of particular importance to the Central Leeside area are the policies on employment and economic development. In essence, these policies seek to promote Enfield as an attractive location for business, and to protect existing commercial, industrial and distributive employment uses. The UDP also seeks to encourage and support small-scale business developments and to ensure the provision of adequate infrastructure and an attractive working environment to facilitate the most efficient use of employment-generating areas. Emphasis is placed on the importance of providing support for the local business community and the workforce, through the provision of information services and training, crèche facilities, improved public transport links, affordable housing, and support for new business enterprises.

3.2.8
In terms of transport the UDP promotes the effective integration of land uses and transportation. This will help to reduce dependency on the private car and encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling, and public transport services. To further encourage sustainable modes of transport the UDP promotes improvements to facilities and conditions for pedestrians and cyclists wherever possible.

3.2.9
Finally of relevance to Central Leeside are the UDP policies in relation to both the natural and built environments. These policies state that areas of nature conservation, recreation and amenity value should be protected and enhanced across the borough. In relation to new developments the UDP states that they should be appropriate and sensitive to their context and should improve the environment both in terms of quality of life and visual amenity.
Enfield’s LDF

3.2.10 In accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the London Borough of Enfield is currently preparing a Local Development Framework, which will replace the existing Unitary Development Plan (UDP, 1994). This Framework will guide future development across the Borough, regulating land use, as well as providing spatial expression to Enfield’s Community Strategy and other Council strategies.

3.2.11 Enfield’s Local Development Scheme establishes the Council’s three-year programme (2006-2009) for the production of the Local Development Framework, detailing the content and nature of all Local Development Documents to be produced.

3.2.12 Central to Enfield’s Local Development Framework will be the preparation of the Core Strategy, which is due to be adopted late in 2008 following a period of statutory consultation. The Core Strategy will present the Council’s strategic vision and priorities for the Borough, and will establish a series of core policies to provide a framework for development control. The Core Strategy will replace most of the policies contained in Chapters 2-14 of the UDP.

3.2.13 The Central Leeside AAP will be prepared and adopted as a Local Development Document. It will be developed in the context of the London Stansted Cambridge Growth Corridor, the London Plan’s Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area, and the Sub Regional Development Framework. The Plan will seek to provide detailed policies and site proposals aimed at regenerating the Central Leeside Business Area. It is anticipated that the Central Leeside AAP will replace UDP Supplementary Planning Guidance 9 (B OC Site, Argon Road, N18) and 10 (Glover Drive, N18).

3.2.14 In addition to the Central Leeside AAP, a number of other Local Development Documents will form part of the emerging Local Development Framework. These documents include the Statement of Community Involvement, Proposals Map, Sites Schedule, North East Enfield Area Action Plan, Enfield Town Area Action Plan, North Circular Road Area Action Plan, Enfield Design Guide and Development Standards. Of these documents the Statement of Community Involvement has already been adopted. The documents being prepared for the LDF and the relationship of the Central Leeside AAP to these is shown in Figure 16.

3.2.15 Further details about Enfield’s policy context are provided in Appendix C.
3.3 HARINGEY’S POLICIES

Haringey’s UDP

3.3.1
In July 2006 Haringey Council replaced its first UDP, which was adopted in 1998. The UDP policies and proposals adopted in 2006 are therefore saved for at least three years, after which they will be replaced by the Local Development Framework. The UDP provides a framework for the Borough in land use terms up to 2016 and will be a tool for enabling development and facilitating the implementation of the Council’s and other bodies’ strategies, including Haringey’s Community Strategy. The Plan will provide a positive strategy for delivering identified social, economic and environmental needs.

3.3.2
As stated within the UDP the vision for Haringey is “to secure a sustainable quality environment with opportunities for economic growth and social progress, to improve the quality of life for all those in Haringey”.

3.3.3
In order to realise this vision 12 overarching policies are established. In essence these policies seek to encourage high quality and sustainable development that will contribute to the overall quality, sustainability, attractiveness and amenity of the built environment. Emphasis will therefore be placed on (i) the provision of affordable dwellings; (ii) the efficient use of housing land; (iii) supporting and meeting the needs of business and industry, including SME’s and those organisations within the voluntary sector; (iv) decreasing dependency on the private car by improving public transport provision; and (v) protecting and enhancing areas of open space, waterways and area of nature conservation.

For a more detailed list of UDP policies of relevance to Central Leeside, please refer to Appendix C.

Haringey’s LDF

3.3.4
The adopted Local Development Scheme (LDS, March 2006) for Haringey sets out the scope and timetable for the preparation of the Local Development Framework. In accordance with the LDS, the first document to be prepared as part of the LDF will be Statement of Community Involvement. This document is currently undergoing a further period of public consultation, which will be followed by an independent examination. It is expected that the Statement of Community Involvement will be adopted in March 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable for Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping and developing the evidence base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on issues and options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September – October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on preferred options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of representations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – July 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft to Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation on submission draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September – November 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-examination meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Inspector’s report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal/SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2007 – December 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Core Strategy Preparation Table

3.3.4
The main document to be prepared as part of the LDF will be the Core Strategy. The LDS states that the Core Strategy will “include housing targets derived from the London Plan and broad location for the delivery of new housing and other strategic development needs. It will contain new development control policies and could include site allocations and site specific policies. It will contain an updated Proposals Map”.
3.3.5
The Core Strategy will be adopted in June 2009. Prior to this date of adoption, the timetable for preparation will be as in the table above. It should be noted, however, that the Central Leeside AAP is not identified as a future development plan document within the LDS.

3.4 STRATEGIC CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES

3.4.1
At a strategic level, the Central Leeside AAP will be prepared in accordance with a series of documents, including the London Plan, the Sub-Regional Development Framework, the emerging Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework and the Upper Lee Valley New Vision document.

The London Plan

3.4.2
The London Plan (2004, alterations December 2006) is the spatial development strategy for the London area and establishes the strategic context and objectives for London’s social, economic and physical development up to 2016.

3.4.3
The vision for London, as established within the Plan (paragraph xxii) is ‘to develop London as an exemplary, sustainable world city, based on the three balanced and interwoven themes of strong, long-term, and diverse economic growth, social inclusivity and fundamental improvements in the environment and use of resources’. Stemming from this vision are six more specific objectives, namely:

- To accommodate London’s growth within its boundaries without encroaching on open spaces;
- To make London a better city for people to live in;
- To make London a more prosperous city with strong and diverse economic growth;
- To promote social inclusion and tackle deprivation and discrimination;
- To improve London’s accessibility; and
- To make London a more attractive, well-designed and green city.

3.4.4
Within the London Plan the Upper Lee Valley is identified as an Opportunity Area with significant capacity for new and sustainable development to include homes and jobs. With regards to housing development, the London Plan (December 2006) currently establishes a target of 3,950 homes to be provided within the Borough of Enfield between 2007/8 and 2016/17, and 6,800 homes within the Borough of Haringey. More widely, 37,300 homes are to be accommodated across the same period within the five London Boroughs covered by the London, Stansted, Cambridge and Peterborough Growth Area designation.

3.4.5
In addition to housing the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area is an area with considerable potential for employment growth. In essence, the London Plan seeks to ensure the provision of an adequate range of employment space, whilst promoting social enterprise, ICT infrastructure and the creative industries. To aid such economic growth, parts of Enfield have been identified as Strategic Employment Locations. Brimsdown, Central Leeside Business Area and Freezywater are all identified as Preferred Industrial Locations, whilst Great Cambridge Road is identified as an Industrial Business Park. Strategic Employment Locations are designed to reconcile demand and supply and to take into account industry’s needs in terms of clustering, capacity, environment, accessibility and cost requirements (Figure 18).

3.4.6
Within the London Plan parts of Upper Edmonton, Edmonton Green and Jubilee wards (and a small part of Edmonton) are identified as an ‘Area for Regeneration’. Policy 2A.4 goes on to state that these areas will be a priority for action and investment to ensure their sustained renewal. Further, paragraph 5.130 of the London Plan states that the areas identified for regeneration in North London should develop strong links with the defined Opportunity Areas of the Upper Lee Valley, Tottenham Hale and Stratford is of importance, as well as links with development opportunities within and beyond the sub-region.

3.4.7
Finally, with regards to transport infrastructure, the London Plan seeks to improve public transport capacity and accessibility within areas designated for development and regeneration. Sustainable transportation infrastructure is therefore encouraged within the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area.
Figure 17: Opportunity areas within the Upper Lee Valley (Source: GLA)
Figure 18: Strategic Employment Land (Source: GLA)
Sub-regional Development Framework

3.4.7
The Sub-Regional Development Framework for North London (GLA, May 2006) provides non-statutory guidance on the implementation of London Plan policies in light of sub-regional circumstances. The North London sub-region, as defined by the Greater London Authority, comprises the four outer north London boroughs of Barnet, Enfield, Haringey and Waltham Forest.

3.4.8
The Sub-Regional Development Framework does not replace the London Plan; rather the Framework sits alongside the London Plan to aid the delivery of both sustainable and prosperous development within the North London sub-region, as well as aiming to maximise the sub-region's advantageous geographical position. Indeed, the North London sub-region lies between central London, the LSCP corridor, the Thames Gateway Growth Area, the Western Wedge, and the M1/A1 corridor. Given this strategic location, the sub-region has the potential to act as a gateway or hub between these growth areas, benefiting from the improvements in accessibility, quality of life and economic performance that such a position offers.

3.4.9
More specifically, the Sub-Regional Development Framework provides detailed targets for growth and development within North London. Approximately 60,000 new homes and between 9,000 and 26,000 new jobs are allocated for the sub-region. With regards to the spatial distribution of such growth it is envisaged that new development will be concentrated in existing town centres, Strategic Employment Locations and Areas of Intensification and Opportunity. These latter two locations hold particular relevance for the Boroughs of Enfield and Haringey.

3.4.10
With regards to Strategic Employment Locations Brimsdown, Central Leeside Business Area and Freezywater are all identified as Preferred Industrial Locations, whilst Great Cambridge Road is identified as an Industrial Business Park (Figure 18). These locations are therefore promoted as the prime areas for industrial activity, where the development of non-business uses should be restricted. The Preferred Industrial Locations are deemed suitable for firms which do not place a high premium on environmental quality, including B1(c), B2 and B8 use types. Industrial Business Parks, on the other hand, are deemed suitable for firms which need better quality surroundings, usually comprising B1(b) and B1(c) type uses as well as higher value B2 uses.

3.4.11
Further, the Borough of Enfield will accommodate greater levels of growth given the Upper Lee Valley's designation as an Opportunity Area. In other words, it is an area that is well placed with regards to transport connections and therefore capable of accommodating additional housing and employment growth. Development Frameworks will be prepared for these areas by the Greater London Authority, relevant London Boroughs and other parties to outline the contribution that these locations can make to the growth assumptions outlined within both the London Plan and the Sub-Regional Development Framework.

3.4.12
Finally, the Sub-Regional Development Framework makes reference to North London's considerable natural assets. It is noted that the network of parks, open space, wildlife sites and Green Belt within the sub-region should be protected, and opportunities taken to enhance the quality and range of facilities that are offered.
Draft Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework

3.4.13 Following the designation of the Upper Lee Valley as an Opportunity Area (Figure 17) and the publication of the Lower Lee Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework, a similar Framework is currently being prepared for the Upper Lee Valley. Once adopted, the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) document will constitute a material consideration for development within the Upper Lee Valley. The Upper Lee Valley OAPF (December 2006) is currently at draft stage.

3.4.14 The draft Upper Lee Valley OAPF builds upon the vision and objectives established within both the London Plan and the North London Sub-Regional Development Framework, providing more detailed spatial guidance on key policy issues. The OAPF comprises a series of strategies covering key policy areas including (i) transport, (ii) open space, and (iii) employment.

(i) Transport

3.4.15 With regards to transport infrastructure, the draft Upper Lee Valley OAPF supports the notion of a new M25 access road and junction (NGAP - see section 7.3). It is argued that a new junction would increase accessibility to Brimsdown Strategic Employment Location, enhancing the area’s attractiveness as a prime location for warehousing and logistic facilities. The proposed ‘four-tracking’ of the London-Stansted rail route is also supported.

(ii) Open Space

3.4.16 The Open Space and Connections Strategy seeks to maximise the potential of the Upper Lee Valley’s natural assets, including parks, open space, wildlife site and the Green Belt. As such, the Green Grid and Green Arc initiatives are strongly supported, both of which seek to better integrate areas of open space, including Epping Forest, Hainault Forest, Thames Chase and the Lee Valley Regional Park, with the existing urban fabric. In addition the draft Upper Lee Valley OAPF recommends improvements to the existing Blue Ribbon Network.

(iii) Employment

3.4.17 With regards to the provision of employment land, the draft Upper Lee Valley OAPF supports the objectives as outlined within the Sub-Regional Development Framework, namely to (i) ensure an adequate stock of industrial employment capacity to meet future needs, and (ii) to plan, monitor and manage the release of surplus industrial land. The draft OAPF reiterates the conclusions drawn within the Sub-Regional Development Framework, which suggest that the amount of land required for industry is declining and that 100 hectares of industrial land could be released for non-industrial usage in North London.
Upper Lee Valley: A New Vision

3.4.18
The Upper Lee Valley Vision document (October 2006) responds to and develops the Vision prepared for the Upper Lee Valley by the North London Strategic Alliance, namely the Upper Lee Valley as ‘North London’s Waterside, a place for people and businesses, a space to grow... to start and stay’. The document therefore promotes the consideration of the Upper Lee Valley as a complete entity, seeking to encourage a wider approach to plans and investment opportunities within the area and to raise the profile and identity of the Upper Lee Valley, highlighting its strategic importance.

3.4.19
The Vision document provides a strategic overview for work currently being undertaken in developing Area Action Plans for parts of the area, as well as the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area Development Framework. Indeed, the document establishes a longer-term view for the area covering a period of 20 to 30 years, or even longer.

3.4.20
In support of the Vision for the Upper Lee Valley, seven interconnected objectives have been established, namely:

- To make better use of the unique assets of the Upper Lee Valley and promote the area as North London’s Waterside;
- To reverse economic decline and create a strong platform for economic growth;
- To improve transport connections to Central Leeside and Stratford and to enhance internal connectivity;
- To promote social inclusion, sustainability and an improved quality of life;
- To make better use of urban land accommodating more housing and business;
- To create an improved and sustainable housing environment and to support community facilities; and
- To promote good design.

3.4.21
More specific spatial guidance is provided within the Vision document, some of which holds particular relevance for the Central Leeside area. The document, for example, seeks to capitalise upon the area’s considerable natural assets, encouraging the creation of better green connections between areas of open space and surrounding communities, as well as better public access to the waterways (Figure 20). The improved waterside and park setting is considered as integral to the development opportunity at Central Leeside.

3.4.22
In relation to the promotion of greater levels of connectivity the New Vision supports the concept of 4-tracking to increase rail capacity within the area and to reduce journey times. In addition, the Vision supports (i) a bus-based transit system to link Central Leeside with key nodes in Leyton, Walthamstow, Blackhorse Road, Tottenham Hale, Stratford and elsewhere in Enfield, (ii) improved east-west connections, (iii) the improvement and enhancement of the North Circular, (iv) a series of walking and cycling improvements and (v) the possible extension of the Victoria Line to Central Leeside.

3.4.23
Other relevant proposals include (Figure 19):

- The promotion of Pickett’s Lock as a leisure node, with improved public transport access and open space.
- The promotion of Central Leeside as (i) a centre for start-up business and mixed use development; (ii) a more diverse employment location with new emphasis on economic sustainability and business services; and (iii) a site with better transport connections and industrial site legibility. In addition, the Vision advocates the rationalisation and enhancement of the existing retail and employment offer within Central Leeside.
- The promotion of Northumberland Park as a new community spine, with (i) better links to White Hart Lane football stadium, the Regional Park and Stonebridge Lock; (ii) an improved local employment offer and station precinct; and (iii) the potential to use the rail depot in the future subject to investment in extending the Victoria Line.
Figure 19: Place Making Opportunities - The Upper Lee Valley Vision (Source: NLSA, 2006)
Figure 20: Improving Connections - The Upper Lee Valley Vision (Source: NLSA, 2006)
2004 London Housing Capacity Study

3.4.24 Published by the GLA in July 2005, the London Housing Capacity Study provides estimates of the potential to accommodate new dwellings through the use of previously used land and buildings in London over the period 2007/08 – 2016/17.

3.4.25 The total capacity for the North London Sub-region is estimated at 37,184 units, representing 12% of the overall total for London. The majority of this potential across London comes from the identification of large sites, which are those defined as being 0.5 hectares or greater. Estimates of capacity for these sites are based upon application of the GLA Density Matrix. An allowance is also made for the development of small sites and other sources, including vacant homes.

3.4.26 The estimates for Enfield and Haringey are shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Haringey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Sites</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>4,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Sites</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Self Contained</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancies</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Housing Capacity Estimates for Enfield and Haringey
(Source: GLA)

3.4.27 The Housing Capacity Study has subsequently informed the Early Alterations to the London Plan (December 2006). The revised targets for additional homes between 2007/8 and 2016/17 within both Enfield and Haringey are outlined in paragraph 3.4.4 of this report.
LSCP: London Growth Potential

3.4.27
Dated October 2004 and produced by RTP et al for the GLA, this study provides an initial assessment of growth potential in the London part of the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough corridor.

3.4.28
Within this, the Central Leeside area is identified as a major opportunity. The area included within this comprises the Lea Valley Trading Estate, Glover Drive (and the wider area now occupied by Ikea and Tesco), the Meridian Way Land, Kimberley Road and the land around Angel Road station (including the southern part of the Montagu Estate). The report acknowledges that the Kimberley Road site represents the main area of opportunity and that scope exists to significantly improve public transport provision. However, given issues about contamination and fragmented land ownerships it is assumed that much of this potential will take place after 2016.

3.4.29
A series of growth scenarios are applied to the Central Leeside area. The Baseline scenario is based upon use of the land for Class B type-uses (employment). Higher level housing and employment-led scenarios are also tested. These are based on housing densities of approximately 130 dwellings per hectare and employment densities of 20m² per worker. Gross to net ratios of 60% are applied to allow for the provision of open space and other community facilities. Depending upon the scenario (see Table 6), it is estimated that the opportunity exists to provide between 100 and 900 homes, and between 2,600 and 3,900 jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Housing led</th>
<th>Employment led</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Central Leeside Growth Scenarios
(Source: GLA)

Joint Waste Strategy

3.4.30
The London Plan requires that the Capital becomes 85% self-sufficient in waste management by 2020. Consequently, this requires additional waste infrastructure to complement that already existing. It is however recognised that not all boroughs will be able to become self-sufficient. The GLA has thus ‘apportioned’ waste that can not be managed in boroughs with insufficient capacity to other London boroughs. The apportionment has been based on a number of objectives, including borough performance against:

- Capacity – identification of theoretical surplus / deficit in each borough;
- Proximity to waste arisings;
- Proximity to sustainable transport modes;
- Proximity to road network;
- Ability to use sustainable transport modes;
- Historic patterns of waste management;
- Other land uses / environmental factors;
- Flood risk; and
- Socio-economic factors.

3.4.31
The results of this assessment are shown in Table 7, which indicates the amount of waste that each of the boroughs in the North London waste strategy area will be required to handle by 2020. The ranking refers to the positioning of the borough in terms of all 33 boroughs in London. The higher the ranking (with 1 being highest and 33 lowest) means that the borough has been apportioned a higher amount of waste.

3.4.32
Table 6 shows that Enfield is required to handle a significant amount of waste and is the prime location for such facilities in North London. Specific sites for such facilities now need to be found: this will be undertaken through the Joint North London Waste Strategy Development Planning Document. This is due for adoption in December 2010.
3.4.33

Although specific sites have yet to be identified, the Central Leeside area is likely to be a key area of search, particularly given existing facilities and uses and the transport infrastructure. This may have an impact on the possible level of change that may take place in the area. However, it is recognised that new technologies no longer mean that such facilities are considered as bad-neighbour uses. There are also benefits to be gained in terms of energy generation, re-use of by-products (particularly for manufacturing) and job creation. The incorporation of such uses within the Central Leeside area will thus need to be tested through the issues and options stage of this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Ranking (out of 33)</th>
<th>Tonnes by 2020</th>
<th>% of London Total</th>
<th>% of Region Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>345,828</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>293,383</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>560,828</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>321,984</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>292,297</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>315,574</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>313,500</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Waste Apportionment, North London Boroughs
(Source: GLA)
3.7 POLICY CONSTRAINTS

3.7.1
Having reviewed both Enfield and Haringey’s planning policy context it is possible to identify a series of constraints to development. These constraints primarily relate to environmental characteristics within the study area, including green belt land, Metropolitan Open Land, the Lee Valley Regional Park, water resources and sites of conservation value. The boundaries of these areas are taken from the adopted UDPs. Each of these constraints is considered in turn, drawing upon material from all policy tiers.

3.7.2
It should be noted, however, that whilst these natural characteristics represent a constraint in terms of development within Central Leeside, they also represent a considerable asset. These characteristics must be preserved and exploited to ensure both the sustainable and successful regeneration of the AAP study area.

Green Belt Land

3.7.3
Part of the study area is designated as Green Belt land, including Pickett’s Lock and part of the Lee Valley Regional Park. These areas are therefore subject to stringent development control procedures. Figure 21 shows the extent of Green Belt land within the study area.

3.7.4
At a national level PPG2 provides guidance regarding the treatment of Green Belt land and states that there is a general presumption against development under such a designation. Indeed, the purpose of Green Belts, as outlined within PPG2, is to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population, as well as to retain attractive landscapes and to secure nature conservation interest. These objectives are reiterated at a more strategic level within the London Plan (policy 3.8) and the North London Sub-Regional Development Framework (Action 4A), both of which highlight the valuable role of Green Belts in preventing urban sprawl and promoting an urban renaissance.

3.7.5
At a more local level, the emerging Upper Lee Valley OAPF further promotes the safeguarding of Green Belt land within the Central Leeside study area. In addition policies (I) G1–G3 of the adopted Enfield UDP and policy OS1 of the adopted Haringey UDP seek the protection, enhancement and active management of Green Belt land. Indeed, Enfield Council state that their ‘over-riding concern is to keep the Green Belt generally free from buildings and built development, together with inappropriate changes of use of land and existing buildings’.

3.7.6
By contrast the Upper Lee Valley New Vision document questions the rationale for the Green Belt designation within the study area, arguing that the designation extends over many of the available waterfront sites along the Upper Lee Valley hindering the potential for new development. The current Green Belt designation, for example, could impact on the ability to provide new east-west connections across the Upper Lee Valley.

3.7.7
This questioning of established Green Belt boundaries is endorsed within the recently published Barker Review of Land Use Planning (December 2006). Barker recommends that new development should occur in the most sustainable way, by encouraging planning bodies to review their Green Belt boundaries and to take a more positive approach to proposals that will enhance the quality of Green Belt land.
Figure 21: Policy Constraints

Policy Constraints & Designations
- Green Belt
- Metropolitan Open Land
- Lee Valley Regional Park
- Wildlife Corridor / Ecological Corridor
- Ecologically valuable site
- Area of Special Character
- Area of Special Scientific Interest
- Site of Nature Conservation Importance
- National Trail / Long Distance Route
- Area of Archaeological Importance
Open Space/Lee Valley Regional Park

3.7.8
As shown in Figure 25 a large proportion of the Central Leeside study area is open space. Most significantly the Lee Valley Regional Park stretches north to south along the length of the area forming its eastern boundary. In addition there are a number of smaller areas of open space across the study area.

3.7.9
At all levels, current policy seeks the retention and enhancement of such open space. Indeed, the London Plan (policy 3D.9) states that Metropolitan Open Space should be afforded the same level of protection as the Green Belt, whilst the Upper Lee Valley Vision document (paragraph 4.2.1) asserts that the potential of this ‘unique and defining feature of the Upper Lee Valley’ should be maximised. Moreover, both Enfield and Haringey’s adopted UDPs set out detailed policies regarding the protection of areas of open land, as well as highlighting opportunities to add to and enhance areas of open space (Enfield, policies (1) O1-O4; Haringey, policies OS1-OS17).

3.7.10
Both UDPs promote improved access to areas of open space (Action 4D, Sub-Regional Development Framework), as well as better east-west green connections to link with surrounding communities and the wider urban fabric (paragraph 4.2.3 Upper Lee Valley: New Vision).

3.7.11
Finally, the Lee Valley Regional Park Plan establishes a more specific set of objectives regarding open space within the area. The key objectives are to raise the image of the park, increase its accessibility, improve recreation and leisure facilities and implement an integrated public transport system. Although the Lee Valley Regional Park Plan is not a Development Plan, its objectives must be reflected by Local Authorities within their own plans and strategies.

3.7.12
Given that these policies, at all levels, actively seek the enhancement of open space provision within Central Leeside, it can be determined that the prevalence of open space within the area will continue to act as a policy constraint.

Water Resources

3.7.13
A central feature of the Lee Valley Park is the strong network of water resources, including the River Lee, reservoirs and canals. These resources form part of the Blue Ribbon Network, as detailed within the London Plan (section 4C). Policy 4C.1 of the London Plan recognises the strategic importance of the Blue Ribbon Network and seeks to protect and enhance the network so as to positively contribute to London’s wider open space network, whilst promoting opportunities for sport, leisure and education.

3.7.14
The objectives and principles of the Blue Ribbon Network are promoted within planning policy at a sub-regional level. The North London Sub-Regional Development Framework, for example, asserts that the River Lee corridor should be restored and redeveloped to ensure the creation of a high-quality and sustainable environment, and one within which the water resources in the area are deemed to be local assets. The emerging Upper Lee Valley OAPF further endorses the concept of the Blue Ribbon Network, and adds its support to the Environment Agency’s scheme ‘Bringing your rivers back to life: a strategy for restoring rivers in North London’. Finally, the Upper Lee Valley Vision document promotes waterside development within the area, as well as the use of the water for leisure. The re-naturalisation and ‘softening’ of the waters edge is supported by the Environment Agency (many of the water courses are currently culverted in concrete channels). However, with regard to development potential at the waters edge, a buffer strip of at least eight metres must be maintained.

3.7.15
Whilst this large network of water is a considerable asset to Central Leeside, it also represents a real constraint to development, given localised flood risk. Indeed, as identified on the mapping, a large part of the study area, particularly that which is currently in employment use (such as the Brimsdown estate) is liable to flooding. In areas of flood plain where development is proposed the sequential test outlined in PPS25 should be followed. The purpose of this is to steer new development to areas at the lowest probability of flooding (Zone 1). Much of the Central Leeside area, however, lies within Flood Zone 3 (see Figure 22). This is the highest risk zone, in which development proposals will be strongly resisted.

---

Figure 22: Flood Plain
3.7.16
PPS25 also notes that local authorities should identify and appraise the risk of flooding within their areas. To this end, Enfield Council are in the process of commencing work on a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The risk of flooding should also be managed and reduced. This can be achieved through the following measures:

(i) Managing Risk
- framing policies for the location of development which avoid flood risk to people and property where possible, and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change;
- only permitting development in areas of flood risk when there are no reasonably available sites in areas of lower flood risk and benefits of the development outweigh the risks from flooding;

(ii) Reducing Risk
- safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management e.g. conveyance and storage of flood water, and flood defences;
- reducing flood risk to and from new development through location, layout and design, incorporating sustainable drainage systems (SUDS);
- using opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding e.g. surface water management plans; making the most of the benefits of green infrastructure for flood storage, conveyance and SUDS; re-creating functional floodplain; and setting back defences.

3.7.17
In essence, development will only be allowed in floodplain areas where the environmental effects are compensated for and where there is no additional flood risk created as a result of the proposals either on-site or downstream.

3.7.18
The quality of water in the area is also a concern: the Environment Agency has undertaken recent research demonstrating the negative impact of urban run-off on the quality of water within the area. As such, design proposals must demonstrate sufficient consideration of water quality, including on-site drainage and SUDS.

Lee Valley Regional Park

3.7.19
Wastewater in the area is fed into the Deephams Sewage Works. It should be recognised that any growth in development may impact upon local sewage capabilities and thus improvements to the infrastructure may be required as part of any development proposals. This study area, and London as a whole, is one currently at risk from significant water shortfalls in drought conditions. The increasing demand for water through new development may exacerbate these problems. Water efficiency should thus be promoted in new schemes.
3.7.20 A final constraint to development within Central Leeside is within those areas identified as areas of special character, sites of nature conservation importance, wildlife corridors and sites of special scientific interest. Figure 21 displays the extent of these areas, which principally coincide with the boundary of the Lee Valley Regional Park.

3.7.21 At all levels of planning policy these areas are heavily protected against inappropriate development. Indeed, the London Plan (policy 3D.12) states that 'the planning of new development and regeneration should have regard to nature conservation and biodiversity, and that, where appropriate, opportunities should be taken to create, enhance and manage wildlife habitats, as well as the natural landscape. These objectives are further endorsed within the North London Sub-Regional Development Framework (Action 4E), the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area Development Framework (paragraph 4.3), and the Upper Lee Valley Vision document (paragraph 4.2.5).

3.7.22 Both adopted UDPs provide more detailed guidance regarding the protection of such areas. Policy (II) EN9 within Enfield’s UDP, for example, states that development should be resisted on or adjacent to the Lee Valley Special Protection Area, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and Local Nature Reserves, as shown on the Proposals Map. Further, policy (II) G6 asserts that development within designated areas of Special Character should be vigorously resisted, and efforts made to conserve and enhance the quality and landscape of the area. Within Haringey’s adopted UDP, policy OS6 [Ecologically Valuable Sites and their Corridors] states that wherever possible sites of conservation value should be protected and their green nature enhanced in order that they do not become fragmented and thereby diminish their ecological value.

3.7.23 As noted above, significant areas of land within the study area are designated as Strategic Employment Locations (Figure 23). These locations are therefore promoted as the prime areas for industrial activity, where the development of non-business uses should be restricted. However, the GLA’s Industrial Capacity SPG encourages owners and occupiers of industrial land, the LDA, boroughs and other stakeholders to manage and invest in capacity to meet the changing needs of industry. In supporting this, mixed use higher density development of some SELs, which are in close proximity to town centres and public transport nodes may be appropriate (provided this does not result in a loss of industrial capacity or compromise the function and operation of the SEL).

3.7.24 The North London Employment Land Study2 has assessed the function of SELs and has determined that scope exits to reclassify some of this land for alternative uses. In Enfield, it is estimated that the potential exits to reclassify between three and nine hectares of employment land over the period 2005-2016.

3.7.25 Set within the context of this sub-regional study, both Enfield and Haringey have undertaken borough wide employment land studies3.

3.7.26 With regards to the Central Leeside area, the Employment Land Study for Enfield notes the following:

- Central Leeside accounts for 27% of Enfield’s gross employment land;
- The Central Leeside AAP area incorporates 31.8ha of vacant land, which equates to a vacancy level of 34%;
- Within the Central Leeside AAP area the largest employment land cluster is Eley’s Estate, which accounts for 33% of sites within the study area and 24% of net employment land. Other significant clusters include Meridian Way Land/Glover Drive/Kimberly Road (23% of net employment land within the AAP area), Aztec 406 development site (19%), and the Lee Valley Trading Estate (17%);

---

2 Halcrow for LDA and NL5A, May 2006, North London Employment Land Study
3 Halcrow for Enfield Council, December 2006, Enfield Employment Land Study; Atkins for Haringey Council, November 2004, Haringey Employment Land Study
As mentioned above, Central Leeside has a high proportion of vacant or derelict land (34% of net employment land). Other significant land uses include warehousing (10%), refuse and recycling (8%), utilities (7.9%) and motor vehicle sales and repairs (7.1%); and

The premises stock within Enfield as a whole is of a relatively good quality. Around 43% of the stock was classified as ‘good’ quality and identified as built since 1985.

3.7.27
Within the Employment Land Study a policy response for each of the employment land clusters is recommended. In relation to the majority of clusters within the Central Leeside area it is recommended that any change of use or release of land should be strongly contested, although some release of land may be acceptable (see Table 8). The following recommendations, however, are made for Claverings Industrial Estate / Dominion Business Park / Horizon Business Centre:

- Partial change could be considered provided that it is used to assist with the retention of employment land on the remaining areas; and
- While it is currently a vibrant cluster and has good transport connections it is constrained to some degree by the surrounding housing.

3.7.28
The key finding from the Enfield Employment Land Study is:

‘we consider there to be very limited scope for employment land release within Enfield. The analysis suggests that the existing stock of vacant land and premises can be used to meet future demand and still leave sufficient ‘vacancy’ levels to allow smooth market operation. Limited and small scale land release may be appropriate where sites are clearly not marketable or where intensification/redevelopment for employment use creates opportunities for other adjacent uses’

3.7.29
Table 8 overleaf summarises the key findings from the Enfield Employment Land Study with specific relevance to Central Leeside.

3.7.30
The Haringey Employment Land Study identifies three Defined Employment Areas (DEAs) that fall within the Central Leeside study area, namely (i) Brantwood Road, (ii) North East Tottenham, and (iii) Willoughby Lane. Defined Employment Areas represent dedicated areas which are able to sustain general industrial uses, warehousing and business uses other than large scale free standing office uses in locations which are not well related to public transport. In relation to these three DEAs the following comments are made:

- The three DEAs within Central Leeside account for 26% of DEAs within Haringey as a whole.
- North East Tottenham is the largest DEA within the Borough at 20.17 hectares (83 units). Brantwood Road is 16.76 hectares (83 units) and Willoughby Lane 1.22 hectares (38 units).
- Both the condition of the building stock and the image of the area were rated as ‘fair’ for Brantwood Road and North East Tottenham. By contrast, the condition of Willoughby Lane was rated as ‘fair’ and the image rated as ‘poor’.
- Brantwood Road and North East Tottenham have uses including B1, B2, B8 and Sui Generis. Willoughby Lane, only accommodates B1 and Sui Generis uses. All three sites are operational.
- With regards to vacancy levels, North East Tottenham has a high vacancy rate of 14.7%. The two other DEAs within the study area both have a vacancy rate of 8.3%.

3.7.31
The Employment Land Study establishes a series of proposals for the future of existing and potential employment sites in Haringey. In relation to those DEAs within the Central Leeside study area the following proposals are made:

- Brantwood Road is considered suitable for the retention of employment uses only. Two possible opportunities for redevelopment within the estate are identified, including the currently underutilised Astergrove Works with access off West Road and the derelict 1930s buildings in the north east of the site.

---

4 p.64, ibid
5 p.73-83, ibid.
As mentioned above, North East Tottenham has a high level of vacancies. Two opportunities for change are identified, namely (i) the north east corner of the DEA is underutilised and represents an opportunity for redevelopment and intensification for employment uses; and (ii) an area of employment land within the DEA separated from the remainder of the site by an allotment site. This area is underutilised and has potential for redevelopment/intensification for employment use. It is considered that this area of could be designated as a separate DEA (DEA 24 Marsh Lane).

It is considered that there are no opportunities for change within this site. It is recommended therefore that the site should be retained as a DEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Land Cluster</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee Valley Trading Estate</td>
<td>‘an extensive industrial holding, relatively isolated in public transport terms and some distance from any residential. Not considered suitable for transfer of planning use’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Way Land/ Glover Drive/ Kimberly Road</td>
<td>‘the overall site(s) offer significant future development opportunity but they are isolated from other residential uses and associated amenities and are unsuitable for a change of planning use unless a significant ‘masterplan’ can be drawn up which, given Ikea’s recent development, is probably unviable’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montagu Industrial Estate</td>
<td>‘putting aside the huge fragmentation of ownerships the site and its uses thereon is highly unsuitable for its surroundings. Notwithstanding the difficulties in relocating its occupiers a change of planning use would be highly desirable’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Land</td>
<td>‘highly suitable for a change of planning use particularly since it would appear that this could be developed in isolation save for the fact that some boundaries would directly abut the ‘dirty’ users on Montagu Estate as mentioned above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenninghall</td>
<td>‘potentially suitable for transfer to other uses but is well located in commercial and industrial terms and thus is a key employment area’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Business Park</td>
<td>‘rarely vacant but far from ideal in the modern environment, new(ish) residential development on site directly adjacent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Business Centre</td>
<td>‘quality product situated between two sites, which are ideally suited for a change in their planning use’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claverings Industrial Estate</td>
<td>‘highly unsuitable in the modern environment, ideal candidate for change of planning use’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eley’s Estate</td>
<td>‘it is not contiguous at any point to residential and is therefore unsuitable for any movement in the planning use’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azec 406 Development Site</td>
<td>‘substantial site in the core of the employment area, no surrounding residential and therefore no associated facilities. Unsuitable for transfer to other planning uses’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Enfield Employment Land Study Findings (Source: Halcrow, for Enfield Council)
Figure 23: Employment Land
3.7.32
The key finding from the Haringey Employment Land Study is:

‘In light of demand and supply side considerations, the majority of land in Haringey currently designed as DEAs should be retained to meet existing and a proportion of future employment needs. This is reflected by high occupancy rates, significant forecast demand for additional floorspace and a lack of expansion/development land within the Borough. However, to meet modern business requirements and improve the competitiveness of the employment land offer in Haringey, redevelopment of selected DEAs [or parts thereof] for employment use should be encouraged. In some cases, this will need to be accompanied by refurbishment, environment and access improvements’.

6 Atkins on behalf of Haringey Council, November 2004, Employment Land Study, page 7-9

3.8 SUMMARY

Overview

3.8.1
Strategic policy encourages the efficient use of land, economic growth, improving quality of life and overcoming social exclusion, improving accessibility and making areas more attractive, well-designed and greener. These are all important and relevant aspirations for Central Leeside.

3.8.2
The study area falls within the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough Growth Area and Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area, both of which identify the need for large scale growth and development. Central Leeside is thus a key opportunity within this. However, growth and change here needs to be set in the particular context of the area: Central Leeside contains large swathes of strategically important employment land which provides an important function for Enfield and the wider sub-regional area. Employment studies note the need to retain this land. However, the aspiration should not be to just retain this land: it is important to improve the quality of employment and, more importantly, the ability of the local population to access jobs. The policy context notes that achievement of this is likely to involve improving accessibility both to and within the area. In such cases, there are important decisions to be made between the provision of strategic infrastructure and reconciling this with local movements and environmental impact. The main transport issue here is improving train frequencies and services, which will exacerbate east-west barriers to movement at the local level. There is also a need to improve the quality of the environment around the North Circular, reducing the impact of this in terms of its barrier to movement and townscape quality.
3.8.3 Central Leeside is strongly linked to the ‘New Enfield’ element of the ‘Shaping Enfield’s Future Triple Arc Vision’. The vision recognises the need to strengthen the economic base and to improve accessibility. In addition, it also aims to create balanced communities and, along with the Vision for the Upper Lee Valley as a whole, seeks to build upon the unique assets of the area. Haringey’s Community Strategy endorses these objectives, seeking to build mixed communities, where everyone can reach their full potential. In addition, the Strategy promotes environmental sustainability, greater economic vitality and prosperity, and the preservation and enhancement of the built and natural heritage of the Borough.

3.8.4 For Central Leeside this means utilising the Lee Valley Park and associated waterways to their full effect. However, there are a number of policy constraints that may impact upon this and thus the shape of any regeneration efforts. These are:

- Green belt boundaries;
- Areas of open space, including the Lee Valley Park, Metropolitan open land and other locally designated open spaces;
- The Floodplain; and
- Sites of conservation value, including wildlife corridors, areas of special character and sites of special scientific interest.

3.8.5 Of these designations, the need for the Green Belt in this area is questionable. This forms a major constraint to development and the opportunities for enhancing the Park and waterside. The rationale for the Green belt boundary is currently being tested through the Core Strategy and the outcomes of this will inform later stages of the Area Action Plan.

3.8.6 The risk of flooding is an important consideration, particularly given the aspirations to open up the waterside, the level of development that is required to meet demand for homes and jobs in the Upper Lee Valley area and associated effects of this on watercourses, and the wider implications of climate change. This will require development proposals for the area to consider the impacts of flooding and to mitigate against increasing this risk. The floodplain primarily covers those areas currently in employment use: the effect of new development on the floodplain in this area will therefore need to be carefully considered in order to allow the area to retain its strategic importance for employment. Land uses in this area are particularly land hungry yet represent low density uses: land and development in this area should thus be made to work more efficiently.
Opportunity Sites

3.8.7
The review of the policy context and other strategies / documents highlights a number of opportunity areas within Central Leeside in terms of development potential and the opportunity for change (Figure 24). These include:

Kimberley Road

3.8.8
This is identified as a site with potential for housing in the GLA assessment of growth in the London part of the LSCP corridor. However, the employment land study for Enfield notes that the land would be unsuitable for a change of use unless a significant masterplan could be produced including the adjacent Meridian Way land and that at Glover Drive. The site is currently in the ownership of British Gas and the Gas Holders on the site are operational. However, it is understood that the Gas Holders are to be decommissioned.

Meridian Way (‘Teardrop’ Site)

3.8.9
A currently vacant site bound to the west by the railway line (including land safeguarded for additional rail lines) and to the east by Meridian Way.

Land around Ikea and Tesco

3.8.10
The land around the Ikea and Tesco stores represent inefficient use of the land. Opportunities may exist to rationalise the form of car parking provision and introduce additional uses to the area. Such uses would need to be considered in the light of opportunities on adjacent sites, addressing the area in a holistic manner.

Glover Drive

3.8.11
This is identified as a location for employment intensification in the GLA assessment of growth in the London part of the LSCP corridor. However, as noted in the Enfield employment land study, opportunities for change need to be seen in the context of a wider masterplan for the area taking in the adjoining sites (Kimberley Road and Meridian Way). The Council has prepared a development brief for Glover Drive (although this is now dated). The overall objectives established within this brief were to [i] bring back into beneficial use this important gateway site into the Borough, much of which has long remained vacant, [ii] maximise the employment potential of the site through the provision of a range of jobs across different land uses, and [iii] encourage improvements to public transport provision, to ensure that a greater number of journeys to the site are made other than by car. The Glover Drive site includes the former BOC premises: these comprise large sheds, with the potential for re-use.

Kenninghall Estate / Rail Land

3.8.12
This is identified as a site with potential for housing in the GLA assessment of growth in the London part of the LSCP corridor. The Enfield employment land study notes that it is suitable for transfer to other uses. However, the potential here is compromised by the environmental quality of the site, which is surrounded by the North Circular and the access road onto this. The open space on the site is recognised as being inaccessible and unsafe: the Council are thus currently exploring opportunities for undertaking land swaps, developing the land and relocating the open space to a more accessible location.
Figure 24: Opportunity Sites

- Opportunity Sites for Change
- Opportunity Sites for Enhancement
- Limited Change

1. Kimberley Road
2. Meridian Way Land
3. Glover Drive
4. Tesco / Ikea Site
5. Kenninghall Estate / Rail Land
6. Montagu Industrial Estate
7. Eleys Estate
8. Claverings Industrial Estate / Dominion Business Park / Horizon Business Centre
9. Marsh Lane / Allocations
10. North East Tottenham
11. Lee Valley Trading Estate
It is understood that private developers are currently seeking to promote the redevelopment of the Lee Valley Trading Estate for mixed-uses. The potential for this should be explored through the next stage of the process. However, given the relationship of the site to adjacent opportunity areas (i.e. Glover Drive), it will need to be addressed in a holistic manner.

Over the last decade, infrastructure improvements to the Eley’s Estate have recently seen Coca-Cola rationalise their activities here (thus freeing up land adjacent to the Pickett’s Lock leisure complex for re-use). Estate managers are now consulting with occupiers to see how further improvements might be made to the area.

The Enfield employment land study notes that this location would be highly desirable. Many of the uses are considered ‘bad neighbour’ uses, including a scrap yard, open storage, waste transfer and concrete batch plant. 65% of the land is in Council ownership although other ownerships are fragmented. If a change of use could be achieved (to other employment types or indeed other uses) on this site questions arise as to where the existing ‘bad neighbour’ uses should be relocated.

This is identified in the Enfield employment land study as being highly unsuitable in the modern climate and thus suited for a change of use. However, the Council has recently invested in infrastructure improvements and the estate is being used for small business uses. A Council Family Care Centre for child poverty is also now being built. Further opportunities are thus limited.

The Haringey employment land study notes that this estate has a high level of vacancy and that the north eastern corner of the estate represents an opportunity for redevelopment and intensification for employment uses.

The Haringey employment land study notes that this area is under-utilised and has the potential for redevelopment and intensification for employment uses. To the north of the estate the allotments also represent an opportunity, particularly in terms of their proximity both to Northumberland Park railway station and the Lee Valley Park. However, such re-use would need to be considered against wider policy objectives.

These represent the main areas identified within the evidence base for change and development. As such, the opportunities need to be tested through the Issues and Options work. Through this, different land uses and mixes should be tested, although proposals will need to be compliant with strategic policy objectives.
As noted above, the opportunities within the area will be explored and tested through the next steps of the study process. However, it will be important to set these in the context of other development occurring elsewhere. In particular:

- Regeneration at Tottenham Hale to the south of the study area. The scale of opportunity is established through the recently adopted Supplementary Planning Document;
- On-going redevelopment and change at Edmonton Green shopping centres, including the renewal of the housing stock, expansion of the retail provision, enhanced public transport provision and new community facilities; and
- The aspiration held by Tottenham Hotspur Football Club to either expand the White Hart Lane stadium (subject to the provision of transport improvements) or relocation to a more accessible location. This could have an impact on movements to and from the study area, particularly from Northumberland Park station.
4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1
The majority of the Central Leeside AAP area falls within the Borough of Enfield, with the southern part of the study area falling within the Borough of Haringey. A useful overview of the Central Leeside area, with regards to its socio-economic characteristics, is provided by the Local Area Profile for the Neighbourhood Renewal Area, prepared by Enfield Strategic Partnership. The Neighbourhood Renewal Area includes the wards of Ponders End, Jubilee, Lower Edmonton, Edmonton Green and Upper Edmonton. It should be noted, however, that whilst this document provides useful contextual information regarding the Central Leeside area, it should not be regarded as a wholly accurate profile of the area. The AAP study area does not incorporate Ponders Ends, and should also include the two Haringey wards of Northumberland Park and Tottenham Hale. The key findings of the Local Profile Area for the Neighbourhood Renewal Area are presented in Tables 9 and 10.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Structure</strong></td>
<td>The Neighbourhood Renewal (NR) area has a much younger profile compared to the Borough average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The NR area has high proportions of pre-school and school age residents compared to the Borough average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The area has a lower proportion of elderly people than the Borough as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>There is a relatively high proportion of minority ethnic groups within the NR area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The largest ethnic groups in the area are White British, White other, Indian, Black Caribbean and Black African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The greatest difference to the Borough average is for Black Caribbean’s, though all Black groups are well above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deprivation</strong></td>
<td>If the NR area was one large ward then it would rank as the 3rd most deprived ward in Enfield (out of 21), on the basis of the ODPM Indices of Deprivation 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The NR area is in approximately the worst 24% of local areas in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proportion of households receiving Council Tax Benefit at December 2004 was 34.2%. The six wards making up the NR area were the top six for the increase in such households on a percentage point change basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residents’ Opinion</strong></td>
<td>The resident’s top concern is rising crime and disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residents are marginally less satisfied with their local area than the average resident in the Borough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Summary of Contextual Information (Source: ESP, based on data from the GLA, Census, DCLG & Enfield Resident’s Survey)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better Enfield'</td>
<td>The NR area has a high level of non-decent homes compared to the Borough average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The area has the same rate of litter/detritus as the Borough average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Council stock in the NR area is in a slightly better condition than the Borough average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Young People</td>
<td>Childcare provision within the NR area is generally well below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of pupils within the NR area attaining 5 GCSEs at A*-C in 2004 was considerably below the Borough average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proportion of children within the NR area who were admitted to care was far higher than the Borough average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder</td>
<td>The NR area has a high rate of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills, Employment &amp; Enterprise</td>
<td>Based on the proportion of the economically active population, unemployment across the area is much higher than the Borough rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Improvement</td>
<td>The area has a poorer health than the Borough average (measured against life expectancy and coronary heart disease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The provision of sheltered housing across the NR area is higher than the Borough average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Within the NR area the Angel Raynham, Edmonton Green, Ponders End and Weir Hall libraries seem to be well used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Edmonton Green Leisure Centre, on the other hand, seems to be slightly underused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Renewal &amp; Stronger Communities</td>
<td>The proportion of children in poverty across the area (as of 2001) was higher than the Borough average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Summary of Contextual Information
(Source: ESP, based on data from the GLA, Census, DCLG & Enfield Resident’s Survey)
4.2 POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLDS

4.2.1
The Central Leeside AAP study area, as indicated previously, spans the borough boundary of Enfield and Haringey, and includes parts of six wards, namely (i) Jubilee, (ii) Lower Edmonton, (iii) Edmonton Green, (iv) Upper Edmonton, (v) Northumberland Park, and (vi) Tottenham Hale. To gain a more accurate profile of the study area, in terms of population and households, data has been collected from the Office of National Statistics at the super output area level, enabling a closer ‘fit’ to the study area boundary.

4.2.2
At the 2001 Census the Central Leeside AAP study area had a total population of 4,843 people. Closer analysis of these population figures reveals that the study area has a lower proportion of young adults. Indeed, between 1998 and 2004 the percentage of individuals aged between 25 and 34 fell by approximately 7% across the Borough of Enfield. Closely related to this is the higher than average proportion of young people across the area: 32% of the population are aged 20 years or younger, compared to 27% across Enfield, 27% across Haringey, and 26% within London.

4.2.3
With regards to housing provision there were 1,888 occupied households within the Central Leeside study area at the 2001 Census (See Table 11). Of these households 56% have 1 or 2 permanent residents, this being slightly lower than for Enfield (60%) and Haringey (64%), as well as London more generally (64%). The AAP study area therefore has a slightly higher percentage of households with 3 or more residents (44%). This household size reflects the demographic make-up of the population as described above; namely the higher proportion of young people, the majority of whom will still live at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Composition</th>
<th>AAP Area</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Haringey</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All households</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>110,398</td>
<td>9,2170</td>
<td>3,015,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pensioner</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with no children</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with one dependent child</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with 2 more dependent children</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with all children as non-dependents</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent with one dependent child</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent with 2 or more dependent children</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent with all children as non-dependents</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Household Composition (Source: Census data)
4.3 CENTRAL LEESIDE POPULATION PROJECTIONS

4.3.1
Future population and household projections are provided within regional and strategic planning documents. At a strategic level the Sub-Regional Development Framework states that the population of north London is projected to grow by nearly 160,000 or 15% to the year 2016. More specifically, population projections published by the GLA provide population estimates for each London Borough on a ward-by-ward basis up to 2031. The GLA projections incorporate information from the London Housing Capacity Study, and therefore take into account the impact of future housing development on the area. These population projections have informed the housing requirements set out in the London Plan (2004, alterations 2006). The Plan allocates 3,950 homes for Enfield, with an annual monitoring target of 395 units, and 6,800 homes for Haringey, with an annual monitoring target of 680, over the next ten years (2007/8-2016/17).

4.3.2
The population projections for the wards which form part of the Central Leeside area are summarised in Table 12. It should be noted, however, that the figures presented in Table 12 are not representative of the Central Leeside study area specifically, as the study area does not include these wards in their entirety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee</td>
<td>13,258</td>
<td>13,026</td>
<td>12,962</td>
<td>12,924</td>
<td>23,094</td>
<td>13,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Edmonton</td>
<td>14,023</td>
<td>14,084</td>
<td>14,135</td>
<td>14,217</td>
<td>14,643</td>
<td>15,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Green</td>
<td>15,938</td>
<td>15,995</td>
<td>16,020</td>
<td>16,115</td>
<td>16,776</td>
<td>17,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Edmonton</td>
<td>15,355</td>
<td>15,389</td>
<td>15,658</td>
<td>15,822</td>
<td>16,383</td>
<td>17,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Park</td>
<td>12,820</td>
<td>13,801</td>
<td>14,313</td>
<td>14,785</td>
<td>15,640</td>
<td>16,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham Hale</td>
<td>13,033</td>
<td>13,437</td>
<td>13,732</td>
<td>14,006</td>
<td>14,683</td>
<td>15,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>84,427</td>
<td>85,732</td>
<td>86,820</td>
<td>87,869</td>
<td>101,219</td>
<td>94,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population forecasts (thousands)</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>277.3</td>
<td>283.9</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285.7</td>
<td>286.5</td>
<td>288.6</td>
<td>291.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>221.3</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>231.1</td>
<td>233.1</td>
<td>237.7</td>
<td>244.5</td>
<td>251.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Population projections (Source: GLA 2005 Round Interim Ward Population Projections)
4.4 INDICATORS OF DEPRIVATION

4.4.1
The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) is a measure of the levels of deprivation experienced in a particular area. The index measures distinct dimensions of deprivation separately. These are then combined into a single overall measure where an average for all the deprivation rankings is produced for each borough. The seven distinct dimensions, or domain indices used in the IMD, are income; employment; health and disability; education skills and training; barriers to housing services; living environment and crime.

4.4.2
The Upper Lee Valley as a whole is an area of deprivation. This is particularly acute in the Central Leeside area, although patterns of deprivation stretch for each borough. The seven distinct dimensions, or domain indices used in the IMD, are income; employment; health and disability; education skills and training; barriers to housing services; living environment and crime.

In the 2004 Index of Multiple Deprivation released by the DCLG, Enfield was the 104th most deprived out of the 354 local authority areas in England. Table 13 presents Enfield’s rank for each of the seven indicators (lower numbers indicate high deprivation). Indeed, when judged against these seven indicators, Enfield is one of London’s most deprived Boroughs. The index places Enfield in the worst quarter in England for four out of the seven domains: housing, income, crime and living environment. More specifically, Edmonton Green and Upper Edmonton are identified as the most deprived wards in the Borough, both of which fall within the Central Leeside study area.

4.4.3
Haringey also scores poorly in relation to the seven indices of multiple deprivation, and suffers from greater levels of deprivation than Enfield. In the 2004 Index of Multiple deprivation Haringey was the 13th most deprived out of the 354 local authority areas in England. Approximately 30% of Haringey’s Super Output Areas are amongst the 10% most deprived in the country. These SOAs are concentrated in the east of the borough, including Northumberland Park. Indeed, Northumberland Park is amongst the 5% most deprived SOAs in the country.

Table 13: Enfield IMD Ranking, 2004
(Source: DCLG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMD Rank, 2004</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Services</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Environment</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25: Areas of Deprivation in the Upper Lee Valley
(Source: NLSA)
4.4.5
For the Central Leeside area several aspects of the multiple deprivation index hold particular relevance, namely educational attainment, income, housing stock and condition, and employment. These issues will be considered in turn, with reference to the relevant wards both in Enfield and Haringey.

Educational Attainment

4.4.6
The population of the AAP area has a significantly higher proportion of individuals with no qualifications. Indeed, some 38% of individuals living within the AAP area have no qualifications, compared to 28% in Enfield, 23% in Haringey, and 24% in London. This suggests a high level of educational deprivation in the adult population of the AAP area.

4.4.7
More generally, whilst Enfield has lower than average education levels for adults, attainment levels for students have risen steadily within the area over recent years. On average, 52% of students in Enfield achieve 5+ grades A* to C at GCSE level, 6% lower than the national average. Within Haringey, no SoAs are amongst the 10% most deprived in the country in relation to education, although pockets of relatively extreme deprivation are concentrated within the two wards included in the Central Leeside AAP study area, namely Northumberland Park and Tottenham Hale.

Income

4.4.8
In terms of income, the eastern areas of the Enfield borough are significantly more deprived than the central and western parts; the wards of Edmonton Green and Upper Edmonton score particularly poorly. Within Haringey approximately 43% of SOAs are amongst the 10% most deprived in the country in relation to income deprivation. Northumberland Park, in particular, has high levels of income deprivation. Indeed, the ward is amongst the 5% most deprived SOAs in England. In addition, the ward has a high incidence of income deprivation affecting children.

4.4.9
Table 14 sets out the average weekly earnings for both Enfield and Haringey, as compared to the London average. Whilst it reveals that the Boroughs of Enfield and Haringey have considerably lower average weekly wages than the Greater London value, both marginally outstrip the national average of £436 per week. Within the Enfield Employment Land Study it is considered that there is potential for the four North London Boroughs to increase their average weekly wages in line with the Greater London value, given the changing industrial structure within the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Average Weekly Wages (2005)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>£458.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>£466.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>£555.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>£436.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Average Weekly Wages (Source: Enfield Employment Land Study)
Housing Stock and Condition

4.4.10
Within a national context, both Enfield and Haringey perform badly in relation to the housing and services indicator. This domain looks at barriers faced by local people in obtaining suitable housing, and in accessing local services, particularly in relation to distance. In 2001 Enfield ranked 21st out of all local authority areas in England and Wales for housing overcrowding (in the worst 6%). More recently, 2005/2006 figures reveal Enfield as having overall levels of housing unfitness below the London average. In common with similar areas in London, there is high affordable housing demand. Government figures reveal an annual net shortfall of 2916 affordable dwellings compared to an average supply of 685 (Enfield Housing Needs Study). In essence, Enfield has some of London’s lower valued housing.

4.4.11
A similar conclusion can be drawn for Haringey. Approximately 96% of Haringey SOAs are amongst the 10% most deprived in the country with regards to housing and services. More specifically, Northumberland Park is amongst the 5% most deprived SOAs in the country.

4.4.12
Illustrative of this lower valued housing is the Council Tax Band by which the properties are valued (Table 15). The Central Leeside study area has a significantly higher proportion of properties within Council Tax Bands A-C; 69% compared to 39% for Enfield, 52% for Haringey and 44% for London as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Tax Band</th>
<th>AAP Area</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Haringey</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band A</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band B</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band C</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band D</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band E</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band F</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band G</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band H</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Percentage of Homes by Council Tax Band (Source: Neighbourhood Statistics)

4.5 EMPLOYMENT / LABOUR MARKET

4.5.1
Having analysed levels of deprivation within the Central Leeside area, it is appropriate to consider both employment activity and inactivity within the study area, as well as employment by sector.

4.5.2
At the 2001 Census, the Central Leeside area had a very high economically inactive population, accounting for 41% of the study area population. This figure is significantly higher than for either Enfield [34%], Haringey [35%], or London more widely [32%]. Two of the wards within the study area had particularly high rates of inactivity, namely Northumberland Park and Tottenham Hale.

4.5.3
With regards to unemployment rates, the Central Leeside study area also performs poorly. In 2001 7% of those between the ages of 16 and 74 were unemployed, compared to 4% for Enfield, 6% for Haringey and 4% for London. As noted above, the two wards within Haringey have the highest rates of unemployment; Northumberland Park has an unemployment rate of 9% and Tottenham Hale a rate of 8%.
Over recent years both Enfield and Haringey have experienced significant shifts with regards to employment by sector. Within Enfield, for example, there has been a steady decline in the number of manufacturing jobs and in banking, finance, and insurance. Growth areas include public administration, education and health, as well as some growth in the fields of distribution, hotels and restaurants. The biggest employer in Enfield has remained the public sector, which on a yearly basis continues to provide a greater proportion of the area’s jobs. Specific employment sectors have seen major changes over a similar time period. The energy and water sector retracted by 90% between 2000 and 2004, while banking and insurance retracted by 15%. The health sector in Enfield has grown beyond the London average. Between 2000 and 2003 the health sector grew by 28% in Enfield and 13% in London.

Similar employment shifts have occurred in Haringey. Between 1991 and 2001 the manufacturing sector experienced significant decline (30.2% to 21.1%). Fast decline was also experienced in the energy and water sector. In contrast to Enfield, however, Haringey has experienced growth in the banking, finance and insurance sector (23.3% to 34.2%). Despite these shifts, the employment structure in Haringey is significantly different to that for London as a whole. Manufacturing employment is still over-represented in Haringey, whilst the banking, finance and insurance sector remains under-represented.

In light of these shifts, Table 16 displays current levels of employment by sector. This table reveals that the AAP area has a high proportion of manufacturing employment (24.9%). Likewise, the study area is over-represented in terms of jobs within the ‘distribution, hotels and restaurants’ sector. Also worthy of note is the difference in employment within the banking, finance and insurance sector (18.6% in Enfield compared to 34.2% in Haringey). This difference reflects the growth of this sector within the Borough of Haringey.

Table 17 shows jobs by their social grade, with 1 being the highest and 9 the lowest. Within the AAP area, administrative and secretarial jobs (grade 4) employ the greatest number of people, with associate professional and technical occupations (grade 3) accounting for the next greatest proportion of the workforce. Table 17 reveals that the Central Leeside study area has a lower proportion of individuals employed within social grades 1 and 2, with managers and senior officials, and professional occupations accounting for only 19% of the workforce. This compares poorly to the corresponding figures for Enfield (28%), Haringey (35%) and London (33%). In essence, the study area has a higher proportion of lower skilled and lower paid jobs than the Boroughs of Enfield and Haringey, as well as London more generally.
### Table 16: Employment by Economic Sector
(Source: Enfield Employment Land Study and Haringey Employment Land Study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and fishing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and water</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution, hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and communications</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, finance and insurance etc.</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration, education and health</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 17: Employment by Occupation (Source: Neighbourhood Statistics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Managers and senior officials</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Associate professional &amp; technical</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrative &amp; secretarial</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Skilled trades</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sales and customer services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Process plant &amp; machine operatives</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Elementary occupations</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.6 Future Employment Trends

#### 4.6.1

Both Enfield and Haringey have prepared an employment land study. These documents provide an assessment of employment land supply and demand, as well as forecasts for future employment growth and change in both Boroughs, building upon the work previously undertaken in the sub-region through the North London Employment Land Study and by the GLA.

#### 4.6.2

At this sub-regional level, the work undertaken by the North London Strategic Alliance and the GLA generate different levels of change with the forecasting undertaken in the North London Employment Land Study being more optimistic than the GLA forecasting (predicting an increase in the total number of jobs of 19% compared to a GLA increase of 11%). Much of the difference is due to health and care services, public administration and construction sectors, which account for the majority of growth in the North London Employment Land Study. However, the change in the manufacturing sector is very similar between both sets of forecasts (around 32-33%).

#### 4.6.3

The evidence base for the Area Action Plan is drawn from the Employment Land Studies for Enfield and Haringey. The former relies heavily upon the forecasts produced through the North London Employment Land Study, whilst the latter utilises, to some extent, the forecasts provided by the GLA.

#### 4.6.4

The Enfield Employment Land Study shows that key sectors of current demand are construction (29%), transport (18%) and wholesale (15%). While the first two sectors are forecast to increase by 2016, the latter is forecast to experience a marginal decline. An important growth sector for the period will also be warehousing, where a growth of 135% in the employment base would increase the numbers employed in this sector to over 2,600. This is particularly relevant to Central Leaside, given the vast areas of strategically important employment land within the area. However, this type of employment might not be appropriate for the economy of the area. The types of uses that should be sought will be tested through the Issues and Options stage.

#### 4.6.5

In conclusion, it is considered that the implications of these forecasts on land will be as follows:

- In the period 2001-2016 the demand for Net Employment Land in the sub-region is estimated to increase by 13ha;
- The main reason for the increase in employment and demand is due to the continued structural change in employment, moving away from traditional manufacturing and industrial uses (B1/B2) towards warehousing/distribution type uses (B8), which are associated with lower employment densities. Therefore, while forecast employment is relatively static, the new employment uses employ lower densities and hence require more land;
- In the period 2005-2016, this change in demand is increased to 28ha owing to the fact that the main decline in manufacturing employment takes place between 2001 and 2005, thus providing less counter balance to the growth in warehousing related employment;
- The impact on land demand would be significant in Enfield. The assumptions behind this builds upon the fact that Enfield is the main employment concentration in the sub-region and therefore would benefit most from positive changes in the market or policy context, and would benefit the most from potential business relocation from the Olympics site.

#### 4.6.6

Analysis of the Haringey Employment Land Study reveals similar forecasts. Employment demand in Haringey is expected to increase significantly in the period 2000-2016 in line with forecasts for London as a whole. Much of this growth is anticipated in the business and professional services sector, computing/R&D, wholesale, retail, professional services and distribution. At the same time, decreasing demand is forecast for sectors including the public sector, manufacturing, construction and transport. Although the demand for additional employment floorspace in Haringey may not be as high as in recent years, it is expected that the requirement will be significant. Floorspace forecasts indicate that between 2004 and 2016, take-up of B Use Class buildings arising from employment growth will be in the range of 37,000 sqm to 108,200 sqm. This equates to 3,100-9,000 sqm per annum.
The following conclusions and implications can be drawn from these forecasts:

- Employment land policies need to respond by providing appropriate choice and quality in the supply of land and premises suitable for growth activities. This will involve the restructuring of some industrial sites and premises where there is a danger of market demands not being met by a threat of obsolescence;

- It is important for the Haringey employment land offer to provide competitive sites and premises for activities requiring light and general industrial space. Sites should offer sufficient choice, quality and flexibility for modern industrial uses;

- Employment land and premises supply must be sufficient to accommodate the needs of small firms. These small firms have the potential to diversify the local economy and add to the prosperity of local residents;

- Business expansion needs must be catered for within the Borough. Expansion needs are greatest for business services, vehicle repair, food and other services activities. If their existing site cannot accommodate expansion through extension, refurbishment, redevelopment or more intensive use of space, alternative options must be provided; and

- Employment policies must facilitate an improved business and industrial environment. This will ensure dividends not only in terms of retaining existing businesses but attracting potential investors.

Having analysed both Employment Land Studies it is important to note the growth in low density employment uses and the need for more land to accommodate these jobs. Land is a finite resource; as such, employment growth will need to be accommodated in more efficient models of development, utilising land more intensively.

The types of jobs that are forecast will have an impact on the economic competitiveness of the area. The Sub-Regional Economic Development Plan\(^2\) notes that North London currently has 14% of London’s population but only 8% of London’s jobs – although with over 300,000 jobs it is still a significant economy in its own right. Job densities are well below levels for London as a whole, with nearly twice the number of residents of working age as jobs and higher levels of out-commuting than any other sub-region. This gap is set to widen with population growth projected to grow by 160,000 by 2016, while jobs are predicted to grow by only 5% to 2016 – less than half the London average of 12%. In order to overcome these imbalances the sub-regional economic development plan recognises that a number of strategies need to be put in place, supporting enterprise growth and competitiveness. It is therefore recognised that North London as a whole needs to:

- Realise the potential of its internal drivers of growth – the Opportunity Areas (the Upper Lee Valley), Wood Green Metropolitan centre and other town centres with intensification potential;

- Improve transport accessibility, links to growth areas, and reduce congestion;

- Focus on retaining and enabling the growth of manufacturing businesses, particularly in the ULV, and supporting growth in other key sectors of the local economy, i.e. the creative industries, retail and leisure, office-based services, construction and ‘green technologies’;

- Provide more affordable premises for SMEs – not only for start-ups but for those that are seeking to expand;

- Provide clear and simple pathways to access good quality business support especially targeted to the small and micro business sector;

- Stimulate more business investment in workforce training and development; and

- Support increased qualification attainment of local residents to improve the quality of employees at entrance level and enable them to access the professional, associate professional; and technical and managerial jobs that will increasingly characterise the occupational structure of employment in the sub-region.

\(^2\) North London Strategic Alliance, April 2006, North London Sub-Regional Economic Development Plan.
4.7 SUMMARY

4.7.1 The Central Leeside AAP study area has a small resident population of 4,843 individuals. Closer analysis reveals that the population is imbalanced, with a higher proportion of young and elderly people. In other words, there is a higher proportion of economically inactive individuals. The population in the area also suffers in terms of deprivation: educational attainment is low and the skills base is low. Indeed, at the ward level the indices reveal that deprivation is particularly acute in the two Haringey wards, namely Northumberland Park and Tottenham Hale.

4.7.2 Given the strategic nature of employment land in the area it is interesting to note the relationship between this and the indicators of deprivation. Employment here is predominantly of the low wage, low skill sector and the changes that have taken place and which are forecast to take place may exacerbate this problem. Efforts are thus required to (i) diversify the employment base; (ii) provide sufficient choice, quality and flexibility in terms of employment floorspace; (iii) improve educational attainment; and (iv) ensure that the resident population has access to higher paid and higher skilled jobs.

4.7.3 Although accurate figures for the Central Leeside study area are unavailable, it is predicted that the population will increase over the next decade. New housing will be needed to accommodate this population growth. At present the housing stock is closely matched to the composition of households, providing for a mix of household types. However, much of the stock, is of a poor quality. The challenge will be to ensure that the quality of stock exists to accommodate growth. This could require the repair and replacement of existing stock.
5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1
If regeneration of the area is to be sustainable then a mix of uses, community facilities and services need to be planned for and provided. The Urban Task Force in its report ‘Towards an Urban Renaissance’ sets out the components of a successful mixed use community (Figure 26).

5.1.2
In essence, this promotes a basic land use strategy of mixing uses, avoiding zoning. Encouraging a diverse and fine grain mix of land uses is essential to create a vibrant and attractive development which can also offer accessible local services and facilities. Regeneration and development should enhance the viability of the community and provide a range of facilities and which also function as part of the wider urban area.

5.1.3
The mixed use approach advocated does, however, suggest that certain uses should be concentrated or focussed in different localities to capitalise on shared infrastructure and promote more sustainable communities. Successful communities are generally built around a full range of local services and facilities, including commercial, educational, health, spiritual and civic uses. These need to be conveniently sited and connected to residential areas by safe and comfortable routes.

5.1.4
The sections below provide an overview of existing infrastructure provision and the implications of future growth in the area. More detail is then provided in terms of particular uses, including education, health, open space and retail.

Figure 26: The components of a sustainable, mixed use community (Source: The Urban Task Force, Towards an Urban Renaissance)
5.2 CURRENT SERVICE PROVISION

5.2.1 Having considered existing and future population and household patterns in the previous section of this report, it is possible to assess the likely infrastructure that such a population will require, and indeed, can sustain.

5.2.2 ‘Shaping Neighbourhoods’ (Barton, Grant and Guise, 2003) provides best practice guidance for planners, designers, developers and community groups with regards to the creation of sustainable, viable and vital neighbourhoods. The guidance establishes illustrative catchment populations and accessibility standards for certain services. These are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Population Threshold</th>
<th>Catchment area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary / Middle School</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>600m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Centre</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>800m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstore</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>2,000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>2,000m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Catchment Populations and Accessibility Standards for Services
(Source: Shaping Neighbourhoods, Barton, Grant & Guise, 2003)

5.2.3 Whilst it should be recognised that these standards and catchment populations will vary according to local conditions and policies, the figures still provide a useful indication in determining expected levels of infrastructure provision.

5.2.4 The resident population of the Central Leeside study area is relatively small and not sufficient in its own right to support many of the facilities listed in Table 18. For the purposes of this section we have therefore assessed the level of provision in terms of the distance to facilities from the Central Leeside area. Therefore, by applying these figures to the Central Leeside study area and its environs an analysis can be undertaken to determine where there are shortfalls [or a surplus] in infrastructure provision. This section should be read in conjunction with Figure 17, which maps the existing community facilities within the Central Leeside area. The following conclusions can be drawn:

- The residential areas within the study area to the south of Pickett’s Lock and to the north of the A406 are not within the recommended 600m catchment area for primary schools, or the 1,500m catchment area for secondary schools.
- The nearest centres for further education are Middlesex University to the north (which currently has plans to relocate) and the College of North East London in Tottenham.
- The majority of residential areas within the study area lie within the recommended catchment areas for key community facilities, including police stations, fire stations, libraries, post offices and health centres. These facilities are clustered around three nodes, namely White Hart Lane, Edmonton Green and Ponders End.
- With regards to recreation and leisure facilities the northern part of the study area is well served by Lee Valley Leisure Centre at Pickett’s Lock. There are fewer facilities, however, serving the southern part of the study area.

5.2.5 To conclude, this analysis has revealed a particular shortage in education facilities. This shortage is especially marked between the two nodes of Edmonton Green and White Hart Lane.
5.3 FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION

5.3.1 With regards to the future provision of infrastructure it is difficult to predict where there may be a shortfall. However, part of the role of the AAP is to provide information on likely future growth so that such assessments of need can be made.

5.3.2 However, as indicated in Section 3.8, there exist a number of sites within Central Leeside with the potential for large scale change and development. The issues and options stage will draw out what these opportunities may be, although any significant residential development will have a resulting impact on the level of infrastructure required in the area. The following sections provide more detail on particular services and current initiatives, covering:

- Education;
- Health;
- Open Space; and
- Retail.
**5.4 EDUCATION**

**5.4.1**

In order to predict future demand for education facilities it is important to understand pupil number projections. Pupil numbers are driven by a number of factors, which are summarised below:

- The GLA receives its basic population data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) which includes birth statistics in the form of mid-year estimates. These estimates comprise actual births for the first half of the calendar year and an estimate for the second half. The most current data published by the ONS is based on actual births to mid-2005 and estimated births up to the end of the calendar year 2005. The next set of data due in autumn 2007 will include actual births in the second half of 2005 and the first half of 2006.

- ONS data indicates that there was an 11.2% increase in the birth rate across London between 2002 (104,300 births) and 2005 (116,000 births). This is the biggest increase in the capital since the 1960s. At 17.5%, the rate of growth in Enfield during this period was second only to Greenwich (20.7%) in London. The next highest rate was in Redbridge at 15.6%. Statistically, 97.7% of children born in Enfield are still resident in the borough at age 4 and 90.6% at age 11.

- Latest Government Actuary figures for the fertility rate show that the average number of children per woman in London increased from 1.7 to 1.8 between 2001 and 2005. The rate was relatively stable until 2004, when it sharply rose, with a similar occurrence in 2005. This was caused by more women in the 30-34 age range having children during this period, which caused the net increase in the fertility rate. This trend was also higher in London than in the rest of the country. The rate is expected to stabilise, but remain at a higher level than in recent years. The Government Actuary also estimates the “range of uncertainty”, i.e. high and low variants to the fertility rates, which based on the 2005 mid-year estimates is between 91.1% and 112.6% for the UK.

- Enfield Primary Care Trust data also shows a sharp increase in the number of births in the borough in recent years. Before any adjustments for mortality, migration etc, are taken into account, 4016 children were born in the calendar year 2003, increasing to 4505 in 2004 and 4524 in 2005.

- Projections also take account of new residential developments that have been implemented and those that are proposed. Household growth is matched to the expected growth in homes.

- International migration is also a key factor in projecting population changes and the ONS have recently announced new methods to assess inflows and outflows into UK local authority areas. These mainly relate in the short term to young adults, but if a significant number of these switch from migrant to resident status, there could be an impact on school place provision in the medium to long term as and when they have children.

**5.4.2**

More specifically, the situation in Enfield with regards to future pupil numbers can be summarised as follows:

- The GLA feed the ONS population data into their school roll projections model and the latest projections (which also include January 2007 School Census data) indicate significant growth in pupil numbers as a result of the increased number of births in the borough. As referred to above, the birth rate remained fairly flat until 2004, but these latest projections take account of the greatly increased number of actual births in the calendar year 2004 and the first half of 2005. It is anticipated that the birth rate will stabilise thereafter.

- The previous forecast prepared in 2006 had indicated an increase in demand for school places, but the forecast increase in births was smaller than the increases now confirmed and forecast by the ONS. Previous forecasts had indicated a much tighter balance between the supply of and demand for reception places.

- The increase in demand could be highest in the south and east of the borough, given the potential for additional housing in these areas over and above that included in the last Housing Capacity Study. If such schemes ultimately proceed, the pressure on school places in these parts of the borough could be even greater than that exerted by the rise in births.

- The potential impact on the secondary sector is obviously longer term, but the extent to which the primary situation alters in the next few years will determine if secondary provision is going to be sufficient.
Education Requirements within Central Leeside

5.4.3
Within the Central Leeside area future residential development will impact upon the demand for education facilities. These implications are explored below.

5.4.4
Table 19 provides an initial assessment of the need for additional primary school places for various proposed levels of new residential development within Central Leeside as indicated by the Area Action Plan.

5.4.5
Whilst there are no schools within the designated area of the AAP, there are several schools on the periphery – Fleecefield, Brettenham, Raynham, Eldon, Cuckoo Hall. Most of these have been expanded over the last 10-20 years because of the growing demand for places and are all at capacity with no potential to expand further. Given the indicated increase in projected pupil numbers before account is taken of any additional housing within the AAP area, it is assumed that these schools will remain full in the foreseeable future. Provision on new sites is therefore likely to be required.

5.4.6
This assessment is based upon the levels of place provision it has proved necessary to create as a result of recent major residential schemes in the borough such as Highlands Village (800+ units), Enfield Island Village (1300+ units) and Montagu Road EPI estate (400+ units).

5.4.7
Whilst the impact of such schemes can provide an indicative guide to the need for additional school places, the major determining factor will be the final size, mix and type of properties within the various new developments, i.e. high percentages of family sized units, particularly of affordable housing, are likely to create a need for more places than the same level of smaller flatted units, particularly if these are for private sale.

5.4.8
It is also assumed that the “optimum” size of a primary school is 2 forms of entry (420 full time pupils a year, 60 pupils a year group).

5.4.9
On this basis, provision to the equivalent of up to 4 2-form entry primary schools may ultimately be required in this area. As the AAP area is also partly located in Haringey, it would seem logical to adopt a joint approach to the need for additional provision as the scope of potential new housing in the area becomes more apparent.

5.4.10
This could also be the approach in respect of the longer term impact on secondary provision, given that Haringey will be opening a new 6 form entry school in 2010. Significant levels of new housing in the area may strengthen the case emerging in the projections for eventual additional secondary provision as a result of growth in primary pupil numbers from 2008/09 onwards. On the basis of this analysis, a further secondary school could be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of units</th>
<th>Number of forms of entry required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.5 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: The need for additional primary school places
The Need for a New Primary School within Central Leeside

5.4.11 The requirement is for a 2 form entry primary school plus nursery — 420 full time pupils between the ages of 4 and 10 (60 pupils a year, Reception to Year 6) plus a nursery offering 60 part time places (30 places full time equivalent).

5.4.12 An area of up to 5 acres (2 hectares) will be required, of which 1.25 acres (0.5 hectares) would be required statutorily for a playing field for team games.

5.4.13 The remainder of the site will accommodate the main building, external hard play areas, access routes (pedestrian and vehicular) and car and cycle parking (the latter for staff and pupils).

5.4.14 The school should be built as single storey with full accessibility. The nursery should have its own separate external play area.

5.4.15 The final brief for the school will also need to take into account the wider Children’s Services & Leisure and Extended Schools agendas in order to meet community needs in the locality.

5.4.16 The potential location for a primary school will be further discussed during the issues and options stage of the plan preparation process.

5.5 HEALTH

5.5.1 Both Enfield and Haringey have a Primary Care Trust, the mission of which is to improve the health and well being of all individuals within the Boroughs through the delivery of the highest quality care centred around the needs of the individual. More specifically, the objectives of both PCTs can be summarised as follows:

- To improve the health of people living in the Boroughs;
- To provide modern, good quality, local services, working with colleagues in social services where this will benefit service users; and
- To make sure that the services commissioned are developed to meet local needs;
- To tackle the underlying causes of ill-health;
- To focus on debilitating chronic diseases and mental health to improve the quality of care for those who suffer from persistent ill-health; and
- To manage and combat problems which are symptomatic with health inequality, such as teenage pregnancy and substance misuse.

5.5.2 During the last year both PCTs were required to self assess their performance for the new Annual Health Check. The Annual Health Check is the Healthcare Commission’s new system of assessment for all Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) and NHS Trusts. Both PCTs achieved compliance on all 24 core standards in the Annual Health Check.

5.5.3 As a response to Government Policy objectives, Enfield, in association with Barnet and Haringey, are in the process of developing a strategy of providing more care closer to people’s homes, by developing primary and community care and ensuring hospitals concentrate on caring for those who really need to use hospital facilities. The project has identified a series of scenarios for the development of local services which will be subject to more detailed work and public consultation later in 2007. The scenarios are:
A: Three District General hospitals with centralised maternity & children’s services

B: Planned and Emergency Services split, with Barnet and North Middlesex as emergency centres

C: Chase Farm Hospital becomes a Community Hospital; Barnet and North Middlesex hospitals provide all other services

D: Chase Farm Hospital closes as an acute site; Barnet and North Middlesex hospitals provide all acute services

5.5.4
The purpose of this health strategy is to make it easier for people to get healthcare if it is not concentrated in a small number of specific locations: making healthcare available in more settings will have a positive effect on health generally and life expectancy.

5.5.5
In recognising that there is insufficient care in parts of the two boroughs, the PCT are proposing to open a number of new facilities across the wider area. These include:

- Primary Care Resource Centre, Enfield Highway;
- GP Practice, Enfield Lock;
- Neighbourhood Primary Care Centre, Upper Edmonton;
- Primary Care Resource Centre, Ponders End; and
- Neighbourhood Primary Care Centre, Bowes Road / Arnos Grove

5.5.5
None of these are proposed for the Central Leeside area, although accessibility to them will need to be considered if large scale change and development should take place. There may also be a future demand for new facilities.

5.6 OPEN SPACE

5.6.1
In line with guidance contained in PPG171 both Enfield and Haringey have undertaken an assessment of Open Space2. This includes an assessment of the quantity, quality and value of parks and open spaces within both boroughs and identifies whether provision is meeting local needs.

5.6.2
Several general conclusions can be drawn from the Enfield Open Space and Sports Assessment. These are as follows:

- The amount of open space per person is below the recommended standards;
- The quality of public parks is generally below the recommended standard;
- Access to children’s play provision in parts of the area is beyond the recommended 400m catchment; and
- Parts of the area are beyond the recommended 1km catchment of either a Borough or Metropolitan Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

5.6.3
More specifically, in relation to the wards covered by the Central Leeside study area (Jubilee, Lower Edmonton, Edmonton Green, and Upper Edmonton), the following conclusions can be drawn from the Enfield Open Space Assessment.

- Public parks: With regards to public space accessibility, the south of the Jubilee ward and the north of the Lower Edmonton ward are both outside of the recommended 800m catchment area. In addition, all four wards fall below the recommended quantity standard of 2.43ha per 1,000 population. Most significantly, Upper Edmonton is 1.91ha per 1,000 population below the recommended quantity standard. In relation to quality, parts of Upper Edmonton and Edmonton Green fall short of the qualitative public park standards, including Weirhall Recreation Ground, Florence Hayes Recreation Ground, Craig Park and Montagu Recreation Ground.

- Children’s play provision: Central parts of the Jubilee

---

1 DCLG, July 2002, PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
2 Atkins for LB Enfield, August 2006, Enfield Open Space and Sports Assessment, and, LB Haringey, October 2003, Haringey Open Space and Sports Assessment
ward and the Upper Edmonton ward are outside of the 400m catchment for children’s play provision, as well as the majority of Lower Edmonton ward. With the exception of the south eastern corner, most of Edmonton Green ward is also outside of the 400m catchment area.

- Natural/semi-natural green spaces: Much of the wards covered by the Central Leeside AAP are outside of the GLA recommended 1km catchment area to sites of Metropolitan or Borough Importance for nature conservation. In relation to natural greenspace, the ward of Upper Edmonton, with 0.44 hectares of GLA designated natural greenspace per 1,000 population, is below the quantitative standard for natural greenspace of 1 hectare per 1,000 population.

- Allotments: The northern part of the Lower Edmonton ward is outside of the 800m catchment area for allotments. In addition, the eastern and central part of the Upper Edmonton ward and the southern and western parts of the Edmonton Green ward are outside of the recommended catchment area.

5.6.4
The Enfield Open Space Assessment goes on to recommend a range of possible measures to address these deficiencies. These include:

- Making targeted improvements to the quality of parks and open spaces;
- Making provision for children’s play spaces in those parks and open spaces that do not currently include such provision but which could be accommodated;
- Diversifying existing areas of open space to incorporate an element of natural / semi natural greenspace; and
- Improving green linkages between areas of deficiency and existing natural green spaces, creating linear routes and habitat spaces.

5.6.5
Haringey Council have undertaken a similar assessment of open space. The assessment identifies that Haringey has a fairly high proportion of open space in relation to other London boroughs and 0.75% more than the average for boroughs in the north sub-region in 1991 (12.45%). The provision of open space within the Borough does, however, still fall short of NPFA standards, with a provision of 1.7 hectares of public open space per 1000 population compared to the recommended provision of 2.43 hectares. Indeed, there are parts of the Borough which are deficient in public open space (further than 280m from any form of public open space). Northumberland Park, parts of which fall within the AAP study area, is identified as being particularly deficient in public open space. It is recognised, therefore, that measures are needed to extend present catchments. Whilst these measures will be different for each park, recommendations include creating more park gates, investigating open space provision in adjoining Boroughs, the ‘greening’ of routes and better signposting. More specific measures for Northumberland Park include the following:

- There is de facto public access to sports facilities at the Frederick Knight Sports Ground;
- Somerford Grove open space has been assessed as having restricted access and is predominantly hard playing surface. There may be potential to reconfigure this space to provide facilities associated with small local parks; and
- The proposed Moselle Brook green chain runs through this deficiency area. The implementation of this chain should be prioritised.

5.6.6
With regards to the quality and condition of public open spaces within Haringey the assessment concludes that the majority of open spaces are classified as having a below average range of facilities in good condition, with 31% scoring average condition, and just 13% of sites considered above average. With specific reference to the Central Leeside area, the Powerleague Soccer Centre Sports Ground (bounded by the railway line and Willoughby Lane) is identified as an area of open space the condition of which is above average. The Tottenham Marshes and the Lee Valley Park, however, both scored below average. This score could, however, reflect the ecological value of these areas, given that it is not usually appropriate to provide the range of typical park facilities or amenities in open spaces which have nature conservation value. The Tottenham Marshes also scored poorly in relation to crime, safety and security issues. Indeed, the assessment identifies a strong link between crime hotspots and areas of poor quality.
5.7 RETAIL

5.7.1 Within Central Leeside the only significant area of retail provision is around Angel Road station, including the Angel Road Retail Park to the north of the A406 and several retail units to the south, including Ikea and Tesco. The characteristics of the Angel Road Retail Park are summarised in Table 20.

5.7.2 In addition to this focus of retail units around Angel Road there are several smaller local centres within the Central Leeside area, including Bounces Road, Nightingale Road and Dyson’s Road within the Borough of Enfield. There are no local retail centres located within Haringey of relevance to the Central Leeside AAP.

5.7.3 Local Centres are particularly important in serving day-to-day needs and it is therefore important that they are accessible to all. Indeed, the recent study of town centres in Enfield notes the importance of Local Centres:

‘The network of local centres and parades should be maintained to ensure that residents have easy access to local shops and services. There may be scope for improving some local centres, but there is no obvious need for new centres. Improvements would help to secure their viability but would only meet a small element of the scope for new retail development’.³

5.7.4 In terms of accommodating future growth, the sequential approach should be followed, whereby town, district and local centres are the preferred location for new retail, leisure and cultural development. Furthermore, development should be appropriate in terms of scale and the catchment area it serves. It is recommended that small local centres are maintained to ensure they provide basic food and grocery shopping facilities, supported by a limited choice and range of comparison shops selling lower order comparison food and a range of non-retail services and community uses. Small local centres should continue to serve small catchment areas focused on their respective local communities.

5.7.5 More specifically, the Enfield Retail Capacity Study explores the quantitative capacity for additional convenience and comparison floorspace within the borough. With regards to convenience sales floorspace it is estimated that in 2017 convenience expenditure will exceed the benchmark turnover of large food stores in the borough by £9.77 million. This surplus expenditure estimate could in theory support new food store sales floorspace.

5.7.6 Of particular interest to the Central Leeside area, however, is the projected quantitative capacity for additional comparison floorspace. The Retail Capacity Study identifies that there is a high level of comparison expenditure leakage from across the borough. As such, major retail development in the borough could change existing shopping patterns and could reduce comparison expenditure leakage. Conversely, improvements to comparison retailing in competing centres may increase expenditure leakage from Enfield. In other words, development in competing towns could limit the ability of shopping facilities in Enfield to increase their market share of expenditure. On balance, however, it is believed that development proposals in Enfield will help to increase expenditure retention in the future. It is estimated that in 2017 there will be a surplus comparison expenditure of £123.51 million, which converts into 31,612 sqm [gross] of potential new floorspace. The Central Leeside area could provide some of this additional comparison floorspace.

³ para 15.78, A Study of Town Centres, Sept 06, Nathaniel Lichfield for Enfield Council
In addition there is also a need to improve the general quality and appearance of the centres. The Upper Lee Valley Vision document also recognises the importance of improving the quality of town centres in the wider area, particularly those strung along the A1010, being places where a mix of uses and thus sustainable patterns of development can be accommodated. The components making up the opportunity for change along the retail spine as envisaged by the Vision document are:

- Creation of coherent, pedestrian friendly spaces;
- Improvements to physical structure and environmental quality, including new civic spaces;
- Develop a series of better defined sub-centres integrating a mix of uses;
- Redevelopment of low intensity uses for mixed use space;
- Promotion of 'incubator' units and workshop space for entrepreneurs and start-up companies;
- Improved range and mix of leisure and community facilities serving surrounding neighbourhoods; and
- Redevelopment of poor quality housing to improve housing choice and support the retail centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mix of uses</td>
<td>Angel Road Retail Park is situated to the north of the North Circular road (A406) with access off Advent Way. The retail park includes six units, namely (i) Joy Sleep (beds); (ii) Paul Simon (curtains); (iii) Carpet Right; (iv) MFI and Sofa Workshop Direct (joint unit); (v) Kingsbury Interiors; and (vi) Allied Carpets. The units are in three groups with Kingsbury Interiors and Allied Carpets located to the west of Eley Road, with the remaining units located to the east of Eley Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility and movement</td>
<td>A reasonable amount of car parking is provided on the retail park, with individual car parking for each group of units. Angel Road Retail Park is easily accessible by car from the North Circular (A406), although signage is currently poor. In terms of accessibility by public transport, Angel Road train station is within walking distance and there are also several bus routes that have stops close to the retail park. Access for pedestrians throughout the retail park is quite poor, with the park divided by Eley Road which carries a considerable amount of industrial traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental quality</td>
<td>Angel Road Retail Park has some landscaping at the entrances to the retail units but only a small amount. Noise and air pollution from the North Circular is detrimental to the retail park’s overall environmental quality. In addition, lighting on the park is limited, only being provided by the street lamps and lights above the signage on the units. The retail units themselves are basic warehouse buildings made of brick and corrugated iron. In general the buildings are in a reasonable condition and well maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Summary of Angel Road Retail Park Characteristics
(Source: Summarised from A Study of Town Centres, Sept 06, Nathaniel Lichfield for Enfield Council)
5.8 SUMMARY

5.8.1
A mix of services and facilities are required in an area if it is to be ‘sustainable’. The following is noted with regard to existing and future provision within the Central Leeside area:

- The education facilities in the vicinity of the Central Leeside area are increasingly under pressure. Demand for school places is projected to increase, and new residential development within the area would further increase pressure and need for new facilities.

- The Primary Care Trust is currently in the process of improving access to health services by spreading health facilities across the wider area rather than concentrating its facilities in concentrated locations. There are currently however no new plans for any health provision within the Central Leeside area. Improved links to those facilities that do exist, and those that are planned, will thus need to be investigated;

- The area is deficient in terms of open space and the quality of the open space is below recommended standards. Targeted improvements to the quality of the space and accessibility to it should be promoted; and

- Retail provision is currently centred around Angel Road. This area, however, is generally of a poor quality, especially in terms of pedestrian accessibility and the general environment. Indeed, the environmental quality of Angel Road Retail Park is significantly compromised by both noise and air pollution from the North Circular Road (A406). Measures for environmental improvement are therefore needed. There is also considerable potential for further development around Angel Road, especially given its sustainable location close to Angel Road station.

5.8.2
The issues and options testing to be undertaken at the next stage of the study will thus need to balance growth and change with the need for social and community infrastructure, particularly in terms of education provision, the quality of local retail provision, and the condition and accessibility of public open space.
6.1 INTRODUCTION

6.1.1 This section provides an overview of key trends in the property market in the Central Leeside AAP area. Where possible it provides a summary of trends and patterns of supply, demand and rents and values for the following land uses:

- Employment (warehousing and distribution, industrial and office);
- Residential; and
- Retail.

6.1.2 The analysis is intended to assist in informing the scope of possible initiatives and projects that may be tested as options and emerge as recommendations from the Area Action Plan.

6.2 EMPLOYMENT

6.2.1 Employment activities make up the majority of the land uses within the study area. They comprise a mixture of warehousing and distribution and industrial activities contained within a series of relatively discrete estates. Enfield and Haringey’s objective is to sustain this pattern of land use and facilitate improvements / enhancements to areas of poor quality.

6.2.2 Historically much of the study area represented a convenient location for these types of uses as there is a degree of physical containment provided by the A1055 and railway line and the William Girling and Banbury Reservoirs. These provide a useful series of physical boundaries separating these ‘dirty’ land uses from the areas residential population and thereby mitigating any potential negative environmental externalities or bad neighbour impacts.

6.2.3 In addition to these physical benefits, the area is also well served by London and the south east strategic road infrastructure with access to the north circular, M25 and beyond. There are significant benefits for industrial and warehousing uses locating close to major transport nodes such as this due to their reliance on the movement of bulk goods.

Warehousing and Distribution

Supply

6.2.4 Table 20 shows that there are around 580 warehousing hereditaments (units) in the study area which equates to around 35% of the total commercial stock. This proportion is significantly above that for both LB Enfield as a whole (11%) and London (9%). The significant difference reflects the dominance of these land uses within the study area as a result of the factors noted above.

6.2.5 The warehousing and distribution stock is principally located at a number of estates (these estates are a mixture of both warehousing and industrial stock, discussed below). Key estates in the Central Leeside AAP area include:

- Brantwood Road;
- Eleys Estate;
- Hastingwood Trading Estate / Kingsway Estate / Stonehill Business Park / Lee Valley Trading Estate;
- Montagu Road Industrial Estate / Kenninghall Estate; and
- North East Tottenham.

Demand

6.2.7 Our initial analysis suggests that there is strong demand for warehousing space as a result of the study area’s strategic accessibility and ability to easily serve markets in London and the south east.
Evidence of the demand can be seen in recent market activity in this sector throughout the Borough. For example, the Enfield Employment Land Study (2005) reports on a recent speculative development of around 100,000 sq.m at the Great Cambridge Estate to the north west of the study area which was well received by the occupier market with strong lettings.

Only limited data was available for local rental levels for warehousing and distribution space. This is presented jointly below with commentary on industrial space.

Table 21: Warehousing Units and Floorspace (Source: Commercial and Industrial Floorspace and Rateable Value Statistics, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEREDITAMENTS/UNITS</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Haringey</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>97,537</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>81,339</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factories</td>
<td>22,934</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>19,493</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bulk</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>223,923</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOORSPACE (sqm)</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Haringey</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Avg size</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Avg size</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>15,389,000</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>441,000</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>27,724,000</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factories</td>
<td>7,989,000</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>459,000</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>13,468,000</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>697,000</td>
<td>1.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bulk</td>
<td>812,000</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>65,382,000</td>
<td>1,872,000</td>
<td>1,487,000</td>
<td>681,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industrial

Supply

Table 21 shows that there were around 430 ‘factory’ or industrial hereditaments in the study area in 2006. This equates to 26% of the total stock in the AAP area in terms of number of units. The proportion of this type of stock in the Central Leeside study area is significantly larger than for Enfield (14%), Haringey (16%) and London (10%). The prevalence of this type of stock is likely to be a result of the same factors outlined above for warehousing which bases its locational decisions on a series of similar parameters.

The 2004 Enfield Employment Land Study indicates that there is around 42,000 sq.m (450,000 sq.ft) of new small to medium sized warehousing / industrial units in the development planning pipeline or currently under construction. It is not clear what proportion of this space will be developed specifically for industrial or warehouse operators or whether the space will be sufficiently flexible for use by both sectors.
Demand 6.2.12
As with the warehousing sector, demand for industrial space in the study area is strong. Recent evidence of this is found in the sale and emergent redevelopment proposals for the former BOC and Parker Knoll sites, which together total some 18 acres of new development.

Rents and values 6.2.13
FOCUS (2007 recorded rents for industrial / warehousing space in the study area for larger units (1,400 sq.m or 15,000 sq.ft and above) as ranging from £43 psm (£4.00 psf (Stonehill Business Park, 12/05/05)) to £56.5 psm (£5.25 psf (Eleys Estate, 21/06/05)). In terms of the small – medium sized stock FOCUS (2007) recorded rents for properties at the larger end of this bracket at around £43 to £54 psm (£4.00 to £5.00 psf). Smaller, more modern and higher quality space has commanded higher rents in the region of £64.6 to £86 psm (£6.00 to £8.00 psf).

Office 6.2.14
The study area is not an established location for office (B1) based activities and there are few dedicated or established areas for office uses within it. The majority of B1 accommodation in the Central Leeside AAP area is ancillary to other industrial / warehousing activities with only a small proportion being related to discrete office based businesses in stand-alone units.

Supply 6.2.15
Table 21 shows that there are approximately 270 office hereditaments in the study area which equates to around 16% of total stock in terms of number of units. The comparison with the London, Enfield and Haringey figures demonstrate the relative underperformance of this sector at this location with the equivalent figures for the Boroughs and London being 21%, 19% and 36% respectively.

6.2.16
This trend is likely to be exacerbated by the fact that a proportion of this office space will be ancillary to industrial / warehousing units although it is not possible to quantify this distinction from the available data.

Demand 6.2.17
The demand for office accommodation in the Central Leeside AAP area is understood to be comparatively limited. There is little evidence of demand from developers to build speculatively in this sector of the market reflecting the comparatively modest rental levels and therefore market appetite in this location. It is considered that the industrial and warehousing sector currently offers stronger returns for the development and investment market in this location.

Rent 6.2.18
Research focussing on office space elsewhere in the Borough undertaken as part of the work for the North East Enfield Area Action Plan indicated that office rents in the study area could be expected to range from £118 psm (£11 psf) to £172 psm (£16 psf).

6.3 RESIDENTIAL

Supply 6.3.1
There is very little residential stock within the Central Leeside study area; as noted above the principal land uses in the area are industrial, distribution and retail warehousing / trade-counter. The limited residential stock that is contained within the study area is concentrated around the following areas:

- North of the study area: Off Montagu Road to the east of Edmonton Green
- South of the study area: Off Northumberland Park to the east of White Hart Lane

Values 6.3.2
Table 22 shows the average sales prices for all properties in LB Enfield in 2001 and 2006 and the change in average price of this period. The comparison with the equivalent data for England and Wales shows that despite starting from a higher base, the proportional growth in Enfield (58%) has not matched that at the national level (71%).
Many areas in the south of the country and particularly in London have seen significant growth over and above the national trends in recent years. The comparative underperformance of the housing market in Enfield is therefore indicative of there being significant issues serving to limit local residential values.

Table 23 shows average sales price data for residential properties over the period 01/01/04 to 01/03/07 for a number of areas.

6.3.4 Table 23 illustrates that the average price of terraced properties for the cluster of residential units in the study area off Montagu Road (£169,089) is below that for the Borough in which it is situated (LB Enfield, £220,094) but higher than that for England and Wales (£144,431). This equates to an actual difference between the cluster and the Borough of Enfield -£51,005 or -23%.

6.3.5 Table 23 also illustrates that the average price of both terraced and flatted properties in the study area of Northumberland Park is around 30% lower than the average for the LB Haringey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad area of analysis</th>
<th>Detailed area of analysis</th>
<th>Average sales price (£)</th>
<th>Actual variance from respective Borough average (£)</th>
<th>% variance from respective Borough average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Montagu Road to the east of Edmonton Green (LB Enfield)</td>
<td>Hudson Way (Terraced)</td>
<td>168,941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Montagu Road to the east of Edmonton Green (LB Enfield)</td>
<td>Rays Avenue (Terraced)</td>
<td>163,167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Montagu Road to the east of Edmonton Green (LB Enfield)</td>
<td>Rays Road (Terraced)</td>
<td>178,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Montagu Road to the east of Edmonton Green (LB Enfield)</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>169,089</td>
<td>-51,005</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Northumberland Park to the east of White Hart Lane (LB Haringey)</td>
<td>Haynes Close (Flats L/H)</td>
<td>134,333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Northumberland Park to the east of White Hart Lane (LB Haringey)</td>
<td>Blaydon Close (Flats L/H)</td>
<td>141,916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Northumberland Park to the east of White Hart Lane (LB Haringey)</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>138,124</td>
<td>-66,447</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparators</td>
<td>Thornley Close (Terraced)</td>
<td>213,833</td>
<td>-94,136</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Average residential sales prices from 01/01/04 to 01/03/07 (Source: HM Land Registry, March, 2007)
6.4 RETAIL

Supply
6.4.1 There is only very limited traditional high street retail activity located within the study area. The main retailing activity is focussed on large-format comparison goods retail warehousing such as the new Ikea store and other more informal ‘retail trade counter’ operators associated with the exiting industrial and warehousing activity.

Demand
6.4.2 FOCUS [2007] shows continued strong demand for retail units in Enfield as a whole with an increasing number of requirements from retailers for new space. This is supported by the findings of Enfield’s Retail Capacity Study that indicated that there would be capacity for new comparison retail development towards the end of the plan period [2013] and that longer term growth up to 2017 should be monitored and updated as necessary.

6.4.3 The lack of an established significant retail park and lack of a significant area of convenience retailing is likely to mean that any new demand for retail space in this location will be limited and displaced to areas with existing available floorspace such as town centre / high-street locations or shopping centres such as Edmonton Green, Palace Gardens and the Palace Exchange centre.

6.4.4 Given the study area’s accessibility, demand at this location is likely to continue to be focussed in the retail warehousing sector. The determination of the promoters of the Ikea development, its delivery and subsequent success is strong evidence of this.

Rents
6.4.5 FOCUS [2007] shows that since the dip in the early 1990s when Zone A retail rents fell as low as £968 psm (£90 psf), rents have continued to grow year on year to the extent that they stood and £1,600 (£150 psf) in June 2006. As with demand, it is likely that these trends are more of a reflection of prime pitch floorspace in shopping centres and town centre / high street locations and not the type of retail space found in the study area for which there was no up-to-date data available.

6.5 SUMMARY

6.5.1 The study area is viewed at the local and strategic level as an important location for industrial activity. However, the poor quality of much of the built stock, estate infrastructure and pressure from land owners for redevelopment for other uses such as retail and residential is serving to limit this objective.

6.5.2 A key challenge for the AAP will be providing a coherent framework of actions that can improve the quality of existing employment estates and support the growth of higher value added activities and enhanced employment densities.

6.5.3 There is likely to be continued pressure from the private sector to establish a large, modern retail park at this location as a result of its excellent accessibility and the presence of a key anchor (Ikea).

6.5.4 The average sales prices of residential stock within the study area is significantly lower (around 20 – 30%) than the equivalent averages for LB Enfield and Haringey.
07 Transport and Movement

7.1 POLICY CONTEXT

The Mayor’s London Plan

7.1.1 The Mayor is responsible for strategic planning in London, his duties including producing a Spatial Development Strategy for London – called the London Plan (Feb 2004) – and keeping it under review. The London Plan replaces existing strategic guidance, and boroughs’ development plans must be in ‘general conformity’ with it.

7.1.2 The Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999 requires that the London Plan deals only with matters that are of strategic importance to Greater London. The required content of the London Plan is set out in a government guidance note (Circular 1/2000). The GLA Act also requires that the London Plan takes account of three crosscutting themes:

- The health of Londoners;
- Equality of opportunity; and
- Its contribution to sustainable development in the UK.

7.1.3 As spatial policies cannot be considered in isolation from their links to existing and proposed transport accessibility and capacity, the London Plan makes reference to transport. Sustainable and public transport is highlighted as particularly important.

7.1.4 Integration (Policy 3C.1) of spatial development priorities with existing and future public transport infrastructure and services is a key theme, with development areas in the opportunity areas and areas for Intensification. Matching transport capacity and development proposals (Policy 3C.2) should be ensured through the instruments of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.

7.1.5 As outlined above, strengthening sustainable transport is a core objective, especially enhancing bus services, walking and cycling and improving integration between bus, rail and underground services (Policy 3C.3). This policy is reconfirmed by Policy 3C.9 which supports increased integration, reliability, safety, quality, accessibility, frequency and attractiveness of the existing public transport system.

7.1.6 While there are no dedicated major bus transit, tram or rail schemes scheduled for the study area, the Mayor will work with TfL, the boroughs and other strategic partners to implement additional priority measures to assist buses (Policy 3C.13).

7.1.7 Land for expanding transport functions needs to be safeguarded to serve the economic, social and environmental needs of London (Policy 3C.4). The Mayor also supports further runway capacity to create a sustainable and balanced London area airport system which will provide for the needs of London and its economy as a whole (Policy 3C.6).

7.1.8 Road scheme proposals need to contribute to London’s economic regeneration and development and must not increase the net traffic capacity of the corridor unless essential to regeneration (Policy 3C.15). All schemes should further positively contribute to London’s environment, increase safety for all users, improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, disabled people, public transport and businesses in particular and integrate with local and strategic land use planning policies. Congestion in the inner London areas which applies to CLAAP is expected to achieve zero growth, while weekday traffic in central London is expected to decrease by 15 per cent and reduce growth in outer London from 2001 to 2011 (Policy 3C.16).

7.1.9 Street space should be allocated balancing the needs of all users and boroughs should presume in favour of movement of people and goods on the strategic highway network, presume in favour of local access and amenity on other London roads, and pay particular regard to the prioritisation of sustainable transport through bus priority, bus or tram (light transit) schemes, cyclists and pedestrians (Policy 3C.17). Prioritisation of buses is reconfirmed Policy 3C.19.

7.1.10 Improved walking conditions are highlighted of importance to and from public transport nodes and key land uses (Policy 3C.20). Lea Valley Walk is one of the six strategic walking routes identified in the Mayor’s Transport Strategy which are a particular priority, while pedestrian safety, convenience, directness and disabled access are further key objectives, as is walking routes to schools.
Implementation of high quality, direct, cycling routes, secure cycle parking facilities and promotion of the National Cycle Network and Cycle Network Plus (Policy 3C.21) are highlighted as important factors to facilitate cycling as a core sustainable mode.

While accessible parking for disabled people is supported, on-site parking provision of new development should be reduced to a minimum as over-provision could undermine the use of more sustainable non-car modes (Policy 3C.22).

Freight transport has a particular importance for the land uses currently prevailing in the study area. Promotion of sustainable development of the full range of road, rail and water-borne freight facilities and the improvement of intermodal integration is supported by the Mayor (Policy 3C.24). Water transport plays a particular role in the Lee Valley due to the extensive navigable canal system.

The Mayor’s Transport Strategy

In support of the London Plan, the Mayor is required by law to produce other strategies for London, including a Transport Strategy (July 2001) which must be consistent with the London Plan. It provides a vision of London as an exemplary sustainable world city and is underpinned by five overarching objectives to make London a prosperous, accessible, fair and green city for people (3.6).

To support the vision of London as an exemplary sustainable world city, the strategy seeks to increase the capacity, reliability, efficiency, quality and integration of the transport system, facilitated by the following 10 priorities:

• Reducing traffic congestion;
• Investment on the Underground network;
• Radical improvements to bus services;
• Improved integration of London transport system with the National Rail network and services;
• Increased capacity through new cross-London rail links, orbital rail links and cross-river services;
• Improved journey time reliability for car users;
• Support of local transport initiatives;
• More reliable, sustainable and efficient freight movements
• Accessible and socially inclusive transport;
• Increased fare integration, improved interchanges and enhanced safety and security; and
• Improved integration of London transport system with taxis and private hire vehicles.

Economic performance is particularly highlighted for the Lee Valley and its potential for development as a centre of high-technology enterprises linking with similar activities in the Stansted/Cambridge corridor. Improvement to the transport network, specifically to rail access is considered to assist this development and the regeneration process in general.

Further initiatives on the rail corridor include:

• Upgrade of Liverpool Street to Stansted Link;
• Potential route for Hackney-Southwest Line and Crossrail currently being studied (both major projects, chapter 4Q); and
• Improved frequency, service quality and integration on the Lee Valley Line as part of London Metro (long term).

The impact of the Lee Valley regeneration on the expansion of air traffic capacity at Stansted and vice versa are highlighted in chapter 4L of the Transport Strategy which links into the provision of further rail capacity on the Liverpool Street to Stansted rail line along the Lee Valley.

With regard to walking, the Lee Valley Walk is adopted by Transport for London, supported and promoted to contribute to the overall vision of the development of pan-London pedestrian routes. [Proposal 4I.6]
London Borough of Enfield Local Implementation Plan

7.1.20 Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) are to be produced by each of the London boroughs to set out how they will implement the Mayor’s Transport Strategy in their area. The plans are statutory documents required by the Greater London Authority Act 1999. They provide a mechanism for ensuring continued delivery of well-integrated transport improvements for London and for monitoring progress. Priorities such as safety and security, reducing traffic congestion, improved bus services, accessibility and local area initiatives will be addressed.

7.1.21 London Borough of Enfield’s LIP was approved by the Council in April 2005 and submitted to Transport for London (TfL) in December 2005 for comment and their response was received in March 2006. It also went out to Statutory and Public Consultation which ended in March 2006. With the process in an intermediate phase before publication of the final document, the policy review is based on the draft LIP as provided by LB Enfield.

7.1.22 As part of the Council’s strategy statement of “Putting Enfield First”, a series of objectives with regard to transport have been established. These cover:

- Transport provision;
- Accessibility;
- The environment;
- Freight;
- Safety;
- Partnership working;
- Travel awareness; and
- Implementation.

7.1.23 The LIP also defines LB Enfield’s priorities for investment in transport improvements. Projects of significance for the study area are:

- Securing better access to the M25 as part of the Northern Gateway Access Package (NGAP); and
- Securing better railway services for Enfield through the West Anglia Route Modernisation Enhancements (WARME) and Thameslink 2000 and improving safety at railway stations.

7.1.24 These major localised priorities are completed by general priorities to support accessibility and sustainable transport modes borough-wide:

- Ensuring that local transport services are accessible to disabled people, people with sensory impairment and people with mobility problems;
- Developing integrated routes and networks which enable easy access to key service provision points.
- Promoting walking and cycling to enable more people to travel safely within the borough.
- Ensuring transport improvements support employment initiatives;
- Promotion of public transport, cycling and walking to key employment sites.

London Borough of Haringey Local Implementation Plan

7.1.25 London Borough of Haringey has produced a draft Local Implementation Plan for consultation to demonstrate how their local transport plans and programmes will contribute to implementing the key priorities set by the Mayor. The LIP sets outs details of specific transport schemes up to March 2009 with indicative proposals for the two years after that. The document contains the Haringey Transport Strategy along with Plans for Parking, Walking, Cycling, Road Safety and School Travel Plans. The LIP also includes a Strategic Environmental Assessment to ensure that proposals are sustainable and will not damage the environment.

7.1.26 Following the public consultation period, the Final Draft LIP was submitted to TIL in September 2006 for approval.
The Transport Strategy (Chapter 3) sets out a series of objectives which cover the following issues:

- Strategic context;
- Transport and land use;
- Public transport;
- Roads;
- Traffic Management;
- Parking;
- Walking and cycling; and
- Freight.

7.2 TRANSPORT PATTERNS

Movement And Access Principles

7.2.1
In assessing the transport provision within the Central Leaside area it is important to consider the movement and access principles that will help create a positive social, economic and environmentally friendly community.

7.2.2
These will be examined in more detail in the option generation aspect of the study, however a brief overview is provided below.

Hierarchy of Modes

7.2.3
An important aspect of promoting any form of travel is to consider the appropriate hierarchy of modes. When establishing preferences for mode choice it is useful to start with the following hierarchy, based upon environmental and social considerations, even if in reality it may not always be practical in economic terms:

- Walking;
- Cycling;
- Public transport and walking;
- Public transport and cycling;
- Public transport and car
- Car sharing (2 or more in a car);
- One person in one car.

7.2.4
At a basic level, any movement and access strategy should seek to promote mode choice though this hierarchy, albeit within the constraints of local geography, economic sustainability and culture.

Wider Principles

7.2.5
More generally, the issues of land-use and transport planning should seek to create high levels of connectivity between relevant areas of social and economic activity. This process should be led through appropriate land-use designation and planning and supplemented through transport provision to provide necessary accessibility. Transport provision should be applied within the context of appropriate mode choice, not least because improvements in accessibility are likely to encourage increases in travel and so the impact should be minimised. Integration between modes is also key, particularly in terms of public transport, in order to promote efficient transport. Understanding local travel behaviour is particularly important in order to develop appropriate solutions that will be able to influence that behaviour.

7.2.6
Within the context of Central Leaside the diversity in economic activity between, residential, retail, industrial and leisure has, historically, been dealt with through a tendency to segregate areas into specific designations. Furthermore, links between these areas are often poor, which has the impact of re-enforcing this feeling of segregation. The area is also dominated by highway provision, with public transport, walking and cycling lower down the hierarchy.

7.2.7
The rest of this report outlines the issues surrounding travel patterns and the infrastructure and service provision by mode. This will provide the basis upon which to identify the key areas where connectivity can be enhanced and a more balanced provision of services can be implemented.

Transport Patterns

Travel Mode Split

7.2.8
In order to understand the usage of all modes for the CLAAP study area, CENSUS 2001 data is compared with the borough level data, North London borough and London average figures.

7.2.9
Two sets of travel-to-work data have been assessed, daytime population (UV37) and resident population (UV39), covering the population aged 16 to 74.
The daytime population is defined as those people who live and work in the area and those people who live outside the area and work inside the area. ‘No fixed place of work’ is counted as if working in the area. In comparison the resident population data sets reflect the usual resident population aged 16 to 74.

**Daytime Population**

The analysis from this data set is particularly relevant to the dominant employment land uses, i.e. to the east of Meridian Way (A1055), which reflects travel behaviour for this area. This is outlined in Table 24.

The analysis shows a very atypical travel profile for the local area and sub-region. Principally the study is highly car-dependent (71%) above the average borough levels and significantly above the London average.

In contrast public transport mode share (19%), though in line with the Enfield average with a comparable rail and bus service, is considerably smaller than for North London or London averages. This is mainly down to the unavailability of underground access within the study area. While bus travel (13%) is comparatively average, train travel (3%) is particularly low which can be interpreted as a function of the poor service frequencies at Angel Road, but also Northumberland Park and Ponders End just outside the CLAAP study area.

While cycling and motorcycling are on par with the average, walking is considerably lower than in the surrounding boroughs, on sub-regional and regional level.

The employment pattern among the daytime population of the area (which is highly industrialised) is reflected in the particularly low ‘work from home’ figure (2%), which is very low even in comparison to the overall Enfield levels. This can only be explained by the dominance of employees in manufacturing/ warehousing located east of Meridian Way (A1055) over the resident population potentially working from home along the west fringe of the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Study area average</th>
<th>LB Enfield average</th>
<th>LB Haringey average</th>
<th>North London average</th>
<th>London average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underground or DLR</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/C</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other modes total</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Driver</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Passenger</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Total</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work from Home</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Mode split comparison (1) (Source: Census 2001 Daytime Population Travel-to-work (UV37))
**Resident Population**

7.2.16
The resident population travel-to-work data set is relevant to the predominantly residential land uses, i.e. the west part of the study area, which reflects travel behaviour for this area. This is outlined in Table 25.

7.2.17
The resident population shows a travel profile very similar to the North London average travel patterns for all major mode groups, public transport, car-based travel, other modes and home working.

7.2.18
The commute by public transport (40%) is of higher importance for the resident population, partly commuting into central London with better public transport links, than for the daytime population who is expected to commute partly from outside the borough with an advantage for car travel. This is valid for underground (15%) and train travel (8%), but bus travel (17%) plays a minor role for the resident population. This is also reflected in the comparison with the sub-regional averages with tube travel being slightly less and bus travel being a slightly more popular mode of choice.

7.2.19
Complementing the high public transport mode split, travel by private car (43%) is less important, especially in comparison to its dominance for the daytime population. In the sub-regional context, the study area split is positioned between the North London and Haringey averages, but lower than the average car mode split in Enfield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Study area average</th>
<th>LB Enfield average</th>
<th>LB Haringey average</th>
<th>North London average</th>
<th>London average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underground or DLR</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/C</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other modes total</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Driver</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Passenger</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Total</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work from Home</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 25: Mode split comparison (2) (Source: Census 2001 Resident Population Travel-to-work (UV39))**
7.3 ROAD NETWORK

Highway Network

Strategic Connections

7.3.1 The North London sub-region contains strategic road infrastructure that supports both the local economic functionality of the region as well as providing connections to the wider London area and to the Stansted/Cambridge/Peterborough and Milton Keynes/Luton development Corridors.

7.3.2 Central Leaside is located along the strategic Stansted/Cambridge/Peterborough development corridor. The A10, to the west of the study area provides the primary strategic north-south connection from Central London to Junction 25 on the M25 and Hertfordshire beyond. The M11 can also be easily accessed via either the A10/M25, or the North Circular. The A1010, also to the west of the study area, provides a north–south route through Edmonton Green but does not offer direct access to the M25. To the east of the study area the A112 provides a connection up to Waltham Abbey and access towards Junction 26 on the M25.

7.3.3 Within the study area the A1055 provides a secondary-level strategic north-south connection to Tottenham Hale and Central London beyond, as well as to North East Enfield; however, it offers no direct access to the M25 (Figure 27).

7.3.4 The North Circular runs directly east – west through Central Leaside and represents the primary strategic orbital highway connector in the sub-region. It provides connections with Barnet and the west, as well as Waltham Forest and East London. The A110 provide secondary-level strategic east–west connections to the north of the study area; however there are no other east–west routes within the study area due to the presence of the William Girling, and Banbury Reservoirs and the WAR rail line. In this way the highway network mirrors that of the rail network (see section 7.4.13) with most provision on radial routes, running from Central London outwards. This lack of highway provision also impacts upon the bus network which offers few orbital routes (see section 7.4.44).

Local Access

7.3.5 Local highway access within Central Leaside is centred around the east-west North Circular and north-south A1055 corridors. The Cooks Wharf roundabout provides primary access from the North Circular to the Ely Estate as well as the Lea Valley Trading Estate. Vehicles can also access the Tesco/Ikea sites, although a second access is provided off the A1055. The A1055 also provides access to the Mowlem Trading Estate to the Southeast of the study area, as well as the northern end of Ely Estates and Picketts Lock to the north.

7.3.6 Access along the western side of the study area is restricted by the WAR rail line. Local bridge crossings from the A1055 are provided along Leeside Road, Conduit Lane and Picketts Lock Lane. In addition, an at-grade level crossing is provided at Northumberland Park Station; however, due the frequency of rail services along the WAR this crossing point is closed for long periods. Montagu Road provides local access to the residential and industrial areas within the northwest of the study area. Willoughby Lane and Northumberland Park provide access to The Royal London Estate in the southwest of the study area.

7.3.7 The River Lea Navigation and Flood Channels create further barriers to local vehicular access in and around the Ely and Lea Valley Trading Estates. On the east side of Ely Estates runs Lee Park Way, providing a connection between the North Circular and Picketts Lock. However, this is a private, gated road and so is currently has very low levels of traffic.

7.3.8 Signalised junctions are located along the A1055 at Marigold Road, Leeside Road and Picketts Lock Lane. An unsignalised roundabout provides connections to Conduit Lane. The North Circular has slip roads leading to the Kenninghall Junction with Montagu Road and the Cooks Wharf Roundabout.

7.3.9 Access roads within the local industrial estates are of varying standards, reflecting the manner in which they were created and adopted. In some instances the access roads are below local authority standards, although works have been undertaken recently in areas, such as the Ely Estate, to improve provision.
Accidents

7.3.10
Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data has been obtained for the 36 month period to 31 October 2006 for the study area [Please note any 2006 data is provisional and may be subject to change].

7.3.11
There were 256 accidents observed during the 36 month period, involving a total of 303 casualties. 2% of the incidents were classified as fatal (4), 20% serious and 79% slight. The results are shown in Tables 26 and 27 in numeric format and graphically in Figures 31, 32 and 33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident severity</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Accidents by fatality (Source: TfL Road Safety Unit)

7.3.12
While the greatest proportion of casualties being car drivers or passengers (81%), there were a significant share of motorcyclists (14%), pedestrians (10%), bus passengers (8%) and good vehicle drivers (7%) recorded as casualties.

7.3.13
Casualties from cyclists, taxis and other vehicles were less frequent, and all fell into the slight severity category. A high share of the all fatal and serious casualties was recorded for the most vulnerable road users, pedestrians (40%) and motorcyclists (44%). For both modes the share of severe and serious accidents within the overall accidents involving these modes is particularly high, representing the vulnerability of these road users. In comparison, only 14% of all accidents involving car users as casualties were either fatal or serious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Cyclist</th>
<th>M/C</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Taxi</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Goods vehicles</th>
<th>Other vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Casualty by fatality (Source: TfL Road Safety Unit)

7.3.14
The unusually high share of good vehicle driver casualties reflects the importance of goods vehicle traffic in the area and is a particular area to be targeted. The low importance of cycling in the CLAAP study area is also reflected in the PIA data set, accounting for a relatively low share of accidents, as well as being slight accidents. When addressing cycling in the area, the current low presence and hence little infrastructure for cyclists needs to be considered.

7.3.15
The geographical distribution of the accidents is biased towards the key A and B routes. Meridian Way (A1055) carried most accidents, in particular the severe and all four fatal accidents. The Lea Valley Viaduct (A406) carries a similar share of accidents reflecting the high traffic volumes.

7.3.16
Montagu Road carries a smaller share of accidents which are mostly slight. In general accidents are evenly spread along the two corridors. The junction of Conduit Lane and Angel Road (A406) is the junction with the highest concentration of accidents within the CLAAP study area.

7.3.17
Minor accident hotspots are located at the access to Pickets Lock, around the Montagu Road Industrial Estate and concentrations around all junctions off Meridian Way (A1055).
Figure 28: Accident map (1) (Source: TfL Road Safety Unit)

Figure 29: Accident map (2) (Source: TfL Road Safety Unit)
Congestion

7.3.18
Congestion is a key issue within the area with a number of junctions that suffer from severe delays during peak periods. The key issue surrounds the absence of any connections from the north east corner of Enfield to either Waltham Forest, Hertfordshire, or, importantly, the M25. There is currently no link from the A1055 to either the A112 or the M25 which means that all traffic wishing to travel north, east or to access the M25 must travel along the A1055 and use the A1010, the A110 or the A10, respectively.

7.3.19
Resident surveys have indicated that traffic congestion is a high concern within the London Borough of Enfield. Furthermore the perception of traffic congestion affects the image of the area and the level of inward investment.

The North Circular

7.3.20
The section of the North Circular through Central Leaside is generally relatively free-flowing as all the junctions within the local areas are designed as flyovers, with off and on-slip roads. To the east the first at-grade junction is beyond the A10 at the junction with the A105. To the west there are no at-grade junctions till well beyond the junction with the M11.

7.3.21
Given the strategic importance of the route as an east – west connector, flows along the route can be very heavy and, as a result, congestion does occur further east. This has been subject to improvement plans for some time. TfL has produced detailed plans for a road safety and environmental improvement scheme at Bounds Green. This will involve alterations to junction operations, as well as introductions of bus, cycle and pedestrian facilities, amongst other issues. The LB Haringey, whilst not objecting to the scheme, considers that further enhancements could be incorporated. It is understood that LB Enfield also has concerns regarding the scheme.

Connections between the North Circular and the A1055 are convoluted via Conduit Lane. Delays can occur along this route at the signalised junctions.

Congestion along the A1055 corridor

7.3.23
There are at-grade junctions along the A1055 at Marigold Road, Leaside Road, Conduit Lane and Pickets Lock. All of these, with the exception of Conduit Lane, are signalised junctions with priority given to north – south flows along the A1055. The junction with Leeside Road is currently being re-developed to improve operation.

7.3.24
Just to the north of the study area there is a major junction between the A1055 and the A110. Significant delays occur along the A1055 backing-up from this junction in the peak periods.
To the south of the study area, the A1055 ultimately joins the Tottenham Hale Gyratory, which again has heavy traffic flows and delays are experienced during peak periods. It is understood that TfL have major plans for the gyratory, including the possible introduction of two-way workings alongside restricted routes for buses, although these have yet to be confirmed.

Delay at Level Crossings

One further area where delays occur is at the level crossing at Northumberland Park Stations. Due to the high volume of rail services that use the WAR this crossing is closed to vehicular traffic for a considerable proportion of each hour (up to 50%). As a result this route is little used due to the alternative option of Leeside Road with a bridge over the WAR.

Northern Gateway Access Package (NGAP)

Historic

The Northern Gateway Access Package (NGAP) is a long standing proposal, supported by the LB Enfield, aimed at improving access from the northeast of Enfield to the strategic road network, namely the M25. Currently access to the M25 from the areas is via either the North Circular / A10 or the North Circular / A112. The A10 route, in particular suffers from high level of congestion in North Enfield. The described benefits of the proposed new route were therefore to provide enhanced access to the employments areas along the A1055 corridor as well as to reduce congestion.

Various proposals were assessed linking the A1055 across to A121 in Waltham Forest and ultimately the M25. A major issue surrounding the route is the location of the designated nature reserve, Ramey Marsh, between the A1055 and A121. This area is Green Belt and contains environmentally sensitive habitats. Despite this the formative assessment work culminated in the submission of a planning application in 2001; however it was ultimately rejected at public enquiry as the case for investment was not considered good enough by Central Government, in terms of regeneration benefits, to outweigh the environmental impacts.

At that time the LB Enfield remained of the view that the regeneration benefits of the scheme were considerably higher than allowed for by Central Government and that the special circumstances surrounding the project justified the construction on Green Belt land. The LB Enfield also maintained that the wider package of transport initiatives that supported the NGAR proposal would also improve local access and are deliverable.

A second option considered was a direct link from A1055 to a new junction on the M25. This concluded that there were a number of technical issues relating to the distance between the proposed new M25 junction and Junction 25 (less than 2km between slip roads) that made it infeasible. In addition, the Highways Agency (HA) did not consider that an additional link to the M25 offered value for money given the low number of freight and vehicular trips. Furthermore, the HA only consider new junctions off motorways if they are [i] a strategic rural road; [ii] a link to another major new piece of transport infrastructure [e.g. Heathrow T5 spur] or [iii] service stations.

Current Considerations

Access improvements to the M25 remain a priority for the LB Enfield, although there are currently no firm proposals. It is understood the borough officers have been working with Transport for London, the London Development Agency and the Greater London Authority. A key element to taking the project forward would be the support of the Mayor Office. This would then provide the basis upon which to re-open consultation procedure with the Highways Agency to address their concerns over the provision of an additional access to the M25.

There are, in addition, a number of opportunities that lend themselves to re-establishing the debate surrounding this issue including the Highways Agencies own investigations into widening the M25, alongside the gradual regeneration process for the area.

The planning and regeneration benefits for the wider Enfield area remain the central case for the proposals. It is generally acknowledged that NGAP would provide substantial decongestion benefits along Bullsmoor Road, however it is demonstrating the scale of the impact on the local economy that will ultimately provide the additional benefits that outweigh the perceived environmental and investment costs.
7.3.34
In the event that NGAP were to proceed on some level, then it is likely to have implications regarding traffic flows along both the A1010 and the A1055. The A1055 is likely to become a more strategically important route, given that it would provide access to the M25. Conversely, through traffic along the A1010 may reduce, or at least, there may be the opportunity to introduce measures along the A1010 to enhance it as a pedestrian and community environment, with less car dominance.

7.3.35
On the A1055, although some sections are dual-carriageway, there are a number of pinch-points which may be affected by increased traffic volumes. Notably, the route narrows as it approaches the junction with Ordnance Road and Enfield Island Village. It may be the case that upgrade works would also have to be carried out along the A1055. LB Haringey has expressed concerns regarding the scheme and the impact it may have upon traffic flows down the A1055 to the Tottenham Hale Gyratory. The Council would require further investigative work to be undertaken that demonstrates that the impacts can be mitigated before they would consider supporting the scheme.

7.3.36
A further consideration is the potential 4-tracking of the WAR rail line [discussed in Section 7.4.29] and the likelihood that vehicular bridges over the rail lines would be introduced. This is likely to change the dynamics of vehicle route choice within the area and would need to be considered as part of any NGAP appraisal.

Impact upon Central Leaside
7.3.37
The impact of NGAP upon Central Leaside is likely to be two-fold. It will provide direct access from the A1055 northwards to Junction 26 of the M25 and therefore reduce journey times from areas, such as Eley’s Estate. However, strategic access enhancements from the area would only be incremental as the area already has access to the M11 and M25 Junction 6 via the North Circular. The secondary impact could be considerably higher flows of traffic along the A1055 that could increase congestion on the route, in particular at key junctions such as Tottenham Hale Gyratory. This impact requires further analysis to understand the potential scale.

Parking
Policy
7.3.38
The LB Enfield has twenty parking objectives that provide guidance for parking management in the Borough. Policies P1-P9 and P12-P15 relate to the level and standard of provision.

7.3.39
The LB Haringey has a Parking and Enforcement Plan (PEP) to provide a strong policy framework to guide the Council’s parking management activities. The PEP reflects the core objectives of the Transport Strategy, namely:

- be comprehensive, including consideration of parking provision, charging regimes, on-street controls and parking standards;
- be co-ordinated and compatible with surrounding authorities;
- provide a clear strategy for effective enforcement;
- support the economic viability of town centres, whilst reducing the overall availability of long-stay parking;
- ensure that the needs of disabled people, motorcycles, buses, coaches, business and freight are taken into account, along with loading and signing issues in relation to parking; and
- demonstrate how the provision, location, safety and security of public car parks will deliver the objectives of the strategy.

Controlled Parking Zones
7.3.40
There are no Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) within the Central Leaside AAP area. Both LB Enfield and LB Haringey do operate CPZ’s, however the closest localities are in Palmers Green, Tottenham Hale and Seven Sisters, all of which are considered to be out-with the sphere of influence of the AAP area.

Pay and Display
7.3.41
There is currently no pay and display parking operating within the Central Leaside AAP area, or in nearby areas.
Car Park Provision

7.3.42
Off Street parking is provided in the Council’s Pay & Display car parks throughout the borough of Enfield. The charging period is 0730-1830 Mondays to Saturdays. However, there are no public car parks of note within the AAP boundary. Areas such as Edmonton Green and Bruce Grove, on the periphery of the AAP, do have car parking provision for shoppers. In addition, large-scale car parking is provided in association with the retail outlets of Tesco and Ikea.

Freight

Overview

7.3.43
The high volume of B8 land uses in the AAP study boundary results in freight being of significant importance for the study. Industrial sites are located all along the North Circular and A1055, including Ely Estates, Brimsdown, Innova Park and Freezy Water. In addition the Cambridge Road industrial Site is located just to the west of the study area.

7.3.44
Freight policy is directed at a strategic level from the North London sub-area perspective. Measures are sought to assist freight access to the regeneration areas of North London with a key consideration the current level of congestion and the impact this has upon private sector investment in the sub-region. The sub-regional transport priorities make a commitment to prevent this by “establishing Quality Freight Partnerships that deliver local solutions to the local economy, seek out sustainable means of freight movement incorporating road, rail and water and improve access to regeneration areas”.

Freight Quality Partnerships

7.3.45
Although Freight Quality Partnerships (FQP) have been introduced in Enfield, notably within Brismdown, there are currently none with the Central Leaside AAP study area. A FQP aims to encourage best practice in environmentally sensitive, economic, safe and efficient freight transport through a process of communication. They are a mixture of management procedures and infrastructural schemes that serve the needs of a group of businesses. In essence they provide a framework mechanism to solve localised freight transport problems. Proposed projects are generally centred around Access and Infrastructure or Cooperation and Information initiatives. However, the experience from areas like Brimsdown indicate they tend more to act as a forums for focussing issues surrounding freight in the area, rather than delivering specific initiatives.

Future Enhancements

7.3.46
Improving to future freight movements are likely to be on two fronts. The first is directly related to highway improvements in the area to provide both enhanced local access and improved strategic links. Whilst the North Circular provides good orbital links there are issues with congestion, which are being addressed at a sub-regional level. North – South strategic access is restricted by congestion around access to the M25 at Junction 25. The NGAP scheme remains a potential solution to this by providing a more direct route to Junction 26 on the M25.

7.3.47
Conversely, the second aspect of future freight movement is to look at ways of minimising the impact of freight on the local highway network, either through initiatives led through the FQP’s or by promoting alternative modes, either waterways or rail.
7.4 PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Public Transport Accessibility

7.4.1
PTALs, or ‘Public Transport Accessibility Levels’ were developed by the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham as an aid to decisions about the suitability of specific sites for redevelopment at different densities, and is now widely used across London. It differs from the other accessibility models and planning tools, in that it deals only with accessibility of public transport at a point and not between places – it takes no account of where access is provided to, and is thus only useful in areas with dense and comprehensive public transport networks, such as the London metropolitan area.

7.4.2
Public transport accessibility is measured through a combination of factors. A score is achieved through an assessment of proximity and frequency of all available public transport services (including buses as well as rail and tube services) from a certain locality. It uses a set formula, which takes into account: walk time to nearby public transport services, the number of services available, average waiting time and service reliability. The location’s relative PTAL score is produced on a scale between 1 and 6, where 1 is the lowest provision and 6 is the highest. The highest score of 6 can normally be found around important London interchanges where tube, rail and bus services intersect.

7.4.3
The study area has a very poor public transport accessibility throughout (levels 1a and 1b: see Figure 14), which is largely determined by the low service frequencies of services stopping at Ponders End (just north of the CLAAP area), Angel Road and Northumberland Park (just south of the CLAAP area). None of these station has a positive impact on the PTAL values along the Liverpool Street – Stansted – Peterborough rail line (Figure 31).

7.4.4
There is no notable contrast between the individual sections of the study area. The exception is Pickets Lock which is served by bus routes from Edmonton Green. The latter has a positive effect on this localised area where the PTAL raised to level 2.

Station Access

7.4.5
Local access to the rail network is a critical aspect of improving general levels of accessibility.

Northumberland Park

7.4.6
Northumberland Park is located within the Central Leaside AAP. Access is provided at ground level from Marsh Lane, just of Willoughby Lane. Marsh Lane crosses the WAR via a level crossing. Each platform is accessible from the respective sides of the level crossing. Pedestrians can also cross over the rail line via a footbridge immediately adjacent to the level crossing, when the crossing is closed. However, the footbridge is accessed via stairs only and is steep. A second footbridge, within the rail station, is located further along the platform.

Angel Road

7.4.7
Angel Road Station is located off Conduit Lane and is adjacent to the junction with the A1055, Meridian Way. Station access is extremely convoluted as, despite being less than 15 metres to the west of the A1055, there is no at-grade access to the station. Instead passengers are required to walk up Conduit Lane (a flyover that passes over the WAR), descend steps on the north side of the bridge before walking south, back under the flyover, and down further steps to ground level. Passengers must then walk 150 metres along a metre-wide fenced walkway to reach the northbound platform. Passengers wishing to travel southbound must then use the footbridge provided to cross over to the opposite side. All footbridges are accessed via stairways only ensuring that the station definitively does not have step-free access.

Ponders End

7.4.8
Ponders End Station is located outside the Central Leaside AAP boundary but is the closest station to the north travelling north from the study area up the A1055. The main access to Ponders End Station Access is from South Street. A small car park is located outside the main station building. There is step-free access to the northbound platform and there is a ramp and stairs leading to an overbridge to reach the southbound platform.
7.4.9
The station is also accessible from the east side of the A1055 via a footbridge that connects in with the station overbridge (i.e. there is no at-grade access to the southbound platform). Again ramps and stairs lead up to the A1055 crossing. The station is not officially designated as having step-free access, even though in practice all platforms can be access via ramps. It is likely that the design of the ramps to cross over the rail lines is not of the required standard and not suitable for all users.

**Edmonton Green**

7.4.10
Edmonton Green Station is located outside the Central Leaside AAP boundary but represents the closest station to the northeast of the area. Residents off the Montagu Road area might potentially use this station. The station is located on Church Street just off the junction with The Broadway and The Green. The rail line is raised at this point crossing over the top of Church Road. Access to the platforms is therefore via stairways.

**Silver Street**

7.4.11
Silver Street Station is located outside the Central Leaside AAP boundary but is, technically, within walking distance of the west of the area, although, in practice, it is unlikely to be used by many inhabitants. Access is off Stirling Way, next to the junction with Victoria Road. The A406 runs directly underneath the station in an underpass. The rail line is raised at this point crossing over the top of Stirling Road. Access to the platforms is therefore via stairways.

**Highams Park**

7.4.12
Highams Park Station is located outside the Central Leaside AAP boundary but is the closest station to the east of the area; however it is unlikely to be used by many inhabitants as it is beyond the walking catchment area. The station is accessed from the east of The Avenue and is at ground level. A footbridge provides access to the northbound platform.

**Rail Network**

7.4.13
There is only one rail line running through Central Leaside. This is the West Anglia Route (WAR) main line that operates north-south between Liverpool Street and Stansted, Cambridge and Peterborough. This route combines both strategic high speed rail connections alongside local services.

7.4.14
A second line, the Southbury Loop, runs north-south to the west of the study area which is, in effect, a branch line off the WAR between Hackney Downs and Cheshunt. The line is primarily used for services between Liverpool Street and Enfield Town, however some services also run from Liverpool Street to Cheshunt stopping at Southbury and Turkey Street. In some limited instances, stations on this line will offer the closest available services for travellers in Central Leaside.

7.4.15
A third rail line runs north – south to the east of the study area, offering services between London Liverpool Street and Chingford. However, the closest station, Highams Park, is a significant distance from the area and so travellers are unlikely to use the station in preference to either other rail services or bus services.

7.4.16
All three rail lines run services operated by One Railways.

**Liverpool Street – Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough**

7.4.17
There are two WAR stations within the Central Leaside AAP study area: Northumberland Park and Angel Road, with a third station Ponders End located just to the north of the area. All three are part of the local rail service network with services running to Liverpool Street and Stratford. The Stansted Express and Cambridge / Peterborough services do not stop at any of the stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Service Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 trains per hour*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 trains per day†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponders End</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 trains per peak hour†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Train Service Frequencies – West Anglia Route Stations in Central Leaside

*only 1 tph during inter-peak period
†maximum of 2 train per peak hour but no services between 10am and 15.30
†only 2 tph during inter-peak period
Figure 31: PTAL Mapping (Source: TfL)
7.4.19
The train frequencies for Northumberland Park, Angel Road and Ponders End are not considered to be representative of a high quality inter-urban rail service and do not compare well to comparative frequencies on the Underground Lines that serve north London. Angel Road in particular has a very poor level of service with no train calling at the station between 10am and 15.30pm.

7.4.20
The reason for the low service frequencies is that none of the fast Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough services stop at these stations and there is insufficient track capacity to provide more stopping services. If frequencies at Tottenham Hale (served by Stansted Express) are examined in comparison we observe that ten services per hour stop at this interchange. This demonstrates the volumes of rail services that currently pass through Northumberland Park, Angel Road and Ponders End without stopping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Annual Station Entry / Exist Counts (2005)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Park</td>
<td>73,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Road</td>
<td>17,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponders End</td>
<td>126,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Usage – West Anglia Route Stations in Central Leaside

7.4.22
Ponders End is the busiest station of the three, reflecting the higher service frequency at the station and the greater housing density within the catchment area. However, at less than 150,000 annual trips it is extremely low for London. Annual entries/exists at Angel Road represent only around 50 trips per average weekday. This places Angel Road 604th out of 609 London stations in terms of levels of patronage and the lowest in North London.

Southbury Loop
7.4.23
There are no stations on the Southbury Loop that are within the Central Leaside AAP study area, however, Silver Street and Edmonton Green are located around 1km to the west of the study area boundary. Table 30 below presents the service frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Service Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 trains per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Green</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 trains per hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Train Service Frequencies – Southbury Loop Stations in Central Leaside

7.4.24
The frequency of services calling at Silver Street and Edmonton Green is relatively high as it benefits from services heading to Enfield Town as well as those travelling further north to Cheshunt. Table 31 below presents the station usage data for Southbury and Turkey Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Annual Station Entry / Exist Counts (2005)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver Street</td>
<td>256,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Green</td>
<td>1,152,519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Station Usage – Southbury Loop Stations in Central Leaside

7.4.25
The entry / exit volume at Edmonton Green is relatively high for a sub-regional rail station, certainly within North London. This reflects the town centre status of Edmonton Green.

Chingford Lane
7.4.26
Whilst there are no stations on the Chingford Line that the Central Leaside AAP study area, it is the closest rail provision to the east. Highams Park Station is located on this line, albeit considerably beyond the walk catchment area to the east of the AAP area. Table 32 shows service frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Service Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highams Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 trains per hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Train Service Frequencies – Chingford Line Stations in Central Leaside
Table 33: Station Usage – Chingford Line Stations in Central Leaside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Annual Station Entry / Exist Counts (2005)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highams Park</td>
<td>1,220,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4.27 Table 33 below presents the station usage data for Highams Park.

7.4.28 The entry / exit volumes at Highams Park is, again, relatively high for a sub-regional rail station within North London. This reflects the residential and development density within the area.

Potential Developments

7.4.29 There has been a long-held aspiration to increase the level of rail provision along the WAR. The basic concept is to increase capacity and to reduce journey times by providing two extra tracks alongside the existing trackbed, i.e.: 4-tracking.

7.4.30 The concept of WAR 4-tracking has the support of both Network Rail and Transport for London; however there are a series of issues that need to be resolved before the scheme could be progressed. TfL have recently completed an assessment of the scheme requirements, including outline costings that place the overall funding requirement in the region of £1.1 billion. A phased approach to increasing capacity is proposed with an initial scheme to introduce higher capacity rolling stock, followed by longer trains. Four tracking between Broxbourne and south of Tottenham Hale would then take place between 2016 and 2026 allowing an increase in the level of local services.

7.4.31 The analysis to date indicates that there is the potential to increase the number of local services that stop at Ponders End, Brimsdown, and Enfield Lock to 8 trains per hour, although most of the additional services would operate via Stratford and would only terminate at Liverpool Street if additional track capacity was available after the completion of Crossrail 1.

7.4.32 Network Rail’s aspirations for the route will be outlined within the WAR RUS, which is due to be published by the end of February 2007.

7.4.33 The third key player within the development of the WAR is BAA. The proposed expansion of Stansted Airport to include a second runway will have significant capacity issues for the route to and from London. To date, BAA have not detailed any specific allowance for surface access improvements within their proposals, however they are part of the wider consultative stakeholder group for the WAR.

7.4.34 It is not possible to 4-track the whole length of the route from Liverpool Street out to Broxborough as there are particular issues in the southern section once out of Liverpool Street with pinch-points through Bethnal Green, London Fields, Cambridge Heath up to Hackney Downs. The Upper Lee Valley therefore offers the most potential for 4-tracking and could be used as a series of passing loops.

7.4.35 Level crossings also remain an issue and, indeed, 4-tracking considerably exacerbates the problem by increasing the number of services that run along the rail corridor to an almost continuous stream. As such, the only realistic solution would be to replace the level crossings with bridges. Studies assessing the scope for accommodating new bridges at Northumberland Park, as well as Brimsdown and Enfield Lock to the north, concluded that it would require both land-take and property-take, thus considerably adding to the cost. The replacement of the level crossings with vehicular bridges is also likely to have an impact upon route choice amongst motorists as delays along Marsh lane, Marigold Road will be significantly reduced. The impact that this has upon the overall road network would need to be considered carefully.

7.4.36 The additional capacity that would be created through the WAR 4-tracking could be utilised in a number of ways. Each option provides a varying degree of extra public transport provision and accessibility to the ULV as well as a range of alternative destinations of travel.
Figure 32: Bus Services
**Bus Network**

7.4.37 The bus network in the wider Central Leeside area is dominated by services running north–south along the A1010 between Waltham Cross, Edmonton Green and Seven Sisters. This bus corridor, however, outside the AAP area, although does remain within the walk catchment of the western boundary. Levels of bus services within the AAP boundary are relatively low, although they are dispersed across a number of routes. Routes run along the North Circular, Lansdowne Road, Northumberland Park, Montagu Road, Bounces Road and parts of the A1055 (Figure 32).

7.4.38 Table 34 provides a breakdown of bus routes along with the frequency of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Via</th>
<th>Frequency (AM Peak Hour in each direction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Barnet to Walthamstow</td>
<td>North Circular</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Brent Cross to Edmonton Green</td>
<td>A1010</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Muswell Green to Edmonton Green</td>
<td>A1010</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>London Bridge to Edmonton Green</td>
<td>A1010</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Brimsdown to Edmonton</td>
<td>Carterhatch Ln / A1010</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Tottenham Hale to Edmonton Green</td>
<td>A1055 / Montagu Road</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Kings Cross Road to Edmonton Green</td>
<td>A1010</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Waltham Cross to Manor House</td>
<td>A1010</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Nrnth Middlesex to Stamford Hill Brdwy</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Lower Marsh to Tesco / Ikea</td>
<td>Northumberland Park</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Southbury Stn to Northwold Road</td>
<td>A1010</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Crooked Billet to Debden</td>
<td>Chingford Mount</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Chingford to Turnpike Lane</td>
<td>North Circular / Hall Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: Bus Routes and Service Frequencies in and around Central Leaside (continued overleaf)

7.4.39 The contrast in service provision between the A1010 and the A1055 is highly distinguishable, reflecting the economic nature of the two corridors: A1010 – residential / retail; A1055 – industrial. There are in excess of 50 peak hour buses that run north–south along the A1010 between Silver Street and Edmonton Green. In comparison only 6 peak hour buses run along the A1055 from Tottenham Hale to Angel Road, with no services running any further north along that route. Furthermore, the penetration of these bus services into the industrial estates is all but non-existent.
Service | Route | Via | Frequency (AM Peak Hour in each direction)
--- | --- | --- | ---
476 | Euston to Northumberland Park | Lansdowne Road | 5
491 | Nth Middlesex Hspt to Waltham Cross | A1010 | 2
W3 | Finsbury Park to Northumberland Park | Northumberland Park | 9
W6 | Southgate to Edmonton Green | Edmonton Green | 7
W8 | Chase Farm Hspt to Picketts Lock | Bounces Road | 8

Table 35: Bus Routes and Service Frequencies in and around Central Leaside (continued from previous)

7.4.40 The main east – west provision is along the North Circular with around 12 peak hour services. Again, however, these services do not generally penetrate the industrial areas along the corridor and access to bus stops can be convoluted. A number of bus services run either two or past Northumberland Park. In addition, there are some routes that serve development sites such as Tesco / IKEA (491) site and the new athletics track to the north of Pickets Lock (W8).

Constraints and Future Developments

7.4.41 There has long been an aspiration to enhance the provision of orbital bus services across North London; however, to date London Buses has not prioritised investment in this area. With all the major rail corridors in the sub-region leading into and out from Central London there is a clear opportunity to enhance public transport integration by providing orbital bus services that connect to the major rail interchanges.

7.4.42 Furthermore, the natural barriers to movement between Enfield/Haringey and Waltham Forest created by the reservoirs and waterways have restricted potential cross-borough economic activity with higher frequency bus services and more varied route options a means of stimulus.

7.4.43 At a more local level east – west movement is not as problematic as it is further north in the borough of Enfield due to a higher number road bridges over the WAR. As well as the North Circular, bus routes run over the WAR on Leaside Road, Conduit Lane and Picketts Lock Lane. Despite this there is still an identified need to enhance bus provision between the industrial areas along the A1055 and residential areas further west, as well as the sub-regional town centres, such as Edmonton Green and Tottenham Hale.
7.5 WALKING, CYCLING AND OTHER MODES

Walking Network

7.5.1 Central Leaside has a relatively unstructured walking environment with a combination of ad-hoc industrial areas, new car-orientated development sites, river paths and residential areas. In addition, major road and rail infrastructure create significant barriers to pedestrian movement.

7.5.2 Connectivity between areas is generally very poor with often extremely convoluted pedestrian routes and a sense of dominance of the car. And yet, through the centre of the AAP area runs the River Lea Navigation, a potentially highly significant asset upon which to develop and encourage walking within the area. The area, whilst predominantly industrial and development land at present, does have the potential for a wider variety of uses utilising the open spaces in and around the Lee Valley Park. This potential diversity in uses creates a unique challenge to establish facilities that serve a multitude of users and provide connectivity between areas.

Strategic Walk

7.5.3 Lee Valley Walk that runs north-south alongside the River Lee Navigation provides an excellent recreational environment. The walk integrates with the London Loop further north in Enfield.

7.5.4 Pymmes Brook Trail from Edmonton Green through to either Lea Valley Leisure Centre or Pickett’s Lock following the route of the brook. Here it connects in with the Lea Valley Walk.

Barriers to pedestrian movement

7.5.5 There are a considerable number of barriers to pedestrian movement within the AAP area, including rail lines, waterways and the strategic highway network.

7.5.6 The WAR rail line creates a major barrier to east-west pedestrian movements. There are four vehicular bridges within the AAP area (Leaside Road, North Circular, Conduit Lane, Pickett’s Lock Lane; see Figure 12), which provide access for pedestrians as well, however only one of these can really be considered as an appropriate pedestrian environment (Leaside Road). The North Circular is obviously a busy vehicular route, Conduit Lane is also designed primarily for vehicles, with only a single footpath on the northern edge. Picketts Lock Lane was again designed primarily as a vehicular route but has a poorly designed pedestrian walkway suspended on the side.

7.5.7 In addition to the pedestrian bridges there is also a level crossing facility at Northumberland Park. However, this facility spends a disproportionate period of time closed due to the extremely high volume of rail services utilising the WAR. A pedestrian bridge is provided alongside the level crossing but is of poor design and only accessible via step stairways.

7.5.8 There are no other pedestrian bridges over the WAR within the APP area. However, beyond the study area, one is located at Ponders End Station to the north, whilst to the south a footbridge provides access between the A1055 and Shelbourne Way. There is also an at-grade, uncontrolled crossing point from the A1055 across to the Montagu Recreation Ground; however this is clearly not designed for high volumes of pedestrian movements.

7.5.9 The impact of the highway network on pedestrian movement in the area is considerable. The North Circular is a major two-lane dual carriageway which dissects the heart of Central Leaside. What’s more the route continually changes height between flyovers and at-grade sections. Pedestrian are restricting from crossing the road except where dedicated facilities are provided. At the flyover sections, in and around the A1055 and as the North Circular passes over the River Lea Navigation, pedestrians are able to walk underneath, although often in pretty poor and unsafe environments. A pedestrian footbridge is also provided between Angel Road and Argon Road linking the Ely Estate with the Tesco / Ikea site.
7.5.10 The A1055 corridor runs alongside the WAR rail line for much of the time and so facilities like the Conduit Lane and Picketts Road bridges provide access over both barriers at once. Further south along the corridor at-grade crossing facilities are provided at signalised junctions.

7.5.11 The waterways within the Lee Valley Park, whilst providing a means to attract people to the area, also create barriers to movement. The park is characterised by a large number of water channels that run north-south with varying purposes and degrees of attractiveness. A number of flood alleviation channels, designed with hard concrete banks, are not utilised as leisure attractors and so simply create a barrier to accessing the main River Lee Navigation and the rest of the park.

7.5.12 Within the Central Leaside Area there are some footpaths that provide routes across the open space to the south of the William Girling Reservoir. Bridges are provided across all the separate waterways but the routes are generally circuitous and follow tight boundaries rather than travelling as the crow flies. Furthermore, the paths are very narrow with 6ft palisade fencing on either side that create a claustrophobic environment.

7.5.13 The William Girling Reservoir itself is a further major barrier to movement. This negates the opportunity to move east-west between Edmonton Green and Chingford. Likewise further south the Banbury Reservoir also provides a barrier to east – west movement. Currently, there are also no access routes between the Banbury and Lockwood Reservoirs. This will be rectified when the bridge is re-opened after strengthening works. However, this would still not provide a direct route from Northumberland Park / Marigold Road across to Billet Road.

Future enhancements

7.5.14 Any future enhancements to the pedestrian infrastructure clearly need to be incorporated within the wider development plans for the area; however a key aspect will be to reduce the barriers to pedestrian movements presented by the rail lines, waterways and highway network. The aim should be to creating well-connected pedestrian corridors that link key public facilities and provide access between residential, industrial and open spaces, as well as to public transport facilities.

Cycling Network

7.5.15 Central Leaside has a number of cycle routes that run through it, however, they tend to focus upon north – south connections with poor east – west provision. The environment for cycling is also mixed ranging from routes alongside ‘green’ sections of the river, river sections through industrial estates, dedicated cycleways alongside main roads, and cycle connection under bridges and flyovers.

7.5.16 Signage through the area is not always clear cut and more could be made of the opportunities for recreational cycling.

National Cycle Network (NCN) / Regional Cycle Network (RCN)

7.5.17 No regional cycling routes penetrate North London, but the National Cycle Route No. 1 follows the Lee Valley connecting the north of London to the south and west via the Isle of Dogs.

London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+) and other cycle routes

7.5.18 Whilst North London is integrated into the London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+) the overall cycling route network is not as dense as in other sub-regions. Enfield, in particular, is less well covered.

7.5.19 The A1055 is part of the LCN+ network and has dedicated traffic-free cycle routes along the majority of its length. Within the AAP boundary the A1055 has a segregated cycle lane running along the west side of the road up to Leeside Road and then on the east side all the way up to Ponders End and beyond.
The North Circular has sporadic provision of cycleways with some segregated sections to the east. The generally environment though is poor for cyclists and access routes can be convoluted. Cycle provision is included along Conduit Lane providing a connection between the A1055 and the North Circular.

**Barriers to cycling**

The majority of issues described regarding to barriers to pedestrian movement (Section 7.5.5) also relate to cycling. However, in a number of cases the problems are even worse. For example, ins some cases the existing rail line crossings are not designed for cyclists. In particular, the level crossing at Northumberland Park has no dedicated cycle facilities i.e. no ramps to the overbridge or subways. Furthermore, the road bridge on Picketts Lock Lane, whilst having cycle lanes leading up to the bridge, does not have them on the bridge itself due to the heavily restricted width, making cycling hazardous.

The North Circular creates a major barrier to cycling in the area. Not only does it provide a barrier to north–south movement but it also has limited cycle facilities along it making east–west movements difficult. Whilst it is possible to utilise local access roads alongside the North Circular, there are a number of instances where connectivity between areas is poor.

A number of the access points to Lee Valley Park are also restrictive for cyclists, with convoluted gates, designed to prevent motorbikes accessing the park, meaning that cyclist must dismount and slowly negotiate the barrier. The footpath that runs from the River Lea Navigation across the open space to the south of the Girling Reservoir to Hall Lane is very narrow and creates conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists.

**Future enhancements**

Taking a holistic approach to cycling within the Central Leaside would provide greater connectivity across the area and help to re-address the balance of modes, currently dominated by car. Prioritised routes through the industrial areas along with dedicated infrastructure should be considered to raise the profile of cycling. An opportunity exists to build upon the natural assets provided by the waterway. This can only be achieved through improving access to Lea Valley Park and creating distinct cycle routes that connect in with National Cycle Route 1. Clear signage is a key area to address, particularly through the industrial estates, in order to encourage recreational cyclists to the area.

Providing enhanced east-west cycle connections would also help create a more integrated cycle network within the area. This is likely to require improvements along the North Circular corridor and crossing facilities over the rail lines and waterways. Providing more prominent routes leading to the regional town centres of Edmonton Green and Tottenham Hale could also be a way of helping to reduce the dependency on highway trips for accessing these areas.

**Other Modes**

**Waterways**

The other key potential mode of transport within the Central Leaside area relates to the waterways. At present the Lee Valley Navigation is a highly underutilised asset, in the main due to the lack of wharfing infrastructure that is in place, either locally or further up/down stream.

However, there are a number of initiatives underway elsewhere along the River Lea, including using barges to transport waste. The use of the waterways to transport construction materials as part of the Olympic project has also been considered.
At present none of the industry located alongside the Lea Navigation in Picketts Lock, Ely Estates, Lea Valley, or Hastingwood Trading Estates interact in any way with the waterfront, let alone consider it to be a potential transport mode. Similarly it is not an area that British Waterways have pursued intensively. It should, however, be considered as an important aspect within the potential development strategy of the area.

7.6 ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Summary

7.6.1
Central Leaside is currently characterised by the following transport and movement issues and opportunities:

- High dependency upon car use (> Haringey and London average and >= Enfield average)
- Good access to the east – west strategic highway network, although no direct connection to M25
- Restricted local highway network, with particular barriers to movement including WAR, North Circular and Waterways
- Some restrictions in freight access due to highway congestion leading to M25, although direct access to M11.
- There are no local freight initiatives
- Poor public transport accessibility throughout the area
- Highly infrequent rail services along the WAR, with subsequently negligible rail patronage
- Potential WAR upgrade would provide significantly more local rail services
- Bus network dominated along the A1010, which is outwith the AAP area, with minimal services along the North Circular and A1055 and poor penetration of industrial estates. Some services connecting to local town centres of Edmonton Green and Tottenham Hale / Seven Sisters;
- Walking and cycling network is incomplete, with significant barriers to movement created by the rail, waterway and road network;
- Opportunities to utilise the waterways to transport freight and for leisure purposes.
08 Conclusions

'We want towns and cities and suburbs which offer a high quality of life and opportunity for all, not just the few... people shaping the future... living in attractive, well-kept towns and cities... good design and planning which makes it practical to live in a more environmentally sustainable way... towns and cities able to create and share prosperity... and good quality services'.

8.1 SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Table 34 on the following page summarises the key findings from the evidence base. The next stage in the process is the generation and testing of issues and options, where these findings will be taken forward and a variety of options, or solutions investigated.

8.2 OPPORTUNITY AREAS

The evidence base has pointed to a range of issues and opportunities to be explored and tested in more detail through the next stages of the study process. Given the scale of the study area the opportunities are quite strategic at this stage, although these will begin to be developed in more detail as the study progresses. Those identified thus far include:

- Improving the quality of open spaces within the area
- Creation of green links or fingers, using the network of open spaces to improve east-west connections, strengthening the accessibility to the Lee Valley Park and watercourses
- Improving environmental quality, character and identity
- Focussing development opportunities at transport nodes – in sustainable locations - and along the waterfront where development can contribute to improving the quality of the Park and edge conditions
- Improving general accessibility (by walking and cycling) in the area
- Promoting the frequency and quality of train services to the area through the implementation of the ‘Four-Track’ scheme
- Ensuring greater public transport accessibility
- Exploring the opportunities to use the waterways for freight and leisure activities
- Strengthening the economy, by improving the quality of employment areas and diversifying the employment base. Local people must have access to local jobs

8.2.2 More specifically, this report has highlighted a number of opportunity areas within Central Leeside in terms of development potential and the opportunity for change or improvement (Figure 33). These include the following, which are considered in more detail within section 3.8:

- Kimberley Road;
- Meridian Way;
- Glover Drive;
- Land around Ikea and Tesco;
- Kenninghall Estate / Rail Land;
- Lee Valley Trading Estate;
- Eley’s Estate;
- Montagu Estate;
- Claverings;
- North East Tottenham; and
- Marsh Lane.

8.2.3 The opportunities identified at this stage will need to be tested through the Issues and Options work. Through this, different land uses and mixes should be tested, although proposals will need to be compliant with strategic policy objectives. A key issue will therefore be reconciling the opportunities against wider policy objectives, particularly environmental constraints.

1 DCLG, 2000, Urban White Paper, Our Towns and Cities: The Future
Figure 33: Opportunity Sites

1. Kimberley Road
2. Meridian Way Land
3. Glover Drive
4. Tesco / IKEA Site
5. Kenninghall Estate / Rail Land
6. Montagu Industrial Estate
7. Eley's Estate
8. Claverings Industrial Estate / Dominion Business Park / Horizon Business Centre
9. Marsh Lane / Allotments
10. North East Tottenham
11. Lee Valley Trading Estate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Findings / Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Study Area** | The area is defined by its large areas of employment land and waterways. Access to the waterways is however limited and potential exists to use the waterways both more efficiently and innovatively.  
The Regional Park is also an important asset, although it is largely hidden from view, is inaccessible and thus under-utilised. In addition, other areas of open space are of a poor quality.  
The area is orientated on a north-south basis, with barriers to east-west movement. In particular the eastern most railway line forms a major barrier to movement due to the lack of crossings along its length. |
| **Policy Context** | Central Leeside falls within the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough Growth Area and Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area. The area is thus an opportunity for regeneration and change.  
The area contains large areas of strategically important employment land. Much of this is protected from change to other uses, although opportunities for change and development do exist on some sites.  
Access to employment opportunities should be increased and the economy of the area strengthened. In addition, a greater range of employment opportunities should be encouraged.  
There may be potential for the Central Leeside area to accommodate more waste facilities in the future. This will be tested in conjunction with the North London Waste Authority.  
Improved accessibility is required at the local level, particularly in terms of east-west connections between residential areas, employment land and the Lee Valley Park. |
| | The North Circular Road (A406) dissected the study area, running on an east-west axis.  
Whilst the North Circular provides good accessibility to the area by road, the quality of the surrounding environment is poor and in need of improvement.  
The area is important within the strategic context and opportunities at the strategic level need to be reconciled with need at the local level.  
The special character of the Montagu Road Cemeteries Conservation Area must be protected.  
Policy and environmental constraints restrict the development potential of the area, particularly in the vicinity of the Lee Valley Park and watercourses. The floodplain is a major consideration for future development opportunities. Other constraints include open space designations, water resources, and sites of nature conservation value.  
Regenerating residential areas and centres is an important policy strand, contributing to the Sustainable Communities Agenda. Efforts should focus on improving the quality of life for existing as well as new residents.  
The potential of identified opportunity areas must be maximised. This will involve testing different land uses and mixes at the issues and options stage. |

Table 36: Summary of Baseline Findings / Issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Findings / Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td>The population is imbalanced, with a high proportion of young and elderly, compared to Enfield, Haringey and London more generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The area suffers from deprivation, particularly in terms of the quality of the housing stock, child poverty, educational attainment and employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a high proportion of minority ethnic groups in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rising crime and disorder is a key concern for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social &amp; Community Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Education facilities are increasingly under pressure as a result of rising demand for places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Primary Care Trust is in the process of spreading facilities across the wider area to enhance better local access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The area is deficient in terms of open space. Access to and the quality of this space is also poor. Targeted improvements are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail uses are located adjacent to the North Circular and are largely retail parks rather than local shops. The general environmental quality, however, is poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Market</strong></td>
<td>The study area is an important location for industrial activity. Much of the building stock, however, is of poor quality and there is increasing pressure for retail and residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The area requires a coherent framework of actions that can improve the quality of existing employment estates and support the growth of higher value added activities and enhanced employment densities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport and Movement</strong></td>
<td>There is high dependency upon car use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is good access to the east-west strategic highway network, although no direct connection to the M25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted local highway network, with particular barriers to movement including WAR, North Circular and Waterways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some restrictions to freight access due to highway congestion leading to the M25, although there is direct access to the M11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no local freight initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public transport accessibility is poor: rail services are infrequent and patronage is low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are a lack of bus services within the study area, and poor penetration of these into the employment areas. Some services do though connect with the main town centres nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The walking and cycling network is incomplete and there are significant barriers to movement caused by road, rail and the waterways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: Summary of Baseline Findings / Issues (continued)
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### Use Class Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Financial and Professional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Restaurants &amp; Cafes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Drinking Establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Hot Food Take-away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>General Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Storage &amp; Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Residential Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Dwelling Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Non-residential Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Assembly &amp; Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sui-Generis</td>
<td>A use not falling into the classes above, i.e.: Theatres, Nightclubs, Petrol Stations etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AAP - Area Action Plan: A development plan document that provides a planning framework for an area of significant change or conservation.

Accessibility – the ability of people to move round an area and to reach places and facilities, including elderly and disabled people, those with young children and those encumbered with luggage or shopping.

Active frontage – making frontages ‘active’ adds interest, life and vitality to the public realm. Active frontage should consist of the following:
- Frequent doors and windows, with few blank walls
- Articulated facades with bays and porches
- Lively internal uses visible from the outside, or spilling onto the street
- Activity node – concentration of activity at a particular point.

BREEAM - Building Research Establishment Assessment Method. Measures the environmental performance of commercial buildings by assessing waste, waste, energy and travel usage.

Built form – see ‘form’.

Context – the setting of a site or area, including factors such as traffic, activities and land used as well as landscape and built form.

Core Strategy - A development plan document. Sets out the key elements of the planning framework for an area, comprising a spatial vision and strategic objectives, a spatial strategy, core policies and a monitoring and implementation framework with clear objectives for achieving delivery. All other development plan documents should be in conformity with core strategy.

Creative and Cultural Industries - The Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) classifies the following industries as part of the CCI sector, "advertising, architecture, the art and antiques market, crafts, design, designer fashion, film and video production, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software and computer services, and television and radio production”.

DCLG - Department for Communities and Local Government: Created on 5 May 2006 with a powerful remit to promote community cohesion and equality, as well as responsibility for housing, urban regeneration, planning and local government.

Density – the floor space of a building or buildings or some other unit measure in relation to a given area of land. Built density can be expressed in terms of plot ratio (for commercial development); number of units or habitable rooms per hectare (for residential development); site coverage plus the number of floors or a maximum building height; or a combination of these.

Design Code – A document setting out with some precision the design and planning principles that will apply to development in a particular place. It provides a template within which to design an individual scheme or building.

Desire line – An imaginary line linking facilities or places which people would find it convenient to travel between easily.

DETR - Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions: Government department responsible, amongst other things, for matters of planning law and policy. Since devolved

DPD - Development Plan Document: A spatial planning document prepared by a plan-making authority and subject to independent examination.

DU/HA - Dwelling Units per Hectare: A measure of residential development.

Ecohomes - An assessment method established by BRE which measures the environmental performance of homes by assessing waste, waste, energy and travel usage.

Economically inactive – People aged over 16 who are not in employment or claiming unemployment benefit e.g. housewives/husbands, full-time students, retired people.

Enclosure - The use of buildings to create a sense of defined space.

Fine grain – see ‘grain’.

Floorplate – The surface area of a building.

Form – the layout (structure and grain), density, scale (height and massing), appearance (materials and details) and landscape of development.

Gateway – A structure, building or group of buildings that defines an entrance/exit to an area.
Grain – the pattern of the arrangement and size of buildings and their plots in a settlement, and the degree to which an area’s pattern of street-blocks and street junctions is respectively small and frequent, or large and infrequent.

Human scale – the use within the development of elements, which relate well in size to an individual human being and their assembly in a way, which makes people feel comfortable rather than overwhelmed.

Landmark – a building or structure that stands out from its background by virtue of height, size or some other aspect of design.

Landscape – the character and appearance of land, including its shape, form, ecology, natural features, colours and elements and the way these components combine. Landscape character can be expressed through landscape appraisal, and maps or plans.

Landscape Design – involves the collective organisation of human activities, natural processes and physical components in the process of shaping external space. It encompasses both the built environment, and is allied with urban design in sharing the purpose of creating varied, distinctive and engaging places.

Layout – the way buildings, routes and open spaces are placed in relation to each other.

LDF – Local Development Framework: A portfolio of documents that together provide a framework for delivering the spatial planning strategy for an area. The framework includes the Core Strategy, Area Action Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents. Collectively, these are known as Development Plan Documents.

Legibility – the degree to which a place can be easily understood and traversed.

Lifetime Homes Standards – A set of 16 design features that ensure a new house or flat will meet the needs of most people in terms of accessibility

Massing – the combined effect of the height, bulk and silhouette of a building or group of buildings.

Mixed-uses – a mix of uses within a building, on a site or within a particular area.

Movement – people and vehicles going to and passing through buildings, places and spaces.

Natural surveillance – the discouragement to wrongdoing by the presence of passers-by or the ability of people to be seen out of surrounding windows.

Neighbourhood Centre – Defined by the London Plan as centres which provide services for local communities... with a key role to play in addressing the problems of areas lacking accessible retail and other services.

Node – a place where activity and routes are concentrated often used as a synonym for junction.

ODPM - Office of the Deputy Prime Minister: Government department responsible for housing, local government, regeneration, planning and urban and regional issues. Since devolved and replaced by the DCLG.

Perimeter block – this is the term given to street blocks where the buildings follow a continuous building line around the block and contain private space within backyards or courtyards. This is opposed to individual buildings that sit in the middle of plots. Buildings face the street and can accommodate a diversity of uses. The private areas enclosed to the rear may contain car parking, servicing and open space.

Permeability – the degree to which an area has a variety of pleasant, convenient and safe routes through it.

Planning Regulations - Relating to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Transitional Arrangements) Regulations 2004. Introduced the need for production of Local Development Frameworks to streamline the planning process and promote a proactive, positive approach to managing development. Also introduced requirements for greater community and stakeholder involvement in the preparation of development plan documents and the need to produce Sustainability Appraisals.

PPG / PPS - Planning Policy Guidance Note: of planning policy that local authorities must take into account in formulating development plan policies and in making planning decisions. PPGs are being replaced by Planning Policy Statements (PPS).

Public art – permanent or temporary works of art visible to the general public, whether part of a building or freestanding; can include sculpture, lighting effects street furniture, paving railings and signs.

Public realm – the parts of a village, town or city (whether publicly or privately owned) that are available, without charge, for everyone to use or see, including streets, squares and parks.
SA - Sustainability Appraisal: Local development plan documents need to be prepared with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. An SA is a systematic and iterative process. The purpose of the SA is to appraise the social, environmental and economic effects of the strategies and policies in a local development plan document from the outset of the preparation process.

Scale – the impression of a building when seen in relation to its surroundings, or the size of parts of a building or its details, particularly as experienced in relation to the size of a person. Sometimes it is the total dimensions which give it its sense of scale and at other times it is the size of elements and the way they are combined.

Shoulder Height – The general height of buildings in an area, above which landmark buildings stand out.

Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) – small enterprises are defined as businesses with less than 50 employees and medium enterprises are businesses with up to 250 employees.

SPD - Supplementary Planning Document: A piece of planning guidance supplementing the policies and proposals contained in development plan documents.

Structured Parking - Car parking provided within a structure such as a multi-storey or underground.

Sustainable Communities Plan - The Sustainable Communities Plan was launched in 2003 and is a key policy of the DCLG in guiding its regeneration and departmental objectives. The Government’s definition of a sustainable community is:

Sustainable communities are places where people want to live and work, now and in the future. They meet the diverse needs of existing and future residents, are sensitive to their environment, and contribute to a high quality of life. They are safe and inclusive, well planned, built and run, and offer equality of opportunity and good services for all.

Sustainable Development - as defined by the Bruntland Commission (1987, and quoted in PPG1) as ‘Development which meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to achieve their needs and aspirations.’

Urban design – the art of making places. Urban design involves the design of buildings, spaces and landscapes, in villages, towns and cities, and the establishment of frameworks and processes which facilitate successful development.

Walkable neighbourhood/ environment - a neighbourhood that designed for ease of walking. The quality of the routes should be designed to give walking priority and discourage car us. People should be able to walk to local facilities e.g. newsagent, bus stop.
11 Appendix C: Other Plans & Strategies

11.1 ENFIELD: BOROUGH WIDE POLICIES


11.1.1
As set out within the Sustainable Community Strategy it is the Partnerships ambition that Enfield has “a healthy, prosperous, cohesive community living in a borough that is safe, clean and green”. The Strategy therefore provides an overarching framework for all key services in the borough.

11.1.2
Five themes are identified within the Strategy and a series of more detailed objectives outlined. These objectives are summarised below:

Children and Young People
11.1.3
Under this theme the Strategy seeks to decrease child poverty, through the provision of more and better facilities for children, improving levels of health and educational attainment, safeguarding children from crime and violence, and encouraging participation in community activities and local decision making.

Safer and Stronger Communities
11.1.4
This theme seeks to decrease crime and the fear of crime, through Neighbourhood Watch schemes, partnership working within the community and businesses, and by creating better places through good urban design. In addition, this theme seeks to strengthen community cohesion, reduce anti-social behaviour and deliver the Respect Agenda Action Plan.

Healthier Communities
11.1.5
This theme encourages people to participate in healthy lifestyles, through engaging in physical activity, reducing reliance on the private car, and improving personal diets and nutrition. In addition this theme aims to improve life expectancy across the borough, through reducing mortality rates from heart disease, stroke and related diseases, reducing the number who smoke, and reduce the harm caused by drugs and alcohol.

Older People
11.1.6
This theme aims to tackle discrimination and inequalities amongst older people, by ensuring active citizenship and equal access to services, promoting greater independence and positive attitudes towards ageing, and helping older people to live longer and healthier lives.

Economic Development and Enterprise
11.1.7
This theme seeks to create a more prosperous borough, with an extended and consolidated local economic base, by encouraging the location of new businesses within the area, tackling worklessness, and ensuring skills development across the borough. In addition, this theme aims to ensure that all residents have access to decent and affordable homes, that the quality of the built and open environment is protected and improved, that the efficient use of natural resources is encouraged, that dependency on the private car is reduced, and that social inclusion is promoted.

Putting Enfield First: Improvement Plan
11.1.8
The Council’s Improvement Plan shows how the corporate strategy ‘Putting Enfield First’ will be delivered and sets out the purpose, values, aims and priority objectives for improvement over a three-year period. It sets out six key aims for the period 2006 – 2009. These are:

• A cleaner greener Enfield;
• High quality education and lifelong learning;
• A safer Enfield to live, work, study and do business;
• Quality health and care services for vulnerable people in Enfield;
• Supporting the delivery of excellent services; and
• Economically successful and socially inclusive.

These are further broken down in the box opposite.
Aim 1: A cleaner greener Enfield
a. Make Enfield a cleaner and greener place by improving the physical cleanliness of the whole borough and tackling enviro-crime
b. Upgrade and improve Enfield’s roads and pavements
c. Replace all street lights and provide 3,700 additional columns over 5 years from March 2006 to improve public safety
d. Promote borough-wide recycling through education and enforcement to reduce and minimise waste
e. Deliver improvements to Enfield’s transport links by working with our North London partners
f. Protect and enhance the character and quality of Enfield’s buildings and access to green spaces by preparing a new planning policy (Local Development Framework)
g. Strengthen the planning enforcement process

Aim 2: High quality education and lifelong learning
a. Work with schools and colleges to deliver high quality education and raise educational achievement to and above national standards
b. Work with partners to fully include underachieving and challenging pupils
c. Support and encourage children to attend and enjoy school
d. Work with partners to promote healthy lifestyles for children and young people
e. Increase opportunities to learn throughout life
f. Provide positive activities for young people

Aim 3: A safer Enfield to live, work, study and do business
a. Work to achieve a safer, stronger Enfield through development of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
b. Work with partners to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and respond to the fear of crime
c. Promote public safety in Enfield by the use of CCTV, and improve safety on roads and in the home
d. Involve more local people in community safety issues
e. Work to reduce drugs and alcohol abuse in the borough
f. Support the Environmental Crime Unit to secure prosecution by fully using existing and new legislative powers

Aim 4: Quality health and care services for vulnerable people in Enfield
a. Improve access to health and care by working with our partners to provide modern services that meet the needs of our community
b. Work with our partners to provide high quality services for all children especially those with additional needs
c. Help the most vulnerable members of our communities to live more independent lives
d. Work with partners to provide older residents with opportunities to play a full and active part in the community

Aim 5: Supporting the delivery of excellent services
a. Deliver a customer focused approach that helps all people access council services
b. Increase the efficiency, value for money and quality of services through continuous improvement and performance management
c. Communicate the Council’s vision and values to all staff, residents and partners
d. Empower staff to have the skills, motivation and opportunities to improve services
e. Provide effective community leadership and increase public participation in the Council’s decision-making process and local initiatives
f. Deliver the community strategy, local needs and priorities by productive partnership working

Aim 6: Economically successful and socially inclusive
a. Work to develop a prosperous local economy with our partners
b. Promote opportunities for employment by encouraging business growth, skills training and by reducing barriers to work
c. Improve deprived neighbourhoods by working with our partners and the local community
d. Tackle discrimination, promote equality of access and good relations between all groups in the community
e. Improve the quality of housing in the borough through partnership working
f. Promote healthier communities through effective partnership working
Enfield Leisure and Cultural Strategy (Enfield Strategic Partnership, 2007)

11.1.9
Enfield’s Leisure and Cultural Strategy, ‘Enriching Enfield’, was produced in 2002 and subsequently updated in 2004 and 2007 by the Enfield Strategic Partnership. It provides a vision for the period up to 2015 with practical actions for the period to 2008.

11.1.10
A number of key issues have been identified as being important in the development of the Leisure and Cultural Strategy for Enfield. These are:

- **Increasing Access to Services and Promoting Social Cohesion**: There is an uneven distribution of facilities in Enfield. Pricing is a barrier for some people. Public safety and transport also act as barriers to participation and therefore restrict access. People who suffer some kind of social deprivation will also often be denied access to leisure and cultural opportunities. This is important given the barriers created by the road and rail network and the level of deprivation that exists within the study area.

- **Enfield’s Changing Population and its Cultural Diversity**: The challenge will be to ensure that everyone in Enfield has access to leisure and cultural facilities, especially those who suffer from social exclusion and from deprivation. While it is important to plan for everybody it is perhaps more important that the different communities within Enfield are involved in the development of cultural provision in their borough. This means ensuring plans are flexible enough to remain current as the population changes and finding ways to help participate in planning their future.

- **Major new Developments**: The redevelopment of Enfield Town and Edmonton Green, plus the new athletics Regional Performance Athletics Centre at Picketts Lock will impact upon the cultural life of Enfield and, if there is fair access, will help to improve the quality of life for all residents.

- **The Olympics and Paralympics**: The new Edmonton Leisure Centre has been earmarked as a basketball training venue for the Olympics and the indoor athletics facilities at Picketts Lock are bound to become a training venue for athletics. With three athletics venues within a short distance of each other (New River stadium in Tottenham, the QE2 stadium at Donkey Lane and the Picketts Lock facility), Enfield has to be a prime location for one or more of the training camps that other countries will have to set up ahead of the games. There may be further opportunity to improve/add facilities for extra training/holding camps based on the proximity of Enfield to the Olympics zone and also host populations settled within the borough. And with regard to the number of visitors to the Olympics and the impact this will have on local economies, it is recognised that the promotion of tourism in the borough will need to be re-assessed.

- **Promotion and Marketing**: There is a recognised need to find an area of sub-regional (North London) or regional (London) excellence and seek to showcase this to raise the overall profile of Enfield.

- **Resources**: Pressures on the Council’s finances mean that there is unlikely to be any ‘real terms’ increase in the revenue or capital budgets. Therefore, it is important that the Council and other agencies work together to maximise opportunities for joint funding and funding from external sources such as the Lottery boards, Neighbourhood Renewal Fund, the London Development Agency etc. Innovative ways of looking at current charging policies are also needed, for example to generate more income provided this does not further exclude people on low income.

- **The role of leisure and culture in regeneration and sustainable communities**: The real benefits of leisure and culture to social regeneration are in the context of community development. The intrinsic values of leisure and culture make them an essential tool for building strong, cohesive communities based on responsible individuals and families through the core values of commitment, focus, creativity, self confidence and teamwork. Support for the creative industries is important as they contribute to the economic regeneration of an area. However, these industries, which are often reliant on low business rents, need to have special consideration when, for example, commercial businesses push up land prices in newly regenerated areas and therefore price this sector out of the market. The cultural industries, especially the new media sector, represent a strong opportunity for the borough. This, and other similar issues must be built into the community strategy.
• **Enabling Communities**: It is generally accepted that the council has a vital role to play in acting as a catalyst for change and performing an 'enabling' role to help community organisations develop services for their own communities. The Council will support community organisations by building their capacity.

• **The role of the Voluntary and Community Sector**: Much of leisure and cultural activity has historically been provided by the voluntary sector, especially through churches and other faith groups. The challenge is to continue supporting existing volunteers and also help the new communities of Enfield develop leisure and cultural activities that will help improve their quality of life, making life meaningful for individuals and families, to contribute real and lasting value to the borough.

• **Performance management for Leisure & Cultural provision in Enfield**: There are a number of facilities and venues in Enfield, which either directly provide or play host to leisure and cultural activities. These facilities are provided by the public, private and voluntary sectors and they all play an important part in the cultural life of Enfield. However, it is recognised that a significantly stronger range of these activities is needed in North London.

11.1.11
In response to these issues a number of priorities for the Leisure and Cultural Strategy have been devised. These are:

• To provide opportunities and improve equality of access for people in Enfield to enrich their lives, learn and benefit physically, mentally and economically from a broad range of leisure and cultural activities in the borough;

• To identify the leisure and cultural needs of the community of Enfield and be responsive to those needs by developing the necessary range of activities and facilities;

• Use leisure and cultural services to vigorously contribute to the well-being of Enfield’s community by encouraging community participation in all activities; and acting in partnership with providers in the private, public voluntary and community sectors. In doing so this will demonstrate the added value of leisure and cultural activities to the health, social cohesion, regeneration, community safety, economic improvement, environmentally sustainability and other developments to all the people of the borough;

• To celebrate the special and unique quality of Enfield’s community and its diverse heritage by raising the profile and image of the borough both within and outside of London, and to increase awareness of leisure and cultural activities within the borough itself; and

• To be strongly active in identifying significant opportunities and then securing capital and revenue funding streams and resources for all areas of leisure and cultural activity.

Every child really does matter – Enfield’s Local Area Agreement (Enfield Strategic Partnership and Enfield Council, February 2006)

11.1.12
The theme of Enfield’s Local Area Agreement is ‘Every child really does matter’ and by 2009 the Strategic Partnership aim to have:

• Significantly improved the lives of children and their families currently living in poverty;

• Enabled people of all ages, ethnicities and disabilities to play a full and active part in the community;

• Strengthened the role of the voluntary and community sector; and

• Improved the life chances of people living in Enfield’s most deprived neighbourhoods, narrowing the gap between different communities.

11.1.13
More specifically, there are three key strands that run across the Local Area Agreement:

• **Every child really does matter**: by focusing on children and their families, the LAA and the actions contained within it can have a real and measurable impact both during the three years of the agreement but also beyond;

• **Enabling people to make a positive contribution**: encouraging and enabling people of all ages, ethnicity and disabilities to play a full and active part in the community, influencing decision making and strengthening the voluntary sector will ensure Enfield’s community continues to be strong and cohesive;
11.2 HARINGEY: BOROUGH WIDE POLICIES

Draft Haringey Community Strategy: A Sustainable Way Forward 2007-2016 (Haringey Strategic Partnership, June 2007)

11.2.1 The Haringey Community Strategy is currently in draft form, although it is anticipated that the strategy will be fully adopted by the end of June 2007.

11.2.2 As outlined within the Strategy the vision for Haringey in 2016 is “a place for diverse communities that people are proud to belong to”. More specifically, the Strategy aims to improve the quality of life for everyone, ensuring that people feel proud about the area where they live and that they have a sense of belonging and responsibility for the area. The Strategy also recognises the importance of providing excellent facilities and services for the borough’s growing population and ensuring that all individuals have access to local work and employment opportunities.

11.2.3 Seven key objectives have therefore been established. These are as follows:

- **People at the heart of change:** this includes the creation and development of a cohesive and included community, with access to excellent facilities and a clean and attractive environment;
- **An environmentally sustainable future:** this includes tackling climate change and managing the Borough’s environmental resources more effectively;
- **Economic vitality and prosperity shared by all:** this includes increasing the number of people in work and encouraging local enterprise;
- **Be safer for all:** this includes reducing crime and the fear of crime;
- **Healthier people with a better quality of life:** this includes tackling health inequalities, creating more decent homes and focusing on those communities at the highest risk of poor health;
- **Be people and customer focused:** this includes providing high quality, customer focused and accessible services that give value for money, respond to people’s needs and meet their aspirations; and
- **Implementing the strategy and measuring progress:** this includes encouraging a partnership approach to the delivery of the Community Strategy, as well as active community and voluntary sector engagement.


11.2.4 The vision set out in this document is as follows: “Meeting the Borough’s current and future housing needs – and through doing so, making a major contribution to social inclusion and the socio-economic well-being of Haringey”

11.2.5 More specifically, the Housing Strategy identifies a series of priorities; these are to:

- Improve housing services to residents across the tenures;
- Maximise the supply of affordable homes, increasing access and housing choice;
- Improve community safety, sustainability and cohesion in our most deprived communities and create opportunities for people to achieve and succeed; and
- Regenerate our neighbourhoods, achieving decent homes for all and improve the environment.
11.2.6  Housing is recognised as key to delivering the Council’s wider policy objectives and the delivery of sustainable communities in particular. At present Haringey has a significant housing need – many individuals are currently living in temporary, overcrowded or poor quality accommodation. The strategy therefore looks at ways in which to deliver high quality affordable homes, work with landlords to make private renting an option, bringing empty properties back into use and work on mobility schemes. The strategy also highlights the relationship between housing and regeneration and links the Housing Strategy with the Haringey Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.

11.2.7  In delivering high quality and affordable accommodation, the strategy emphasises the need for joint working with stakeholders and agencies. These stakeholders include the Haringey Strategic Partnership, the Housing Strategic Partnership, Housing Associations, private sector groups, the Landlord Forum, the Homelessness forum and groups within the sub-region.

Haringey Homelessness Strategy 2003-2008 (Haringey Council)

11.2.8  The Haringey Homelessness Strategy seeks to provide effective and sustainable solutions for the homeless within the borough, as well as those facing homelessness. The strategy recommends a holistic approach that will address the multiple needs of homeless households, including health, education and support needs.

11.2.9  The Homelessness Strategy is underpinned by six key aims:

- To deliver high quality services that meet the needs of those who are homeless or facing homelessness;
- To ensure a comprehensive approach to homelessness prevention and support;
- To develop a comprehensive temporary accommodation strategy that meets the needs of homeless households and the community;
- To maximise affordable housing supply and develop alternative housing options;
- To ensure that there is an integrated response to homelessness in Haringey and that agencies work together to provide services to promote the well being of individuals in the community; and
- To achieve a reliable and comprehensive knowledge and information system as a basis for delivering the homelessness strategy.


11.2.10  The vision presented in this document is to “use culture and cultural activities to enable people in Haringey to grow and improve their lives, as communities and individuals, residents, workers or visitors”. The strategy highlights the role of culture in driving forward social, economic and infrastructure regeneration. In particular, the strategy looks at how to support and develop the creative economy and businesses, through infrastructure development and training. In addition, the Lee Valley Corridor is identified as a strategic area for regeneration.

11.2.11  Four priority areas are identified and outlined within the strategy, namely:

- Priority 1: Using cultural activity to celebrate diversity;
- Priority 2: Improving quality of life through culture;
- Priority 3: Supporting the growth of a sustainable cultural economy; and
- Priority 4: Increasing access to cultural education, training and employment opportunities.

Narrowing the Gap: Haringey Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy 2002-2012 (Haringey Strategic Partnership)

11.2.12  Narrowing the Gap, Haringey Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy provides the framework for renewal of the most deprived parts of the borough over the next decade. It aims to provide a framework for Haringey that:

- Provides a link between wider strategic policy, the aspirations and needs articulated by local people and local services;
Focuses specifically on the most deprived areas of Haringey indicating ways for all service providers across the borough to work together to tackle more effectively the factors underlying deprivation;

Signposts how to find out more detail about what is going on in specific neighbourhoods and on specific strategic partnership agendas; and

Provides a guide to how more detailed plans for neighbourhoods and borough services join up and a framework for partners’ and partnerships’ future work.

11.2.13
The Haringey Strategic Partnership will ensure that these aims are put into practice through a variety of mechanisms, including (i) joint working with a number of stakeholders (residents, agencies, the local authority, the voluntary and community sector, faith communities, businesses and other partners); (ii) the development of a shared vision and joint action to alleviate deprivation; (iii) the development of deprivation targets; (iv) local capacity building and consultation with local communities; and (v) maximising development opportunities within the borough, such as the Upper Lee Valley.

11.2.14
The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy identifies five areas within the borough in need of renewal. One of these areas is the Northumberland Park area. Within this area the major project for renewal is the Joining Up Northumberland Park SRB programme, which has four strategic priorities as follows:

- Organising the neighbourhood by the construction and operation of the Neighbourhood Resource Centre including accommodating Sure Start Park and HTPCT, and commencing the estate improvement initiative;
- The Aspire, Action for Young People programme, key elements of which involve the establishment of the Northumberland Park School Learning Resource Centre and the development of the youth centre and ball park area;
- Open Door to Employment which, among other things, will include a focus on improving transport facilities for easy access to work; and
- Creating a safer environment by employing an area based enforcement officer and neighbourhood wardens.

The development of the Joining Up Northumberland Park SRB programme will continue to be the major neighbourhood renewal project in the Northumberland Park Priority Area.

The Haringey Safer Communities Strategy 2005-2008 (Haringey Council, 2005)

11.2.15
The vision established within this document is "to measurably improve the quality of life for the people of Haringey by tackling criminal and anti-social behaviour and reducing the harm caused by drugs and alcohol, making Haringey a borough of which we can all be proud".

11.2.16
The strategy emphasises the importance of joint working in tackling criminal and anti-social behaviour. In other words, local leaders, councillors, statutory and voluntary agencies, businesses and individual residents must work together to develop and implement strategies that work.

11.2.17
The strategy is based on the crime and drugs audit carried out in 2004, which identified the following priorities:

- Tackling anti-social behaviour;
- Tackling acquisitive crime;
- Tackling domestic violence and other violent behaviour;
- Drug and alcohol related crime and disorder;
- Young people, crime and victimisation;
- Mental health;
- Victim and witness support; and
- Community engagement.
In ensuring the creation of safer communities the importance of community engagement is recognised. Indeed, the strategy states that communities should be strengthened in order that they are able to respond to criminality, while feeling that they will be supported as either a victim or a witness. The strategy also emphasises the importance of finding a balanced approach between prevention, treatment and enforcement. Early intervention that addresses risk factors and supports those who are vulnerable will help prevent people engaging in criminal and anti-social behaviour. The use of data about crime is also encouraged, to ensure that time and resources are effectively targeted. Finally, the strategy supports joint working in achieving safer communities; services must work together across prevention and deterrence, catching and convicting, and rehabilitating and resettling.
Haringey UDP Part 1 Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General policy theme</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G1: Environment</strong></td>
<td>Development should contribute towards protecting and enhancing the local and global environment and make efficient use of available resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G2: Development and Urban Design</strong></td>
<td>Development should be of high quality design and contribute to the character of the local environment in order to enhance the overall quality, sustainability, attractiveness, and amenity of the built environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G3: Housing Supply</strong></td>
<td>The Council will aim to provide enough housing to meet the needs of Haringey residents and to contribute towards achieving a draft London wide target of 31,090 additional households a year. Draft alterations to the London Plan identify a revised housing target for Haringey of 6,800 additional homes between 2007/8 and 2016/17. This housing provision can be achieved through: Developing new sites for housing; Converting houses into flats; Changing the use of a building to housing; Making use of empty properties; and Redeveloping existing sites at higher densities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G4: Employment</strong></td>
<td>Development should meet the needs of business and industry, and provide employment opportunities for local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G5: Town Centre Hierarchy</strong></td>
<td>The Council will seek to maintain and enhance the existing hierarchy of shopping which comprises: A Metropolitan Centre; Five District Centres; Designated Local Shopping Centres; and Other local parades and individual shops, including retail parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G6: Strategic Transport Links</strong></td>
<td>The Council will aim to improve existing public transport provision, and promote strategic public transport links such as Thameslink 2000, Crossrail 2, and Orbirail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G7: Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, Significant Local Open Land and Green Chains</strong></td>
<td>Areas of Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, Significant Local Open Land and Green Chains are shown in the proposals map as the most important open spaces in the borough. There is a presumption against inappropriate development in these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General policy theme</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G8: Creative, Leisure and Tourism</strong></td>
<td>The Cultural Quarter (Wood Green), Tottenham Green and the metropolitan town and district centres will be focal points for new creative, leisure and tourism development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G9: Community Well Being</strong></td>
<td>Development should meet the borough’s needs for enhanced community facilities from population and household growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G10: Conservation</strong></td>
<td>Development should respect and enhance Haringey’s built heritage in all its forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G11: Implementation</strong></td>
<td>The Council will seek to keep the UDP up to date and take enforcement action where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy G12: Priority Areas</strong></td>
<td>The Council will focus major regeneration and development opportunities in the priority areas, in order to improve the most deprived communities. The Council will support development in these areas provided that they: Comply with policies set out in any relevant development frameworks or area action plans and the policies contained in the UDP as a whole; Contribute towards improving the local area in terms of housing, jobs, transport facilities, local services and the environment; and Satisfy the aims and objectives of Haringey’s Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part two of the UDP establishes a series of more detailed policies. Of particular relevance to the Central Leeside AAP are the following policies:

### Development and Urban Design
Ensuring an attractive and healthy environment for everyone
- **Policy US2**: Sustainable design and construction
- **Policy UD3**: General principles
- **Policy UD4**: Quality design
- **Policy UD6**: Mixed use developments
- **Policy UD7**: Waste storage
- **Policy UD9**: Locations for tall buildings

### Environment
Protecting the Borough’s environment and safeguarding it for the future
- **Policy Env1**: Flood protection: protection of floodplain, urban washlands
- **Policy Env2**: Surface water runoff
- **Policy Env3**: Water conservation
- **Policy Env4**: Enhancing and protecting the water environment
- **Policy Env5**: Works affecting water courses
- **Policy Env6**: Noise pollution
- **Policy Env7**: Air, water and light pollution
- **Policy Env8**: Facilities or alternative refuelling infrastructure
- **Policy Env9**: Mitigating climate change: energy efficiency
- **Policy Env10**: Mitigating climate change: renewable energy
- **Policy Env11**: Contaminated land
- **Policy Env12**: Development at or new premises involving use of storage of hazardous substances
- **Policy Env13**: Sustainable waste management

### Employment
Ensuring there are opportunities for all to contribute to the economy
- **Policy EMP1**: Defined Employment Areas – Regeneration areas
- **Policy EMP2**: Defined Employment Areas – Industrial locations
- **Policy EMP3**: Defined Employment Areas – Employment locations
- **Policy EMP4**: Non employment generating uses
- **Policy EMP5**: Promoting employment uses

### Town Centres and Retailing
Ensuring that the Borough’s network of town centres and retail facilities supports the quality of life for people in the Borough
- **Policy TCR1**: Development in town and local shopping centres
- **Policy TCR2**: Out of town centre development
- **Policy TCR3**: Protection of shops in the town centres
- **Policy TCR4**: Protection of local shops

### Movement
Ensuring safe, effective and accessible movement options
- **Policy M1**: Improvements
- **Policy M2**: Public transport network
- **Policy M3**: New development location and accessibility
- **Policy M4**: Pedestrians and cyclists
- **Policy M5**: Protection, improvement and creation of pedestrian and cycle routes
- **Policy M6**: Road hierarchy
- **Policy M7**: Road schemes
- **Policy M8**: Access roads
- **Policy M10**: Parking for development
- **Policy M10**: Rail and waterborne transport

### Open Space
Providing open space recreation for all
- **Policy OS1**: Green belt
- **Policy OS2**: Metropolitan open land
- **Policy OS3**: Significant local open land
- **Policy OS5**: Development adjacent to open spaces
- **Policy OS6**: Ecologically vulnerable sites and their corridors
- **Policy OS9**: Lee Valley Regional Park
- **Policy OS10**: Other open space
- **Policy OS11**: Biodiversity

### Housing
Better housing for a better borough
- **Policy HSG1**: New housing developments
- **Policy HSG2**: Change of use to residential
- **Policy HSG3**: Protecting existing housing
- **Policy HSG4**: Affordable housing
- **Policy HSG9**: Density standards
- **Policy HSG10**: Dwelling mix
• Policy OS12: Allotments
• Policy OS13: Playing fields
• Policy OS15: Open space deficiency and new developments
• Policy OS16: Green chains

Creative, Leisure and Tourism
Encouraging the arts and leisure in the borough
• Policy CLT1: Provision of new facilities
• Policy CLT2: Protecting existing facilities
• Policy CLT5: Retention of existing tourist facilities and the encouragement of new facilities

Community and Well-being
Protecting and enabling the creation of facilities that support community life and equal opportunities
• Policy CW1: New community/health facilities
• Policy CW2: Protecting existing community facilities

11.3 ADJOINING AUTHORITY STRATEGIES

11.3.1 The Central Leeside study area is bound to the east by Waltham Forest. Policy guidance of relevance to Central Leeside is noted below. The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority also has a Park Plan, the contents of which need to be recognised within the creation of Local Development Documents.

Waltham Forest Local Development Framework
11.3.2 The Local Development Scheme for Waltham Forest (dated March 2005) notes that the Core Strategy, Proposals Map and Site Specific Proposals Schedule should be adopted by Spring 2009. The over arching strategy for these is established by the London Plan and Sub-Regional Development Framework for North London. Further, for those parts of the borough falling within the Upper Lee Valley, the guidance emerging through the Opportunity Area Planning Framework is applicable.

11.3.3 The First Review Unitary Development Plan for Waltham Forest has however recently been adopted [March 2006]. Within this, regeneration of and the need for investment in the Upper Lee Valley is recognised. In particular, the Council will seek to
a. optimise the use of land for employment generation unless otherwise designated. Land and premises currently or last in employment use (Business Use Class) used for B1, B2 or B8 purposes will normally be retained for those uses unless there are environmental, traffic or other demonstrable reasons to do otherwise; and
b. allow for mixed use development in the Mixed Use Regeneration Areas. This should comprise Business Uses combined with housing or other appropriate uses.

11.3.4 Key regeneration areas in Waltham Forest include Blackhorse Lane. An Interim Planning Policy Framework for this area has been produced. The strategy for this promotes mixed use development in and around the vicinity of the London Underground Station. It also seeks improved access to the Lee Valley Park, particularly to Tottenham Marshes and Banbury Reservoir, where opportunities for leisure and recreation are also identified.

11.3.5 In terms of wider access issues, the Council will seek to encourage the use of public transport, cycling and walking. It will also seek environmental improvements for those who live and work adjacent to the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) roads, which includes the North Circular.

Lee Valley Park Plan
11.3.6 The Lee Valley Regional Park Plan is not a Development Plan but its contents must be acknowledged in the Development Plans of the relevant Local Authorities through which the Park runs. The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority has no status as a planning authority, although it is a statutory consultee for all applications in or affecting the Regional Park.
11.3.7
The Authority is currently in the process of reviewing its Park Plan and developing a new Park Development Framework that will reflect its aspirations for the future. The key objectives of the Park Plan as existing are to:

- Raise the image and profile of the Park;
- Increase access to and within the Park;
- Improve recreation and leisure facilities;
- Create visible gateways to the Park and create a legible landscape structure; and
- Implement an integrated public transport system.
12 Appendix D: Council Land Ownerships

12.1.1 The following two plans show the extent of council owned land within both Enfield and Haringey. These are important to recognise in terms of the potential for delivering and implementing change in the area.

Haringey Council land ownerships