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Enfield Council is proposing main and additional modifications to the Edmonton Leeside Area Action Plan (ELAAP).

Please note:

Main Modifications (MM) are made to ensure soundness of the plan. These include changes to policies and consequential amendments to supporting text which are the result of changes to policy. MM are numbered in relation to the policy they refer to (i.e. MM1 is a change to Policy EL1; MM1a is a consequential amendment to supporting text, which is the result of changes to policy EL1).

Additional Modifications (AM) are listed in a separate table. Whilst helpful in assisting with clarity, they are not essential for soundness. AM include typographical changes, updates to names, drafting changes aimed at improving clarity and factual updates. AM are numbered consecutively as AM1, AM2, AM3 etc.

Page and paragraph numbers listed below are consistent with the those of the ELAAP Proposed Submission Version of January 2017.

Any Modifications previously requested by third parties which were not endorsed by the Inspector were removed and are not shown in the table below.

Text in italics denotes existing, retained ELAAP text

Text in Bold Print and underlined denotes a proposed insertion to ELAAP text

Text with a strikethrough denotes a proposed deletion to ELAAP text

All other text is explanatory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM1</td>
<td>Chapter 5 Policy EL1: Housing in Meridian Water Part A</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL1</td>
<td>To edit the wording of Policy EL1 Part A as follows: Development proposals and supplementary planning documents are required to demonstrate that affordable housing is maximised. All residential development proposals at Meridian Water will be expected to achieve a minimum of 35% of units to be affordable housing, subject to grant availability in line with Council’s scheme wide viability evidence and adopted Core Strategy, measured as a proportion of the total number of units, or in part based upon the proportion of habitable rooms. During initial phases of development at Meridian Water, due to site remediation costs and low property values, viability requirements for development proposals may reduce the proportion of affordable housing below the Council’s adopted policy. As the development of Meridian Water proceeds rising property values are expected to improve viability, enabling a higher proportion of affordable housing to be achieved, meeting the Council’s 40% requirement across Meridian Water as a whole. The Council will seek to maximise affordable housing at Meridian Water over the lifetime of the project and work towards the Mayor of London’s strategic target requirement that 50% of development proposals all new homes are affordable housing. The Council will maximise affordable housing in accordance with the preferred Local Plan tenure mix, although other forms of lower cost affordable housing products are recognised as potentially may also contributing to provision of housing at Meridian Water, including London Shared Ownership Starter homes and the London Living Rent products. The Council will support appropriate and high quality ‘build to rent’ schemes as an element of the provision of private housing.</td>
<td>To make the wording of the policy shorter and more effective; to avoid repetition of supporting text; to remove unnecessary reference to the Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD); to add clarity on how affordable housing will be measured; and ensure consistency with adopted Development Plan Policy, London Plan Housing products and up to date viability evidence.</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with GLA and Inspector comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM1</td>
<td>Chapter 5 Policy EL1: Housing in Meridian Water Part A</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL1</td>
<td>To edit the wording of Policy EL1 Part A as follows: Development proposals and supplementary planning documents are required to demonstrate that affordable housing is maximised. All residential development proposals at Meridian Water will be expected to achieve a minimum of 35% of units to be affordable housing, subject to grant availability in line with Council’s scheme wide viability evidence and adopted Core Strategy, measured as a proportion of the total number of units, or in part based upon the proportion of habitable rooms. During initial phases of development at Meridian Water, due to site remediation costs and low property values, viability requirements for development proposals may reduce the proportion of affordable housing below the Council’s adopted policy. As the development of Meridian Water proceeds rising property values are expected to improve viability, enabling a higher proportion of affordable housing to be achieved, meeting the Council’s 40% requirement across Meridian Water as a whole. The Council will seek to maximise affordable housing at Meridian Water over the lifetime of the project and work towards the Mayor of London’s strategic target requirement that 50% of development proposals all new homes are affordable housing. The Council will maximise affordable housing in accordance with the preferred Local Plan tenure mix, although other forms of lower cost affordable housing products are recognised as potentially may also contributing to provision of housing at Meridian Water, including London Shared Ownership Starter homes and the London Living Rent products. The Council will support appropriate and high quality ‘build to rent’ schemes as an element of the provision of private housing.</td>
<td>To make the wording of the policy shorter and more effective; to avoid repetition of supporting text; to remove unnecessary reference to the Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD); to add clarity on how affordable housing will be measured; and ensure consistency with adopted Development Plan Policy, London Plan Housing products and up to date viability evidence.</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with GLA and Inspector comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM1</td>
<td>Chapter 5 Policy EL1: Housing in Meridian Water Part B</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL1</td>
<td>To edit the wording of Policy EL1 Part B as follows:</td>
<td>To make the wording of the policy shorter and more effective; to avoid repetition of supporting text and / or of other policies; and to ensure approach to residential capacity and density is in line with adopted development plan.</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments Canal and River Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council supports maximising the number of units delivered, within the as far as constraining factors and other policy requirements allow, including appropriate transport and other infrastructure, supporting services, and employment floorspace are required to support housing delivery and thereby affect development capacity. Evidence shows that to achieve a higher quantum of residential units within the Meridian Water boundary is dependent upon significant improvements in transportation infrastructure to enable a transformation of PTAL across the site. Upgrades to the railway station, and the number of trains per hour, is critical to achieving this, along with new and improved road routes through the area. The necessity for other uses which support and are driven by residential development, such as schools, retail and open spaces, will increase correspondingly with higher numbers of housing units. Environmental and design requirements, as well as housing mix, are also The mix of units in terms of number of habitable rooms is also a key determining factors in the number units which can be delivered, with evidence demonstrating the trade-off between the proportion of larger units and overall number of units achievable (see Part C below for Housing Mix). The evidence shows that, subject to mix and tenure, sufficient supporting infrastructure, the de-designation of industrial land and the achievement of high quality urban design, 10,000 in line with the adopted Enfield Core Strategy, ELAAP will support delivery of around 5,000 new homes could be provided at Meridian Water. The demand upon the available land at Meridian Water means that a rising number of units will lead to a greater average building height. Development proposals must not result in building heights which lead to poor spatial and design performance, or negatively impact the amenity of other buildings and public realm in terms of light amenity. Also see Policy EL12. Density levels and building heights will vary spatially across Meridian Water, depending upon specific site character, including transport capacity, access to supporting services and location. Higher density development should be situated in areas with higher levels of accessibility to public transport and/or where it can capitalise most appropriately on features such as views and open space, while respecting wider visual and public amenity. Development proposals in Meridian Water should optimise housing through, where justified and appropriate, achieving higher net housing density levels than the London Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM1</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL1 Part C</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL1</td>
<td>To amend the wording of Policy EL1 Part C as follows: Development proposals at Meridian Water must deliver housing which supports a <strong>mixed and balanced</strong> community including high quality family housing. To meet the needs for increased delivery of housing the Council supports maximising the number of units delivered within the constraining factors including transport infrastructure, supporting services and employment floorspace. Housing mix is a key factor in driving floorspace requirements and therefore relates to the quantum of housing which can be delivered at Meridian Water. Development proposals <strong>and supplementary planning documents are required to offer a range of housing sizes to maximise family housing in line with adopted Local Plan policy. Development proposals must demonstrate viability requirements if the Local Plan policy requirements are not fully met.</strong> For initial phases of Meridian Water, development proposals must deliver a minimum of 25% 3+ bed dwellings and opportunities to deliver a higher proportion should be explored. During the development of Meridian Water improving levels of supporting services, the developing sense of place and rising viability are expected to enable a higher proportion of 3+ bedroom housing to be achieved. Where development proposals meet only the 3+ bedroom minimum requirement the delivery of 2-bed units of a design which is sufficient in size and layout to support smaller families must be fully explored. Family units, <strong>including units of 3+ bedrooms, should be located to maximise access to facilities required by families, such as safe outdoor spaces, which might include on the ground or lower floors of buildings.</strong></td>
<td>To make the wording of the policy shorter and more effective; to avoid repetition of supporting text and/or policy; and to clarify that housing mix will be assessed in line with adopted Local Plan policies.</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM1</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL1 – policy reference at end of policy</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL1</td>
<td>Recognition that policy EL1 should reference Core Policy 30 ‘Maintaining and Improving the Quality of the Built and Open Environment’ as follows: <em>This policy should be read in conjunction with Core Policies 3, 5, 30 and 38 ...</em></td>
<td>To ensure that developments must lead to high quality public realm</td>
<td>Canal and River Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM1a</td>
<td>Chapter 3, paragraph 3.1.2</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL1</td>
<td>To make the following change to paragraph 3.1.2: The Council has recognised the requirement for the Edmonton Leeside AAP to reflect changing circumstances in Enfield and Meridian Water, most notably higher population growth and the selection of a master developer. Modelling was therefore undertaken to provide evidence and understanding for the growth potential at Meridian Water. The modelling tested and examined a range of growth scenarios, including at levels of housing and jobs significantly higher than in the Core Strategy, and the results have informed this AAP document. Further details are set out in section 5.3.</td>
<td>To recognise the Council is no longer working with a master developer and is no longer pursuing growth at higher rates than in the Core Strategy through this AAP</td>
<td>Ikea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM1a                  | Chapter 5, 5.1.3                                             | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To add the following wording to paragraph 5.1.3: 
Meridian Water comprises one of the largest areas of underused and brownfield regeneration land in London, with large areas of derelict land alongside industrial accommodation of varying age and quality. It also contains a significant scale of retail, including IKEA and Tesco stores. In the context of a significant and worsening housing shortage across Greater London, the case for comprehensive, residential-led redevelopment is compelling.

To add the following wording to paragraph 5.1.3: 
Meridian Water comprises one of the largest areas of underused and brownfield regeneration land in London, with large areas of derelict land alongside industrial accommodation of varying age and quality. It also contains a significant scale of retail, including IKEA and Tesco stores. In the context of a significant and worsening housing shortage across Greater London, the case for comprehensive, residential-led redevelopment is compelling. | Insertion to recognise the continued importance of existing businesses in the area. And Deletion to recognise proposed retention of valuable SIL land alongside new mixed use development. | Ikea / Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
| MM1a                  | Chapter 5, 5.1.7                                             | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To make the following change to paragraph 5.1.7:
The Council has selected a master developer which has set out an long-term aspiration to provide around 10,000 new homes and over 6,000 new full-time jobs at Meridian Water through this AAP, as well as an significant additional several thousand construction jobs during its development phase. | To ensure the AAP focus is on delivery within AAP area and timeframe. | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment |
| MM1a                  | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.1.14                                   | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To amend paragraph 5.1.14 as follows: 
Housing Zone status supports the delivery of infrastructure projects. A funding package has been secured with key stakeholders including the GLA and Network Rail which includes funding for a third rail track and a new Meridian Water station – both of which will increase train frequency to the area and enable the potential for Crossrail 2 in later phases of development. It is anticipated that the Housing Zone at Meridian Water could support further homes in the surrounding area beyond the boundary of the Edmonton Leeside AAP. | To ensure the AAP focus is on delivery within AAP area and timeframe. | Enfield Council |
| MM1a                  | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.3.8                                   | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To update paragraph 5.3.8 as follows:
Other forms of lower cost housing could contribute to housing provision at Meridian Water. These could include Starter Homes, introduced by the Housing and Planning Act 2016, and London Shared Ownership and the London Living Rent products. | Starter homes reference not appropriate here; Also to make wording consistent with London Plan Housing products. | Enfield Council in line Inspector comment |
| MM1a                  | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.3.17                                   | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To make the following change to paragraph 5.3.17:
The changing circumstances of population growth combined with higher London Plan housing targets and the selection of a master developer, led the Council to undertake evidence base modelling to provide understanding and evidence for the growth potential at Meridian Water. The modelling tested and examined a range of growth scenarios including at levels of housing and jobs significantly higher than in the Core Strategy and the results have informed this AAP. | To recognise the Council is no longer working with a master developer nor pursuing growth higher than in the Core Strategy through this AAP. | Ikea |

Enfield Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM1a                  | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.3.18-5.3.22                            | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To delete paragraphs 5.3.18-5.3.22:  
5.3.18—A range of scenarios were assessed and were selected as follows: the Core Strategy figure of 5,000 housing units, the Council’s evaluation criteria for the master-developer of 8,000 units, the development partner proposal for 10,000 units, and 12,000 units to examine a higher quantum development.  
5.3.19—The housing unit scenarios were further examined through a range of housing mixes as follows: Core Strategy based; Enfield’s emerging SHMA; and the master developer proposal. The figures used, as mix of 1or 2-bed units to 3+ bed units were: Core Strategy 40%:60%; emerging Enfield SHMA 50%:50%, and master developer proposal 74%:26%.  
5.3.20—The supporting infrastructure requirements at Meridian Water were also examined, including education, transport, health, retail, leisure and cultural uses, and open space. These requirements were assessed in terms of the land area and density, having regard to planning policy, guidance and standards, and in consultation with the GLA.  
5.3.21—Employment was also included as a variant, based on scenarios of 3,000 and 6,000 net new jobs.  
5.3.22—The extent of developable land within the Meridian Water boundary was calculated for the purposes of determining development density, and comprises 52 hectares (see the Meridian Water Spatial Scenario Testing document). The developable area was flexed to understand the effects of Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) designation at Harbet Road, examining the outcome at levels of SIL retention at 100%, 75%, 25% and 0%.  
And to replace this with the following sentence, to be added to the start of paragraph 5.3.23:  
A range of development quantum, housing mix, supporting infrastructure, developable land and employment creation scenarios have been assessed. The scenarios were then combined into a single adjustable... | To recognise the Council is no longer working with a master developer  
To recognise that the Council is no longer pursuing housing or employment numbers higher than in the Core Strategy through this AAP.  
And to simplify the text. | Enfield Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM1a/ MMSa</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.3.24-26</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL1 and EL5</td>
<td>To amend paragraph 5.3.24 (starting from final sentence) – paragraph 5.26 as follows: 5.3.24 .. The evidence shows how, depending on the developable land, the number and mix of dwellings, and the level of supporting services, the densities and building heights vary, while the variation on the quantum of supporting infrastructure required is established in broad terms: the more dwellings, the more land needed for uses such as schools, retail, community facilities and open space. and 5.3.25 In terms of available developable land, the evidence shows that scenarios which retain designated SIL within the Meridian Water boundary would be restricting upon the overall quantum of development achievable for housing units and employment, or lead to building heights which would challenge compliance with amenity light standards. Scenarios involving the retention of more than 25% of the existing SIL would require housing densities not present in any part of outer London with similar locational or accessibility conditions. To achieve higher levels of development at Meridian Water needs a flexible use of land to the east of the River Lee Navigation, this point is further explored when examining the characteristics of higher housing figures below, and in the section on Economy and Employment. 5.3.26 The evidence also shows that significant amounts of land are required for supporting infrastructure at Meridian Water, including schools, retail and healthcare. As such, development proposals at Meridian Water must have full and appropriate regard to the amount of land required by supporting infrastructure.</td>
<td>To recognise that the Council no longer seek to de-designate SIL or pursue higher housing numbers than the Core Strategy through this AAP</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM1a                  | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.3.27-29                              | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To amend paragraph 5.3.27-29 as follows:  
*The London Plan density matrix has three broad classifications of ‘suburban’, ‘urban’ and ‘central’ settings for development, with the number of dwellings per hectare also dependent upon links development capacity and density with character, public transport accessibility and connectivity (PTAL).*  

**Evidence base modelling indicates that a range of densities would be appropriate across the site as a whole having regard to public transport accessibility, connectivity as well as to plot specific context for tall buildings. The siting of tall buildings will require considerable care with the design approach if the overall development is to meet amenity light standard and ensure a high quality public realm and high quality liveable neighbourhoods.**  

The evidence base modelling indicates that an ‘urban’ level of density (up to 700 habitable rooms per hectare) could be appropriate across the site as a whole. The possibility of ‘central’ levels of density (up to 1100 habitable rooms per hectare) could also be considered in those locations with suitable characteristics, in particular higher levels of PTAL, although this must also be considered within the local context for the suitability of tall buildings.  

For 10,000 new homes and 6,000 new jobs the modelling indicates that - assuming no designated industrial land is retained at Harbet Road and with 26% 3+ bed homes - a density of 192 dwellings per hectare. This is towards the upper end of ‘urban’ density classification, and assumes PTALs rising to levels of 4-6. The average building height would be between 6 and 8 storeys across Meridian Water, requiring considerable care with the design approach if the overall development is to meet amenity light standard and ensure a high quality public realm and high quality liveable neighbourhoods. | To be consistent with the new draft London Plan’s move away from strict adherence to a density matrix and from PTAL  
And to recognise that the Council is no longer pursuing levels of growth higher than the Core Strategy through this AAP  
And to simplify the text and add flexibility | Enfield Council |
| MM1a/MM9a             | Chapter 5, before paragraph 5.3.31                         | Changes Consequential to EL1 and EL9 | To insert an additional paragraph before paragraph 5.3.31:  
*A further determining factor of development capacity is environmental impact, such as on nearby habitats or designated areas of conservation or protection (see Policy EL9).* | To link with wording inserted to Policy EL9, regarding assessing and mitigating impacts on designated areas of conservation and protection, in line with Natural England recommendations referring to the People Over Wind Judgement. | Enfield Council in line with Natural England recommendations |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM1a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.3.31                      | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To amend paragraph 5.3.31 as follows:  
*For the housing mix, the scenario testing indicates that the Core Strategy policy compliant 3+ bed unit mix would not be compatible with the other aspirations for redevelopment. This is in part due to the fact that a large proportion of 3+ bed units would not be accessible from street level or have access to terraces or gardens normally associated with family type accommodation. Furthermore the high child yield resulting from the Core Strategy mix would require very high levels of social and educational infrastructure. In combination these effects would either significantly lower the achievable number of homes, or drive building heights up to an unacceptable level for adequate light or overshadowing. A bespoke housing mix at Meridian Water can unlock the potential of the site and meet the high costs needed to deliver the necessary quality and infrastructure requirements. Should allow for a range of housing sizes, including appropriately located, high quality family housing, in line with adopted local plan policy.* | To recognise that housing mix must be assessed in line with adopted development plan policies | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
| MM1a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.5.5                      | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To delete paragraph 5.5.5 as follows:  
*Evidence from modelling (see Meridian Water Evidence on Housing and Supporting Infrastructure document) indicates a range of retail floorspace requirements, dependent upon the quantum and mix of residential development - 10,000 new homes could require 5,400 square metres at the minimum mix of 3+ bedroom housing units.* | To ensure consistency of residential and employment capacity figures with Enfield’s adopted Local Plan | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment |
| MM1a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.7.10                     | Changes Consequential to EL1 | To amend paragraph 5.7.10 as follows:  
*The evidence modelling (Meridian Water Evidence on Housing and Supporting Infrastructure document) indicates a range of floorspace requirements for healthcare, dependent upon the quantum and mix of residential development (see Section 5.3 on housing). Ten thousand new homes would require 2,000 square metres at the minimum mix of 3+ bedroom housing units, with up to 2,400 square metres at a Core Strategy compliant mix. At 8,000 homes the range is 1,700 sqm to 1,900 sqm, and is highest for 12,000 homes at 2,500 sqm to 2,900 sqm.* | To remove unnecessary level of detail | Enfield Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM2</th>
<th>Chapter 5, Policy EL2</th>
<th>Changes to Policy EL2</th>
<th>To edit Policy EL2 as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To support the scale of development at Meridian Water and deliver the requirement for net new jobs, the economy will undergo transformational change. There must be an efficient and effective configuration of land uses which supports the growth of key economic sectors and results in a strong and diverse economy. As such the restrictive SIL and LSIS industrial land designations within the Meridian Water boundary are not compatible with either the economic and employment objectives, or the wider aims of transformational change. The evidence shows that, subject to sufficient supporting infrastructure and the achievement of high quality urban design, 6,000 to 7,000 net new jobs could be delivered at Meridian Water. Development proposals and supplementary planning documents are required to demonstrate how they will support:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Intensification of land uses and the introduction of higher density development, including multistorey buildings, that increases employment and job growth density in comparison with the baseline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Higher value added activities and industries that yield higher job densities, in particular in the B1(a), B1(b) and B1(c) use classes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunities for creative and cultural industries, digital and media, ecommerce, pharmaceuticals and high value engineering sectors where these are consistent with relevant designations of the employment land in question;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- High quality, low carbon and innovative design providing an attractive place to work and taking into account neighbouring uses does not compromise the viability of other activities and developments, including of neighbouring residential developments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New development which adversely impacts existing neighbouring uses should provide appropriate mitigation in line with the Agent of Change principle;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support transport connectivity improvements, including pedestrian and cycle links to public transport nodes and new and existing residential areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A comprehensive landscape scheme which includes public realm improvements and capitalises upon the Lee Valley Regional Park and waterways;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Active frontages, especially along the Causeway, Central Spine, River Lee Navigation at the rail station;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Development of a state of the art fibre optic communications network; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A contribution to local labour initiatives and employment skills training, including of Meridian Water construction jobs for the local population, in line with the Council’s S106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Documents. Where appropriate, the Council will explore and support meanwhile uses, in existing buildings or temporary structures, for the development of new types of employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relocation of Businesses - Improving Existing Industrial Estates**

This policy should be read in conjunction with Policy EL15, Part D: Relocation of Businesses, Improving Existing Industrial Estates.

This policy should be read in conjunction with Core Strategy Policy 14 and 15, DMD policies 23 and 24, and London Plan Policy 2.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM2a</th>
<th>Chapter 5, S.1.6</th>
<th>Changes Consequential to EL2</th>
<th>Amend paragraph 5.1.6:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optimising development outcomes at Meridian Water requires a flexible and innovative approach to land uses and design which supports a much greater density of employment. Buildings, spaces and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deletion to recognise the retention of the SIL designations. Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM2a                 | Chapter 5, 5.1.10                                            | Changes Consequential to EL2 | To correct the wording of first part of the final sentence of paragraph 5.1.10:  
These include 5,000 new homes and **1,500** new jobs, ... | To correct the text to accurately reflect the wording of policy CS37 and CS38 | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment |
| MM2a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.4.5                                    | Changes Consequential to EL2 | Delete paragraph 5.4.5:  
The de-designation of all employment land at Meridian Water would potentially lead to the displacement of some jobs which would need to be replaced across the Edmonton Leeside area. | To recognise that the Council is no longer considering de-designation of SIL land at Meridian Water through ELAAP | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment |
| MM2a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.4.7                                    | Changes Consequential to EL2 | To amend paragraphs 5.4.7 as follows:  
5.4.7 The potential for new job creation at Meridian Water in terms of land and infrastructure was assessed at 3,000 and for 6,000 net new jobs. The employment modelling and evidence assessment addressed the extent to which Meridian Water could capture a portion of the office based demand from companies seeking growth or relocation, as evidenced across the wider area through GLA forecasts. | To recognise the Council no longer seeks employment numbers greater than those in the adopted Core Strategy as part through this AAP | Enfield Council |
Chapter 5, paragraph 5.4.10-5.4.13

Changes Consequential to EL2

To edit paragraphs 5.4.10-5.4.13 as follows:

5.4.10 The modelling shows that Meridian Water can achieve very significant employment growth, and that, with the right approaches to land use and design, more than 6,000 new jobs can be achieved, in line with Enfield’s adopted Core Strategy. Overall, the evidence indicates the employment breakdown at Meridian Water could potentially be as follows:

- Higher value added office and research activities 70% to 90% of total net new jobs;
- Administration support services, education, health and public sector activities 10%;
- Retail (A use class): at 3,000 net new jobs 12% of the total or 6% at 6,000 jobs; and
- It is assumed for this analysis that there would not be industries of the B2 and B8 use classes within the Meridian Water boundary, although such uses are not precluded.

5.4.11 The evidence indicates that the area’s existing low employment densities are not compatible with the employment growth needs for Meridian Water and the new population. The Meridian Water area within the red-line boundary will not therefore be suitable for designated industrial land if the comprehensive regeneration of Meridian Water is to progress successfully. To meet this need this AAP removes the Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) designation from the Harbet Road Industrial Estate and the Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS) designation from the southern portion of Montagu Road Industrial Estate which lies within the Meridian Water boundary (see Figure 6.1 for the updated locations of industrial land designations within Edmonton Leeside).

5.4.12 To support a more diverse economic base with a higher density of jobs, Meridian Water must configure its land uses far more efficiently. This includes encouraging and supporting business employment sectors, including office, retail, leisure and cultural uses, which can operate from multi-storey buildings and alongside or co-located with other uses, such as residential, in line with Core Policy 38, retail and leisure. The Council expects any employment development proposed at Meridian Water to be innovatively designed to provide an attractive place to work. New business opportunities for creative industries and business start-ups, and a hub for innovation and new ideas, will be encouraged and promoted. The Council will encourage building types which intensify and increase employment the industrial functions on the site, such as an advanced business park form that is vertically stacked, and which contributes to place making. This will also encourage uses and types that help activate the public realm and provide natural surveillance.

5.4.13 Development must enable a higher density and wider range of employment uses, and a greater mix of non-employment uses. Consideration must also be given to how new uses interact with existing uses, be they residential or employment, in line with the Agent of Change principle fewer “bad neighbour” uses close to new residential development and to the provision of provide for new transport and access infrastructure to enable the area to integrate well with Edmonton and the wider area. Any new or retained employment space must be compatible with the new residential...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM2a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.4.15</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL2</td>
<td>To edit paragraph 5.4.15 as follows: <em>The absence of an industrial land designation does not preclude the operation of industrial sectors within the B2 and B8 uses. Such Industrial land uses could will continue to be accommodated on the designated and undesignated industrial land in #4# the eastern part of Meridian Water where the manoeuvring of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) can be through direct access to Harbet Road. Good design must be used to ensure the efficient use of land, through developing multi-storey buildings, and an appropriate relationship of new proposals with neighbouring uses. The retained industrial estates within Meridian Water are also discussed in Chapter 6 on Edmonton Leeside Employment and Industrial Estates.</em></td>
<td>To recognise that the Council is no longer considering de-designation of SIL land at Meridian Water through ELAAP</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.4.19</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL2</td>
<td>Delete paragraph 5.4.19: <em>Redevelopment of the existing employment land will require the relocation of the bus depot at Harbet Road. The Council will work with Arriva in finding a suitable location in terms of size and surrounding land uses. Proximity to main bus corridors is an important consideration in relocating bus depots as this reduces the time spent travelling between the depot and the bus route. Where relocation of the bus depot requires existing businesses to be relocated, the Council will work with owners (and occupiers), prior to any development taking place, to relocate to appropriate premises in employment or mixed use areas defined in the AAP area, or other locations within the borough. TfL will be engaged in this process to ensure there is no net loss of overall bus capacity or if they agree that the bus garage is no longer required. This reflects guidance set out in the Mayor’s Land for Industry and Transport SPG (2012).</em></td>
<td>Update text to reflect that the Council is no longer looking to de-designate SIL land on which the bus garage is located through ELAAP</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.11.7</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL2</td>
<td>To amend paragraph 5.11.7 as follows: <em>The rationale for tall buildings at Meridian Water is particularly strong around the new railway station where transport accessibility may support higher-density development. The area close to Banbury Reservoir also provides the opportunity to take advantage of views across the Lee Valley from higher residential buildings.</em></td>
<td>To bring in line with council’s approach of SIL retention</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.11.8</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL2</td>
<td>To amend paragraph 5.11.8 as follows: <em>Building heights will vary in response to context, adjacent road widths and public transport accessibility. Whilst the eastern areas for built development at Meridian Water are adjacent to green belt land, the visual context of existing infrastructure, including for example the raised A406 road and reservoir embankments, could allow tall buildings in these locations, subject to good design and the avoidance of creating a ‘wall’ of tall buildings.</em></td>
<td>To reflect the Council’s intention to retain SIL</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2a</td>
<td>Chapter 5 after paragraph 5.11.11</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL2</td>
<td>To change the reference to the Causeway in paragraph 5.11.1 to Causeway Central Spine. And to insert text as a new paragraph to follow paragraph 5.11.11: 5.11.12 Planning proposals are encouraged to include the waterside and waterways within the boundary of their sites, where relevant, to ensure that the public realm is planned, and improvements delivered, in a way that is integrated with the development.</td>
<td>To reflect the name change and to further recognise that proposals should be encouraged to include waterside and waterway within the boundary of their sites to ensure the public realm is planned, and improvements delivered, in a way that is integrated with the development.</td>
<td>Enfield Council, Canal and River Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, after paragraph 5.11.11</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL2</td>
<td>For the following text to be inserted after paragraph 5.11.11 in reference to waterfront development: 5.11.13 Built development near a river front should aim for a minimum 8 metre set back from the top of the river bank, in line with access requirements of the Environment Agency. This allows for maintenance and improvements, such as re-naturalisation of river banks and habitat improvement. Footpaths and landscaping may be included within the buffer zone, although a wider undisturbed green corridor area should be provided where possible. Where the full 8m cannot be achieved, appropriate Environment Agency access has to still be maintained.</td>
<td>To recognise and incorporate the access requirements of the Environment Agency, to allow for maintenance and improvements, such as re-naturalisation of river banks and habitat improvement.</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2a</td>
<td>Paragraphs 6.4.2-6.4.3</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL2</td>
<td>Delete paragraph 6.4.2 and amend paragraph 6.4.3 as follows: 6.4.2 The need for comprehensive redevelopment of Meridian Water, with a more efficient use of land and new economic sectors and jobs, was established in Chapter 5. This approach precludes designated industrial land within the Meridian Water boundary. 6.4.3 To achieve a balance of transformational change and supporting ongoing industrial capacity in Edmonton Leeside, this AAP will retain the SIL designations will continue to be protected in Edmonton Leeside beyond the Meridian Water boundary. Furthermore, additional SIL locations have been identified to ensure the most effective functioning and protection of land for industrial uses in Edmonton Leeside. The new areas for SIL designation is as shown in Table 6.2 below.</td>
<td>To bring up to date with Council’s intention to retain SIL designation alongside mixed use redevelopment</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL3</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL3</td>
<td>To edit the second paragraph of Policy EL3 as follows: The town centre at Meridian Water must function as a diverse and vibrant entity, and therefore the retail and other A-use class floorspace must be provided as a range of multiple units and not as a single large unit. Shop frontage must be not more than 6-8 metres in width. Double frontages must be separated by a minimum of two single frontages.</td>
<td>To add flexibility and endeavour to be less prescriptive in the AAPs requirements.</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL3</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL3</td>
<td>To edit the third paragraph of Policy EL3 as follows: Development Proposals for A-Class uses, and supplementary planning documents showing A-Class uses, will be permitted in the following locations:</td>
<td>To delete unnecessary reference to SPD</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL3 Changes to Policy EL3</td>
<td>To edit the fifth paragraph of Policy EL3 as follows: Development Proposals for A-Class uses, and supplementary planning documents showing A-Class uses, which cumulatively with existing and extant planning permissions lead to provision greater than 2,0500 square metres must demonstrate evidence that there would be no adverse effect on neighbouring centres and that proposals are in proportion to the growth in local demand, taking account of the status of Meridian Water as a large local centre.</td>
<td>To simplify the retail policy and bring it in line with adopted Core Strategy and NPPF</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM3a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.5.3 Changes Consequential to EL3</td>
<td>To change the first sentence of paragraph 5.5.3 as follows: The town centre uses at Meridian Water will should be located along the Causeway Central Spine, River Lee Navigation and around the railway station. Causeway Central Spine</td>
<td>To add flexibility and to recognise the name change of the Causeway to the Central Spine</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM3a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.5.7 Changes Consequential to EL3</td>
<td>To make the following change to paragraph 5.5.7: To encourage a vibrant and diverse local shopping environment, a variety of occupants will be encouraged across Meridian Water. Variety in the width and height of the shops will make a significant contribution to the character and the rhythm of the street. the width of each shop will therefore be limited to 6-8 metres, with restrictions on double fronted shops.</td>
<td>To add flexibility and endeavour to be less prescriptive in the AAPs requirements.</td>
<td>Ikea Enfield Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL4 Changes to Policy EL4</td>
<td>Policy EL4, first paragraph, should be amended as follows: Development proposals and supplementary planning documents at Ravenside Retail Park must demonstrate:</td>
<td>To delete unnecessary reference to SPD</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL4 Changes to Policy EL4</td>
<td>Policy EL4, 2nd bullet point, should be amended as follows: Improvements to the public realm, including active frontages, and green landscaping and interaction with the River Lee Navigation corridor; and</td>
<td>To recognise that any improvements to the public realm at Ravenside Retail Park should also improve the site’s interaction with the River Lee Navigation corridor</td>
<td>Canal and River Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL4 Changes to Policy EL4</td>
<td>To insert as an additional 4th bullet to Policy EL4, a reference to the sequential test, as follows: Where applicable, that a sequential test and retail impact assessment have been applied.</td>
<td>To address Inspector and GLA’s comments on retail impact assessment</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with GLA and Inspector comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL5 Changes to Policy EL5</td>
<td>To amend the first and second paragraph of Policy EL5 as follows: Development proposals and supplementary planning documents must ....</td>
<td>To delete unnecessary reference to SPD</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL5 Changes to Policy EL5</td>
<td>To amend Policy EL5, deleting the final two sentences of the first paragraph under the Heading of Education: As the Meridian Water development is built and grows it is vital to monitor child yields and update the school places requirements to meet the educational need. Financial contributions may be sought to ensure the need for school places is met.</td>
<td>To avoid repetition of supporting text in policy</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM5                  | Chapter 5, Policy ELS | Changes to Policy ELS | To amend Policy ELS, third paragraph under the Heading of Education, as follows:  
*Meeting the need for outdoor sports pitches through off-site provision should be fully considered. Outdoor sports pitches must be provided in immediate proximity to the school where possible, while any off-site provision must be conveniently and safely accessible at a distance of no more than 400m from the school entrance and be able to be conveniently and safely accessed.*  
Outdoor sports pitches must be provided in immediate proximity to the school where possible, while any off-site provision must be conveniently and safely accessible at a distance of no more than 400m from the school entrance and be able to be conveniently and safely accessed. | To further recognise that schools require safe and convenient access to outdoor sports pitches | Sports England |
| MM5a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.7.3 | Changes Consequential to ELS | To amend paragraph 5.7.3 as follows:  
*The evidence modelling (Meridian Water Evidence on Housing and Supporting Infrastructure document) indicates a range of school places requirements, dependent upon the quantum and mix of residential development (see section 5.3 on housing). On the basis of GLA standard child yield, 30 students per class and two forms of entry for a primary school and eight forms of entry for a secondary school, 10,000 new homes at a Core Strategy compliant housing mix the minimum mix of 3+bedroom housing units would require a minimum of 3.2 new primary schools and 1 new secondary school, in line with Core Policy 38 Schools. As the development progresses and grows it is vital to monitor child yields and update the school places requirements to meet the educational need.*  
To ensure residential capacity, housing mix approach is consistent with adopted Core Strategy. | To ensure residential capacity, housing mix approach is consistent with adopted Core Strategy | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
| MM5a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.7.5 | Changes Consequential to ELS | To amend the second – fourth sentence of paragraph 5.7.5 as follows:  
*The option to meet the need for outdoor sports pitches through accessible off-site provision should be explored. The outdoor sports pitches must be provided in immediate proximity to the school where possible, while any off-site provision must be conveniently and safely accessible at a distance of no more than 400m from the school entrance and be able to be conveniently and safely accessed. Areas of underused open space to the east and north east of Meridian Water could provide suitable locations for this (see Section 5.10 below). The LVRPA Lee Valley Regional Park Authority will play a critical role in enabling this to be located within neighbouring parkland. Contributions to education provision may be sought in accordance with the S106 Planning Obligations SPD and in the longer term via Community Infrastructure Levy to support the delivery of suitable accommodation.*  
To recognise that schools require safe and convenient access to outdoor sports pitches  
And to recognise that, while negotiations for the sale, lease or compulsory purchase of this land are ongoing at the time of writing, these are not yet finalised.  
To avoid abbreviations  
And to signify that funding of educational facilities is currently not in line with Enfield’s adopted CIL and therefore subject to the upcoming borough CIL review | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments | Sport England |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM6</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL6 Part A</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL6</td>
<td>To make the following change to Policy EL6 Part A:</td>
<td>To address concerns about the Central Spine and to address the name change and to clarify that the Central Spine route will now be located in a safeguarded corridor and to delete unnecessary reference to SPD</td>
<td>Aytans Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy EL6: The Causeway Central Spine and Central Spine Corridor**

Part A

The Council will work with its partners and stakeholders to implement the Causeway Central Spine and maximise connectivity across Meridian Water. The route of the Causeway Central Spine will be within the Central Spine Corridor shown in Figure 5.1.

The identification of the route of the Central Spine within the Corridor shown in Figure 5.1 and its detailed design will be set out in a detailed planning application as well as in a new Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document. The route and the detailed design of the Central Spine will be developed to take account of third party land interests as far as possible.

In order to ensure the delivery of the Central Spine, permission will not be granted for development that would or could prejudice or interfere with the delivery of this critical infrastructure.

The Causeway Central Spine should comprise a spine route across Meridian Water and be navigable along its length by pedestrians and cyclists, with clear, safe and direct pedestrian and cycle provision. The Causeway Central Spine should be accessible by vehicular traffic between Glover Drive in the west and Harbet Road in the east. The Causeway Central Spine will include a crossing over the River Lee Navigation Canal.

Development proposals and supplementary planning documents that include any land within the Corridor shown in Figure 5.1 part of the entire Causeway route must have regard to the guidance in the Masterplan SPD and must:

- Support the delivery of a continuous link route across Meridian Water and beyond;
- Incorporate the Causeway Central Spine in the design;
- Actively contribute to enable the delivery of the Causeway Central Spine through design, layout, orientation and facilitation;
- Prioritise the route as the primary route for orientation, navigation and connectivity at Meridian Water;
- Show how other routes provide connectivity to the Causeway Central Spine and enable connectivity within and beyond Meridian Water;...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM6                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL6 Part B                                  | Changes to Policy EL6 | To amend Policy EL6 part B as follows:  
Part B: The *Causeway Central Spine* as a Place for Interaction and Communities  
The *Causeway Central Spine* will connect Meridian Water’s new neighbourhoods and play a key role in linking Meridian Water to the wider area, integrating with existing residents and communities.  
Development Proposals and supplementary planning documents that include *any land within the Corridor shown in Figure 5.1 part of the entire Causeway route* must:  
- Demonstrate how resident and employee access to supporting uses is maximised, including retail, health centres, open space and schools.  
- Show how the *Causeway Central Spine* is utilised as a key location for community infrastructure and the clustering of A-Class uses;  
- Ensure active frontages to the *Causeway Central Spine route*, on both its sides and, where the River Lee Navigation is crossed, to extend the activity around the corner plots to permit natural surveillance around and under the bridge;  
- Ensure no Discourage the provision of car parking between the building frontage and the *Causeway Central Spine*, with the only exception being of on-street single-width parking;  
Demonstrate a safe relationship with traffic on the *Causeway Central Spine*; and ...  
To address concerns about the Central Spine and to recognise that there should be active frontages around the crossing of the River Lee Navigation to allow for natural surveillance | To address concerns about the Central Spine  
Enfield Council  
Canal and River Trust |
| MM6                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL6 Part C                                  | Changes to Policy EL6 | To amend policy EL6 part C as follows:  
Part C: The *Causeway Central Spine* as an Infrastructure Corridor  
The *Causeway Central Spine* will form a key route for essential infrastructure, including high speed broadband, decentralised energy, gas and electricity networks and other infrastructure.  
Development Proposals and supplementary planning documents that include *any land within the Corridor shown in Figure 5.1 part of the entire Causeway route* must:  
- Demonstrate how the *Causeway Central Spine*, as shown in the emerging Meridian Water masterplan, *route* will act as the trunk route for servicing and subterranean infrastructure, including details of how the routes will positively and proactively connect to the *Causeway Central Spine* route and servicing on adjacent sites; ...  
To address concerns about the Central Spine  
Enfield Council |
| MM6a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.1                                    | Changes Consequential to EL6 | To amend paragraph 5.8.1 as follows:  
The *Causeway Central Spine and Central Spine Corridor*  
The *Causeway Central Spine* will consist of a strategic east-west link and community focused route running through Meridian Water. *It will be located within the Central Spine Corridor shown on Figure 5.1 and will* connecting with the surrounding areas. The *Causeway Central Spine* will form the core spine road around which Meridian Water can be structured and delivered, and which will unite the entire site.  
To address concerns about the Central Spine and reflect name change.  
To clarify that the Central Spine route will now be located in a safeguarded corridor | Aytans  
Enfield Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM6a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.5                                  | Changes Consequential to EL6 | To make additions and changes to paragraph 5.8.5 as follows:  
The Causeway Central Spine Corridor  
The identification of the route and detailed design of the Central Spine within the Corridor shown in Figure 5.1 will take place through the preparation of a detailed planning application and forthcoming new Masterplan supplementary planning document. It should reflect its dual role as a route and as a destination, supporting retail, leisure, community and cultural uses, reflecting and complementing the character of the surrounding uses and neighbourhoods. | To address concerns about the Central Spine  
And to reflect changed approach | Aytans Enfield Council |
| MM6a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.6                                  | Changes Consequential to EL6 | To make the following changes and additions to paragraph 5.8.6:  
In order to ensure the delivery of the Central Spine, permission will not be granted for development that would or could prejudice or interfere with the delivery of this critical infrastructure. The safeguarded route is articulated in four sections, each having a specific rationale informing its alignment and width. The safeguarded route is identified by a no-build corridor with a variable width, indicating the minimum distance between buildings and permanent structures. Meanwhile uses and temporary buildings can may be located within this corridor only if their presence does not interfere with the Causeway Central Spine’s alignment. Cycle lanes will be provided along its entire length—the Central Spine. Their design should take into account their interaction with the access requirements of existing established businesses. A further Causeway Central Spine connection to the station is shown across the A1055, and each stage of development must show how pedestrian and cycle flows to the station will be enabled and improved. | To address concerns about the Central Spine  
and to reflect changed approach | Aytans Enfield Council |
| MM6a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.7                                  | Changes Consequential to EL6 | To remove the final sentence of paragraph 5.8.7:  
The corridor width in this section is 32 m. | To add flexibility and endeavour to be less prescriptive in the AAPs requirements. | Ikea Aytans Enfield Council |
| MM6a                 | Chapter 5, figure 5.1                                       | Changes Consequential to EL6 | Change the title of Figure 5.1 to:  
Figure 5.1: The Causeway Central Spine Corridor Route  
The figure itself will also be amended to reflect the new Corridor route in line with Policy EL6 | To reflect name change and new route of road and new corridor approach in line with Policy EL6 | Enfield Council |
| MM6a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.8                                  | Changes Consequential to EL6 | To make the following changes to paragraph 5.8.8:  
Segment 2 - begins where Section 1 ends, and continues to the bridge landing on the east bank of the River Lee Navigation. Two new bridges are required over the branches of the Pymmes Brook. The main constraints in this section are represented by the Ravenside Retail Park to the north and the shed buildings (Meridian Works) to the south, which are being refurbished and re-used to house creative industries. The crank in the Causeway alignment allows retention of the sheds and promotes traffic calming. The Causeway corridor width reduces from 32m to 26m, becoming a single carriageway and reinforcing the traffic calming. To bridge and over the River Lee Navigation the Causeway begins to rise 50m west of the waterway bank, and similarly lands 50m east of the waterway’s east bank. | To address concerns about the Central Spine  
To add flexibility and endeavour to be less prescriptive. | Ikea Aytans Enfield Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM6a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.9                                  | Changes Consequential to EL6 | To make the following changes to paragraph 5.8.9:  
Segment 3 – begins where the bridge over the Lee Navigation lands on the east bank. **The alignment of the second section is maintained into the third section. The alignment is also informed by public transport requirements. To introduce an effective bus service requires that pedestrian access to the bus stops is located a maximum of 200 m from any residence. This generates a catchment area that can be utilised most effectively through this central location of the Causeway. The corridor width in this section is 26m.**  

To address concerns about the Central Spine.  
To add flexibility and endeavour to be less prescriptive. | Ikea  
Enfield Council | |
| MM6a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.10                                 | Changes Consequential to EL6 | To make the following changes to paragraph 5.8.10:  
Segment 4 - responds to a very specific constraint: the presence of a water tunnel approximately 10 metres underground. To limit building costs over this tunnel the Causeway adopts the alignment of the tunnel until it continues eastwards and forms a junction with Harbet Road.  

To address concerns about the Central Spine.  
To add flexibility and endeavour to be less prescriptive. | Aytans  
Enfield Council | |
| MM6a                 | Chapter 5, Figure 5.2                                       | Changes Consequential to EL6 | This figure will be amended in line with Figure 5.1 and Policy EL6 to reflect the new Corridor route and approach and to add a key to the figure  

To address concerns about the Central Spine and reflect new route and corridor approach in line with Policy EL6 and to correct previous omission | Aytans  
Enfield Council | |
| MM7                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL7                                       | Changes to Policy EL7     | To amend the first sentence of Policy EL7:  
The Council and its partners the GLA, Transport for London, Network Rail, and Abellio Greater Anglia (train operator), will work closely **together to replace to secure major improvements to Angel Road station,** supporting the regeneration of Meridian Water and wider area.  

To reflect name change | Enfield Council | |
| MM7                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL7                                       | Changes to Policy EL7     | To update the 1st and 2nd bullets of EL7 as follows:  
• Angel Road station is **being replaced with a new and improved station allocated further south,** and **renamed ‘Meridian Water Station’ to create an integrated transport hub with the new bus interchange on Meridian Way. This will enhance access to the station and greatly improve the experience of public transport users, providing an immediate connection between Meridian Water, Edmonton Leeside and the wider North London region;**  

Lengthening of the platforms to the south of the North Circular (A406) to create new entrances on both sides of the railway to the east and west which will connect to the **Causeway Central Spine** (see Policy EL6)  

To provide clarification of bus infrastructure requirements in line with Transport for London comments | Transport for London | |
| MM7                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL7                                       | Changes to Policy EL7     | To update the text at Policy EL7, 3rd bullet as follows:  
**Improved bus interchange and bus standing** connecting Meridian Water to...  

To provide clarification of bus infrastructure requirements in line with Transport for London comments | Transport for London | |
| MM7a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.8.17                                 | Changes Consequential to EL7 | To update paragraph 5.8.17 as follows:  
*A new bus interchange and associated bus standing will be provided, creating a transport hub and connecting bus services to the station*.  

A clarification of bus infrastructure requirements | Transport for London | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM8                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL8                                         | Changes to Policy EL8 | To make the following changes to Policy EL8, 2nd paragraph:  
All developments must be safe from flooding and must not increase flood risk elsewhere. Development proposals must be supported by a detailed technical assessment of the flood risks and appropriate mitigation measures. All development will require a detailed site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to be submitted with each individual planning application, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Enfield’s Level 1 SRFA and the recommendations of the Level 2 SRFA. Adequate flood risk mitigation must be in place for all development. | To clarify requirements for and progress on flood risk assessment for the area | Thames Water Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments and EA recommendations |
| MM8                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL8                                         | Changes to Policy EL8 | To amend text of policy EL8, second sentence of third paragraph as follows:  
Surface water discharge rates should aim to achieve be limited to greenfield runoff rates or such other rates as agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority throughout the development and proposals should demonstrate application of the ... | Align with relevant London Plan policy approach. | Enfield Council in line with EA recommendations |
| MM8                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL8                                         | Changes to Policy EL8 | The following text, based on paragraph 13.4.1 in the supporting text, will be inserted into Policy EL8:  
The Council will apply the Sequential Test within Meridian Water at Masterplanning stage, in order to direct development to areas of low flood risk. More vulnerable and essential infrastructure should be located within Flood Zone 1 and 2 areas. Where this is not possible, development proposals must be shown to meet the provisions of the exception test, as set out by the NPPF. | To give added weight and clarity on the requirements for flood risk assessment in Policy and to adapt policy to reflect the need for appropriate flood mitigation at an area wide basis | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments and EA recommendations |
| MM8                  | Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.9.8                                    | Changes Consequential to EL8 | Amend the second sentence of paragraph 5.9.8 as follows:  
Flood management measures at Meridian Water should could incorporate modifications to the existing flood risk... | To strengthen the text | Enfield Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM8a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.9.4-5</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL8</td>
<td>To delete paragraph 5.9.4, to change the wording of paragraph 5.9.5 and add additional paragraphs as follows. Paragraph numbering of following paragraphs will be amended accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM8a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.9.4-5</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL8</td>
<td>5.9.4 Enfield’s Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) presents and summarises the flood risk at Meridian Water, together with requirements and recommendations for flood risk management. Development proposals must respond directly to the findings and requirements of the SFRA whilst maintaining compliance with the policies set out in the NPPF, London Plan, Core Strategy, Development Management Document and the requirements of the Environment Agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM8a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.9.4-5</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL8</td>
<td>5.9.5 The Environment Agency has updated its requirements for climate change allowances to a higher level than those used to prepare Enfield’s the Level 2 SFRA, and the Environment Agency’s own fluvial modelling. Driven by these revised climate change allowances, Until updated, the Environment Agency is undertaking an update to its fluvial modelling based on the revised climate change allowances is not available. Where Flood Risk Assessments for development proposals are submitted prior to the completion of the EA’s modelling work, it is incumbent on the Developer to must undertake fluvial modelling using the current climate change allowances and submit a Flood Risk Assessments for future proposals in a manner acceptable to the Environment Agency and Enfield Council’s Lead Local Flood Authority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM8a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.9.4-5</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL8</td>
<td>5.9.6 Wider detailed fluvial modelling, commissioned by Enfield Council, is due to be completed in summer of 2019. This will support an FRA covering the whole Meridian Water Masterplan area. Individual developments will still need to be accompanied by an FRA, but these plot-scale FRAs would be underpinned by the wider FRA undertaken for the entire Meridian Water Masterplan area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM8a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.9.4-5</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL8</td>
<td>Amend text of paragraph 5.9.6 as follows: Flood mitigation requirements will create considerable competition for space across Meridian Water, both above and below ground, and must therefore be fully integrated at an early stage within the detailed design of streets, buildings and spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM8a</td>
<td>Chapter 1, Objective 5</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL8</td>
<td>Update 7th bullet point of Objective 5: Manage-Reduce flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environment Agency
And Thames Water
And Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments and EA recommendations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM8a</td>
<td>Chapter 13, paragraph 13.4.1</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL8</td>
<td>For the following text to become new paragraph 13.4.1 and for subsequent paragraph numbers to be updated: <strong>Meridian Water lies within an area of flood risk classified at levels 2 and 3. As such, the Environment Agency recommends that a sequential approach to site selection is undertaken across the site.</strong> <strong>The Enfield Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is out of date as it does not take account of 2015 Environment Agency guidance in relation to climate change allowances. The Council are undertaking updated flood risk modelling but this is not yet available. At present the Environment Agency indicate that it is unclear what the 1 in 100 year plus 35% and 1 in 100 year plus 70% climate change scenarios will mean for the site, but that the level of flood risk on site is likely to increase once these have been taken into account.</strong> <strong>To justify the sequential approach the Council will make explicit how the phasing of development and the emerging new Masterplan supplementary planning document will ensure flood mitigation and prevention measures are dealt with in an area-wide manner, such that at no stage of the development is there any net loss of flood storage.</strong> <strong>The Council will apply the Sequential Test within Edmonton Leeside in order to direct development to areas of low flood risk. More vulnerable and essential infrastructure should be located within Flood Zone 1 and 2 areas. Where this is not possible, development proposals must be shown to meet the provisions of the Exception Test, as set out by the NPPF, and that development can be made safe in accordance with the definition set out in Enfield's Level 2 SFRA. For Meridian Water, the Exception Test is also being delivered by the Council through a Flood Risk Assessment undertaken for the entire Meridian Water Masterplan Area. Subsequent site level assessment, where they are necessary, will be underpinned by this wider FRA.</strong></td>
<td>To recognise that, following the Environment Agency’s requirement to meet new climate change allowances, and the increased level of development at Meridian Water, the assessment of flood risk at Meridian Water has moved beyond the SFRA Level 2 prepared in 2013</td>
<td>Thames Water Enfield Council in line with EA recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM8a</td>
<td>Chapter 13, paragraph 13.4.3</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL8</td>
<td>To insert the following additional text as penultimate sentence to paragraph 13.4.3: <strong>The River Lee Navigation provides an opportunity for receiving surface water drainage from Meridian Water and proposals should explore this potential, subject to assessment for pollution and flow-rate and Environment Agency permit.</strong></td>
<td>To make reference to exploring opportunities for surface water drainage into the River Lee Navigation, subject to assessment for pollution and flow-rate and EA permit</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>To delete the first two paragraphs of Policy EL9: <strong>Development at Meridian Water must make sufficient provision for open spaces, children’s play spaces, and leisure facilities. The pressure on land availability may result in some open space being provided beyond Meridian Water, requiring development proposals to show how good linkages to this space can be provided. Meridian Water has the potential to deliver a significant leisure offering, including for example a public leisure centre, private health club, sports pitches, tennis courts, and facilities for boating.</strong></td>
<td>To reduce repetition and make policy more concise</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>To amend the third paragraph and first bullet point of Policy EL9 as follows: Development proposals and supplementary planning documents must demonstrate: • The provision of sufficient children’s play space, including formal and informal children’s play space, as well as incidental playable space in larger areas of open space; This provision should be in proportion to the quantum of residential development proposed, having regard to the relevant Enfield and London approach to calculating children’s play space requirements;</td>
<td>To simplify sentence And to delete unnecessary reference to SPD</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>To amend the third bullet point of Policy EL9 as follows: The provision of sufficient open space within Meridian Water, including parks and linear spaces which incorporate a wide variety of uses and amenities; this should be in proportion to the quantum of residential development proposed; or how provision can be met through improvements to the accessibility and quality of existing open space;</td>
<td>To improve syntax</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>Add text to Policy EL9 to follow the 3rd bullet point: That opportunities for new waterspaces to support leisure uses within Meridian Water have been considered where appropriate;</td>
<td>To further support for making use of the watercourses and the potential for new waterspaces in appropriate locations at Meridian Water</td>
<td>Canal and River Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>To include additional wording for Policy EL9 through adding a new item as the 4th bullet point: How they will avoid negative impacts such as recreational disturbance on sites of ecological importance, including the Chingford Reservoirs SSSI and Lee Valley Special Protection Area/ Ramsar site at Walthamstow Reservoirs;</td>
<td>To emphasise that development must not negatively impact on areas of ecological importance, particularly through recreational disturbance</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>To include wording for Policy EL9 through adding a new item as a 5th bullet point: How they will assess, avoid and/or mitigate negative impacts on Epping Forest SAC, Lee Valley SPA or other designated areas of conservation or protection, for example from recreational pressure or due to traffic impacts in relation to air quality; appropriate assessment and measures should be determined in consultation with the Council and Natural England;</td>
<td>To further recognise that development must assess, avoid and mitigate potential negative impacts on designated areas of conservation or protection, in line with the Natural England advise following the People over Wind Judgement</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Natural England advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>Amend text, 6th bullet point: Where appropriate there is evidence of need, the provision of formal playing fields;</td>
<td>To clarify the approach to provision of playing fields.</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>Update text, 7th bullet point: Where appropriate, That options for community ...;</td>
<td>To strength the policy.</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>Update text, 8th bullet point: <em>Where the location is suitable, that new waterspaces and wetland habitat is incorporated, which enhances biodiversity and includes boardwalks and pontoons to provide access.</em></td>
<td>To include the potential for new waterspaces and clarify the need for the wetland habitat to enhance biodiversity.</td>
<td>Canal &amp; River Trust Environment Agency Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9</td>
<td>Chapter 5, Policy EL9</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL9</td>
<td>To insert additional wording to follow the second bullet under the heading of Banbury Reservoir in Policy EL9, as follows: <em>subject to Thames Water agreement, in line with considerations regarding operational and structural requirements and public health and safety.</em> This policy should be read in conjunction with Core Strategy policies 30,33,34,35, 37 and 38 and DMD policies 71 to 83.</td>
<td>To recognise that, while Banbury Reservoir has potential to support leisure uses, the structural integrity of the reservoir and operational/health and safety issues must take priority</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Thames Water recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.10.2</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL9</td>
<td>To include additional wording at paragraph 5.10.2: <em>At Meridian Water there are currently very limited areas of open space with, and poor public access, to open recreational spaces and waterways. Development at Meridian Water must deliver a network of open spaces that can provide visual and leisure amenity, as indicated in Figure 5.3. The regeneration must also provide an opportunity to maximise increase access to the LVRP, and other existing areas of ecologically undesignated open space and waterways in the wider area. Negative impacts on the nearby designated sites of ecological importance must be avoided. As such development will avoid new access points to the designated sites. To avoid recreational disturbance of the sites of ecological importance contributions to the management of the site will be required as well as the provision of new open space Meridian Water must deliver a ‘green’ network of open spaces that can provide visual and leisure amenity, as indicated in Figure 5.3.</em></td>
<td>To further recognise that development must not negatively impact on areas of ecological importance</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM9a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, after paragraph 5.10.2</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL9</td>
<td>To insert the following new text after paragraph 5.10.2: <em>A new mitigation strategy is currently being formulated to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) as a result of upcoming development in relation to both air quality and recreational pressure. In order to appropriately assess, avoid and where necessary mitigate negative impacts on designated sites of conservation or protection in the vicinity of the AAP boundary, including Epping Forest SAC and the Lee Valley Special Protection Area (SPA), applicants must work closely with the Council and with Natural England to develop suitable proposals for avoidance and mitigation. Applicants should consult and work with Natural England and the Council at the pre-application stage to devise appropriate mitigation measures and carry out appropriate assessments at application stage. Traffic modelling may be required to ascertain the potential for a likely significant effect in relation to air quality. Given the quantum of residential development likely to come forward, a number of different avoidance and mitigations options should be provided to avoid an adverse effect.</em></td>
<td>To further recognise that development must assess, avoid and mitigate potential negative impacts on designated areas of conservation or protection, in line with the Natural England advice following the People over Wind Judgement</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Natural England advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM9a                 | Chapter 5, paragraph 5.10.5                                  | Changes Consequential to EL9 | To include additional wording at paragraph 5.10.5:  
*The scale of development at Meridian Water requires that space must be used as efficiently as possible, while ensuring a sufficient quantum of open space and leisure facilities are provided to deliver a sustainable community. Meridian Water is constrained in terms of accommodating open and green spaces within the development boundary, due to limited availability of land. Whilst high quality open space and play space provision that is suitable for intensive usage must be made within Meridian Water, there must also be a great emphasis on improving access to existing nearby ecologically undesignated green open spaces and waterways, while also protecting and enhancing biodiversity and sites of ecological importance.*  
To correct typographical error and to add additional protection to sites of ecological importance in line with national policy | To correct typographical error and to add additional protection to sites of ecological importance in line with national policy | Enfield Council |
| MM9a                 | Chapter 5, after paragraph 5.10.6                            | Changes Consequential to EL9 | To insert the following text after paragraph 5.10.6, forming a new paragraph:  
*Banbury Reservoir is an operational reservoir owned and operated by Thames Water for public water supply. Any proposals for public access at Banbury Reservoir will need to be agreed with Thames Water and must ensure the operational function and ongoing structural integrity of the reservoir is maintained and fully consider and mitigate potential risks to public health and safety.*  
To recognise that, while Banbury Reservoir has potential to support leisure uses, the structural integrity of the reservoir and operational/health and safety issues must take priority. | To recognise that, while Banbury Reservoir has potential to support leisure uses, the structural integrity of the reservoir and operational/health and safety issues must take priority. | Thames Water |
| MM9a                 | Chapter 1, Objective 5                                       | Changes Consequential to EL9 | Update 3rd and 4th bullet points of Objective 5:  
*• Create new open spaces where feasible.*  
*Use watercourses and waterways to enable distinctive place-making, especially in Meridian Water.*  
To strengthen the wording of the objective and to correct syntax | To strengthen the wording of the objective and to correct syntax | Enfield Council |
| MM10                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL10                                       | Changes to Policy EL10 | To delete reference to supplementary planning documents from the first and from the second paragraph of Policy EL10 as follows:  
*Development proposals and supplementary planning documents ...*  
To delete unnecessary reference to SPD | To delete unnecessary reference to SPD | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
| MM10                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL10                                       | Changes to Policy EL10 | To change the reference in EL10 3rd bullet to the Causeway to  
*Causeway Central Spine*  
And to clarify the reference to active frontages in Policy EL10 8th bullet point:  
*At ground floor level provide an attractive, and where relevant active, frontage to the street, road or other publicly accessible area*  
To reflect the name change and to address GLA comments regarding active frontages | To reflect the name change and to address GLA comments regarding active frontages | Enfield Council |
| MM11                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL11                                       | Changes to Policy EL11 | To delete reference to supplementary planning documents from the first, second and third paragraph of Policy EL11 as follows:  
*Development proposals and supplementary planning documents ...*  
To delete unnecessary reference to SPD from policy | To delete unnecessary reference to SPD from policy | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM11                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL11 Part A                                | Changes to Policy EL11 | Make the following change to the second bullet of EL11 Part A:  
- Ensure buildings conform to a height-to-width ratio appropriate for the street, with an aspect ratio of 1:1 to 1:1.5, achieved through design solutions such as upper storey set-backs, accent towers and breaks in blocks, as well as raised podium courtyards used to maximise aspect and access to daylight and sunlight;  
And to the final bullet of EL11 Part A:  
For commercial units, *where possible*, incorporate a minimum of four metres floor to ceiling height to allow for flexibility of use;  
To add flexibility to optimise site capacity and design | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
| MM11                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL11 Part B                                | Changes to Policy EL11 | To update 1st bullet point of Policy EL11, Part B as follows:  
- Ensure that no more than 10% of all north facing residential units are single aspect. *Minimise the number of single-aspect dwellings.* Single aspect dwellings which are north-facing, or exposed to noise levels above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur, or which contain three or more bedrooms should be avoided;  
and update the 4th bullet of Policy EL11 Part as follows:  
Ensure the massing and orientation of residential blocks allows direct sunlight penetration into at least 50% of shared open space;  
To address GLA comments on bring the policy in line with the Mayor’s Housing SPG Standard 29 on single aspect dwellings To bring requirements for direct sunlight penetration in line with up to date BS standards | Enfield Council |
| MM11                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL11 Part C                                | Changes to Policy EL11 | To amend the first paragraph of Policy EL11 Part C:  
*Justification for tall buildings* (taller than ten storeys above normal ground level) must be provided for ...  
To avoid inconsistency of wording with London Plan definition of tall buildings | Enfield Council |
| MM11                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL11 Part C                                | Changes to Policy EL11 | To amend the second bullet of Policy EL11 Part C:  
Set out the relationship to transport infrastructure, the capacity of public transport, the quality of links between transport and the site, and the feasibility of making improvements; *where appropriate to be as part of the wider consideration of tall buildings;*  
To improve syntax | Enfield Council |
| MM11                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL11 Part C                                | Changes to Policy EL11 | To insert additional bullet after 3rd bullet point to Part C, Policy EL11:  
- *Assess the impact on the setting of heritage assets, including those beyond the Meridian Water and borough boundaries;*  
To recognise that for tall building proposals there must be an assessment of any impact on the setting of heritage assets | Historic England |
| MM11                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL11 Part C                                | Changes to Policy EL11 | To make the following change to 4th bullet Part C, Policy EL11:  
*Where possible, be located on key routes, in particular significant places or junctions;*  
To add flexibility | Enfield Council |
| MM11                  | Chapter 5, Policy EL11 Part C                                | Changes to Policy EL11 | The following text should be inserted after the 8th bullet point to Policy EL11, Part C:  
- *Avoid compromising the enjoyment of open spaces, including water spaces, through overshadowing;*  
To further support tall building design which considers the impact of overshadowing on public spaces | Canal and River Trust |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM11                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL11 Part C | Changes to Policy EL11 | To insert the following as a final bullet to policy EL11 Part C:  
  *Assess the impact of underlying ground conditions and presence of land contamination to determine appropriate foundation depths and building height, and measures to protect groundwater resources.*  
  *To further recognise that tall buildings will need to consider underlying geological and contaminative context.* | To further recognise that tall buildings will need to consider underlying geological and contaminative context. | Environment Agency |
| MM12                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL12 | Changes to Policy EL12 | Edit the 10th bullet of EL12 and insert a new bullet point after the 10th bullet point:  
  *Provide street furniture including seating, cycle stands and waste separation bins, avoiding which avoids the creation of cluttering the streetscape;  
  ‘Incorporate opportunities for games and urban play’* | To improve syntax  
  And include policy element to meet community needs. | Enfield Council |
| MM12                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL12 | Changes to Policy EL12 | To edit the wording of the third paragraph of Policy EL12 as follows:  
  Development proposals and supplementary planning documents...  
  *Incorporate opportunities to better reveal and interpret the natural and man-made watercourse heritage;*  
  *To give further support to design which reflects the watercourse history of the area* | To delete unnecessary reference to SPD | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
| MM12                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL12 | Changes to Policy EL12 | To include in Policy EL12 the following additional bullet after the 4th bullet point under ‘Waterways and Water Frontages’:  
  *Considering opportunities to better reveal and interpret the natural and man-made watercourse heritage;*  
  *To further recognise the potential benefits of moorings along the River Lee Navigation within Meridian Water* | To further recognise the potential benefits of moorings along the River Lee Navigation within Meridian Water | Canal and River Trust |
| MM13                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL13 | Changes to Policy EL13 | To amend the final sentence of the first paragraph of policy EL13 as follows:  
  *...Key principles in determining the content nature and level of the corresponding S106 planning obligation are that...*  
  *To improve syntax* | To improve syntax | Enfield Council |
| MM13                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL13 | Changes to Policy EL13 | To add the following bullet to the list in Policy EL13 part (a):  
  *Sport and recreation facilities.*  
  *To recognise that provision of sport and recreation facilities is important to the meeting the demand generated by new development at Meridian Water and that developments be required to make S106 contributions* | To recognise that provision of sport and recreation facilities is important to the meeting the demand generated by new development at Meridian Water and that developments be required to make S106 contributions | Sports England |
| MM13                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL13 | Changes to Policy EL13 | To amend the second and fourth bullets in the list in Policy EL13 part (a) as follows:  
  *Flood defences and other blue infrastructure*  
  *New and improved public open space and space for local biodiversity and habitats*  
  *To further acknowledge that environmental enhancements should be sought through blue and green infrastructure funding* | To further acknowledge that environmental enhancements should be sought through blue and green infrastructure funding | Environment Agency |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM13                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL13 | Changes to Policy EL13 | To delete Policy EL13 part (d)  
  
  (d) It may include average provisions to secure an increase in contribution, proportionate with the rise in land value resulting from the delivery of the infrastructure. | In line with Inspector’s comments and the Mayor’s affordable housing and viability guidance, the AAP now sets a clear, single affordable housing target | Enfield Council |
| MM13                 | Chapter 5, Policy EL13 | Changes to Policy EL13 | To amend final paragraph of policy EL13 as follows:  
  
  No more than five obligations for a specific item of infrastructure will be pooled across the borough, except where pooling restrictions do not apply or if pooling restrictions are lifted, in accordance with the CIL regulations. | To ensure against wording becoming out of date if pooling restrictions are lifted | Enfield Council |
| MM13a                | Chapter 5, after paragraph 5.12.8 | Changes consequential to EL13 | To insert the following text as a new paragraph after paragraph 5.12.8:  
  
  5.12.9 In relation to infrastructure for water supply and drainage, developers are encouraged to contact the relevant water and waste water company ahead of submitting their planning application. Discussing their development proposals and intended delivery programme will assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is an identified capacity constraint the Council may, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of or in line with the occupation of the relevant phase of development. | To recognise that development must be supported by delivery of the necessary infrastructure provision and to acknowledge that Thames Water have recently changes their way of assessing, funding and charging for infrastructure upgrades. | Thames Water and Inspector comments |
| MM14                 | Chapter 6, Policy EL14 | Changes to Policy EL14 | To amend the text and table in Policy EL14 as follows:  
  
  The Council will safeguard the following new sites as a Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL):  
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of industrial area</th>
<th>Preferred Industrial Location (PIL) or Industrial Business Park (IBP)</th>
<th>Area of site (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel to the north of Deephams</td>
<td>PIL</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip of land to the east of Deephams</td>
<td>PIL</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deephams STW</td>
<td>PIL</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM14a/MM2a</td>
<td>Chapter 6, new figure 6.1 before former Figure 6.1 (latter is now figure 6.2 below)</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL14 and EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM14a/MM2a           | Chapter 6, former Figure 6.1 (now Figure 6.2)              | Changes Consequential to EL14 and EL2 | To make the following changes to former Figure 6.1 (now figure 6.2):  
- To update proposed and existing SIL boundaries in line with changes to Policies EL2 and EL14  
- To amend LSIS boundary around Ray’s Road  
- To ensure that land to the north of the North Circular and south of William Girling Reservoir, and land to the south or the North Circular, including land owned by Thames Water, is not referenced as ‘open space’, or variations on this label which imply it is publicly accessible.  
- To label this land as **Green Belt**  
And to rename this Figure 6.12, **New and existing SIL and LSIS in Edmonton Leeside (AAP designations)** | To update map in line with Council’s retention of SIL at Harbet road and designation of new SIL at Deephams  
To recognise that space around Ray’s road was already de-designated as LSIS and to correct the remaining LSIS boundary around Montagu estate  
To recognise that land to the north of the North Circular and south of William Girling Reservoir, and land to the south or the North Circular, including land owned by Thames Water, is not publicly accessible and should not be referenced as ‘open space’, or variations on this label which imply it is publicly accessible  
And to differentiate from existing SIL and LSIS designations shown in figure 6.1 above | Enfield Council  
Thames Water |
| MM14a                | Chapter 6, paragraph 6.4.4                                  | Changes Consequential to EL14 | To amend paragraph 6.4.4 as follows:  
The sites for designation to the north and east of Deephams STW are already industrial in character and will benefit from a designated status, together providing 4.1ha of SIL. Designating the Deephams STW site will continue in use as an operational sewage treatment works with its designation as SIL being in accordance with the London Plan approach which recognises utilities as an industrial-type function, will consolidate and strengthen the protection of the area.  
The three locations identified provide a gross area of 38.1 hectares of additional SIL in Edmonton Leeside. Within the Meridian Water boundary there is a gross reduction of 18 hectares of SIL. | To ensure clarity on the future use of the Deephams site and its designation as SIL | Thames Water  
And  
Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment |
| MM14a | Chapter 6, paragraph 6.4.5 | Changes Consequential to EL14 | To delete paragraph 6.4.5: The SIL areas designated can potentially provide locations for businesses displaced from within Meridian Water. The intensification of Edmonton Leeside’s industrial estates set out in other parts of this chapter will also assist in meeting any need, along with industrial estates in other parts of Enfield. The demand for space within Enfield’s industrial estates is expected to continue, with local agents confirming that shrinking availability of stock in London as a whole, and particularly Central London, is forcing occupiers to outer London boroughs such as Enfield. With industrial land releases elsewhere in London exceeding the GLA’s benchmark guidance and reducing the supply in other boroughs, this evidence of businesses relocating to Enfield, supports this designation of SIL in Edmonton Leeside. | To make changes in line with the council’s strategy to maintain SIL in Meridian Water and that therefore new SIL designations will be restricted to Deephams STW | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment |
| MM14a | Chapter 6, table 6.2 | Changes Consequential to EL14 | To amend table 6.2 as follows: Table 6.2: New SIL Designated Areas in Edmonton Leeside | To make changes in line with the council’s strategy to maintain SIL in Meridian Water and that therefore new SIL designations will be restricted to Deephams STW And To add clarity about the future use of Deephams | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment And Thames Water |
| MM14a | Chapter 9, paragraph 9.1.5 | Changes Consequential to EL14 | To make the following amendments to paragraph 9.1.5: The Council is designating Deephams STW as a Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) in accordance with the new London Plan approach which recognises utilities as an industrial-type function, in order to consolidate and strengthen the protection of the area for industrial uses. Further detail is set out in Chapter 6. | To further clarify the situation of Deephams STW and its designation as SIL | Thames Water |
Policy EL15 to be edited as follows:

Policy EL15: Improving Existing Industrial Areas

PART A: Overview

New development in the industrial estates of Edmonton Leeside will be expected to take advantage of the strategic position in the Upper Lee Valley Corridor and Stansted Corridor to drive prosperity and growth. Development should deliver buildings and services to meet modern business needs and a better range of employment opportunities, which could secure higher job densities and opportunities for local people. A coordinated approach is required to ensure that the existing industrial estates meet the demands of businesses. The Council will work with its potential investors, partners and the business community to improve internal connectivity, efficiency, innovation and productivity.

PART B: Priorities for Action

New industrial development or redevelopment will be permitted within the industrial areas identified as SIL and LSIS. Development proposals within the industrial estates listed in Part C will be required to contribute to improvements as follows:

• Provide efficient car parking layouts that direct car users away from parking on the street;
• Improve circulation on internal estate roads where development is of sufficient scale to enable this to happen
• Support opportunities for intensification of employment uses, and making more efficient use of land;
• Improve pedestrian and cycle routes within Edmonton Leeside and beyond, in accordance with Policy EL21; and
• Provide good quality public realm and, where appropriate, planting to support the biodiversity of the area.

PART C: Industrial Estates

Industrial land at Meridian Water, including Harbet Road Industrial Area and Hastenwood Estate (SIL)

• Meet the requirements set out in Part B above.
• Give consideration to how new uses interact with neighbouring existing uses in line with the Agent of Change principle.

Eley Estate (SIL)

Work in partnership with the Eley Estate Management Group to tackle identified issues such as estate crime;
• Where feasible, work with the Eley Estate Management Group to help facilitate the adoption of unclassified roads;
• Meet the requirements set out in Part B above.

Montagu Industrial Estate (SIL) (northern section)

• Pursue a major upgrade to improve outdated infrastructure and to provide new buildings that will meet modern business needs.
• New buildings must be designed to meet the latest regulations which set minimum energy efficiency standards for commercial property.

To make policy more concise and remove repetitive text; to align Policy with changes regarding SIL designation and retention and to strengthen policy with regard to intensification; and to recognise that space at Ray’s Road has already been de-designated as LSIS and turned into public open space; and to bring policy in line with draft London Plan Agent of Change approach

Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support regeneration at Montagu Estate to improve outdated infrastructure and to provide new buildings that will meet modern business needs, potentially through a joint venture partnership between the Council and private developer interests.</td>
<td>• Support regeneration at Montagu Estate to improve outdated infrastructure and to provide new buildings that will meet modern business needs, potentially through a joint venture partnership between the Council and private developer interests.</td>
<td>• Design new buildings to meet the latest regulations which set minimum energy efficiency standards for commercial property.</td>
<td>• Meet the requirements set out in Part B above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montagu Industrial Estate (southern section)</td>
<td>Montagu Industrial Estate (southern section)</td>
<td>• Space at Rays Road and within the Meridian Water boundary to be declassified from LSIS designation; and • Meet the requirements set out in Part B above.</td>
<td>• Meet the requirements set out in Part B above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aztec 406 Industrial Business Park (SIL)</td>
<td>Aztec 406 Industrial Business Park (SIL)</td>
<td>• Meet the requirements set out in Part B above.</td>
<td>• Meet the requirements set out in Part B above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claverings (LSIS)</td>
<td>Claverings (LSIS)</td>
<td>• The Council will maximise employment opportunities through partnership working. • The Council will provide new buildings that meet modern business needs with related environmental and social benefits. • There are a range of options to be explored, including more flexible workspace. Take into account detailed proposals to will be brought forward as part of a masterplan for the redevelopment of the Claverings Estate to include new buildings and/or more flexible workspace to meet modern business needs with related environmental and social benefits. • Take a proactive approach in encouraging creative/cultural uses through flexible lease terms and assisting with artistic and cultural set-ups; and • Meet the requirements set out in Part B above.</td>
<td>• Meet the requirements set out in Part B above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PART D: Relocation of Businesses</td>
<td>PART D: Relocation of Businesses</td>
<td>Where development requires existing businesses to be relocated, the Council will work with owners (and occupiers), prior to any redevelopment taking place, to relocate to appropriate premises in employment or mixed use areas defined within the AAP, or other locations within the borough.</td>
<td>PART D: Relocation of Businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM15a</td>
<td>Paragraph 6.3.4</td>
<td>Changes consequential to EL15</td>
<td>To make the following change to the final sentence of paragraph 6.3.4: <strong>Investment should be particularly encouraged in those industrial estates where the Council have significant land ownership interests.</strong></td>
<td>To clarify that investment should be equally encouraged regardless of ownership</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM15a</td>
<td>Chapter 6, after paragraph 6.5.7</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL15</td>
<td>To insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 6.5.7 and amend the numbering of following paragraphs accordingly: <strong>6.5.8 Industrial land at Meridian Water, including Harbet Road Industrial Area and Hastingwood Estate: Harbet Road industrial Area, which includes the Stonehill Estate, is buffered by the adjacent roads and river and has good access to the North Circular Road. Some of this area is currently cleared and vacant. Hastingwood Trading Estate is currently occupied by small businesses and storage facilities housed within metal warehouses, positioned within a secure and controlled perimeter.</strong></td>
<td>To recognise the retention of SIL at Meridian Water</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM15a</td>
<td>Chapter 6, paragraph 6.5.10</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL15</td>
<td>To edit paragraph 6.5.10 as follows: <strong>The Council will work with representatives of Eley’s Estate management group to better understand the issues affecting the estate, including estate crime and the need to adopt unclassified roads.</strong></td>
<td>To move commentary text from Policy EL15 to supporting text.</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM15a</td>
<td>Chapter 6, Paragraph 6.5.17</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL15</td>
<td>Delete paragraph 6.5.19 and heading: <strong>Relocation Strategy</strong> <strong>6.5.19 The Council will work with occupiers and owners to help relocate existing businesses as part of a Council led regeneration and rationalisation of industrial land, including within the Meridian Water boundary. This will ensure that existing businesses are supported in any relocation and will ensure that:</strong> <strong>• The scale, character and diversity of affected businesses are recognised;</strong> <strong>• The alternative locations that have been identified to accommodate relocated businesses suit their specific needs; and</strong> <strong>• Robust processes are put in place to provide support to businesses during their relocation to minimise potential adverse effects, for example to access support networks. There should be particular regard for small businesses to help them relocate within the existing development if possible, and allow them to return if temporarily displaced.</strong></td>
<td>In line with SIL retention</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM16</td>
<td>Chapter 7, Policy EL16</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL16</td>
<td>First paragraph of Policy EL16 to be amended as follows: <strong>Development proposals that support employment mixed uses and other supporting uses at Angel Road Retail Park will be supported, provided that they: ...</strong></td>
<td>To ensure terms used in policy and supporting text are consistent</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM17 | Chapter 8, Policy EL17 | Changes to Policy EL17 | To make the following text changes to the first paragraph of Policy EL17:  
*Redevelopment of the Edmonton EcoPark site will be delivered through the development proposals consented by the 2017 North London Heat and Power Plant Development Consent Order.*  
*Development proposals at the EcoPark site, which are not consented under the 2017 DCO, or for any other Development Consent Orders made subsequently at the EcoPark site, are required to:*  
*And to make the following text changes to the final bullet as follows:*  
*Support the implementation of the Lee Valley-Meridian Water Heat Network (LV-MW-HN) as set out in Policy EL26.*  
*And to recognise name change of network* | To further recognise the Development Consent Order (DCO) granted in 2017 for the Edmonton EcoPark and to recognise name change of network | North London Waste Authority Enfield Council |
| MM17 | Chapter 8, Policy EL17 | Changes to Policy EL17 | Amend eighth and ninth bullets of policy EL17 as follows:  
• Ensure local access to employment and training opportunities, through employment initiatives and other measures including transportation improvements; and  
• Be designed to be resilient to the impacts predicted as a result of climate change; and | Minor amendment to correct typographical error | Enfield Council |
| MM17a | Chapter 8, Section 8.3 title and Paragraph 8.3.1 | Changes Consequential to EL17 | To change section 8.3 title and paragraph 8.3.1 as follows:  
8.3 The EcoPark and the Lee Valley-Meridian Water Heat Network  
8.3.1 The Council’s approach to the Lee Valley-Meridian Water Heat Network (LV-MW-HN) is set out in further detail in Chapter 12. To make the development of the EcoPark acceptable in planning terms the Council has used planning obligations to secure measures such as including:  
• A commitment to provide heat to the local heat network, subject to a heat supply agreement being agreed;  
• A commitment to safeguard land for the energy centre and pipe routes to the energy centre and from the site;  
• Mitigation measures associated with the outcome of any Environmental Impact Assessment;  
• A landscape strategy;  
• Measures that ensure that development maintains access to the River Lee Navigation for waterborne transport; Travel and management plans;  
• Highways and accessibility improvements; and  
Supporting business and employment initiatives, including initiatives such as local labour in construction, employment skills training, apprenticeships, and job brokerage. | To reflect name change of network and to correctly reflect the terms of the Section 106 legal agreement | Enfield Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM18                | Chapter 9, Policy EL18 Changes to Policy EL18                 | To amend second, third, fourth, fifth and seventh bullets of Policy EL18 as follows:  
- *The incorporation of appropriate landscape treatment and the use of opportunities to enhance ecological links to the wider Edmonton Leeside area;*  
- *Use of planting to visually improve and enhance the site;*  
- *Promote The promotion of renewable energy generation and sustainable design and construction;*  
- *Promote The promotion of sustainable transport for staff;*  
- *Connection to the Lee Valley Heat Network if feasible (see Policy EL26); and*  
- *The incorporation of measures to minimise noise impacts of the site.* | Minor amendments to correct grammar/clarify intent | Enfield Council |
| MM18                | Chapter 9, Policy EL18 Changes to Policy EL18                 | To change the second to last bullet of Policy EL18 as follows:  
*Connection to the Lee Valley Meridian Water Heat Network or another DEN if feasible and viable* (see Policy EL26); and  
And to add the following text by inserting a new final paragraph to Policy EL18 as follows:  
*Planning applications for development proposals in the vicinity of Deephams STW should be accompanied by an Odour Impact Assessment to confirm either there is no adverse amenity impact on the future occupiers of the development, or that appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures will be implemented as necessary.* | To reflect the name change of the network and  
To recognise that Deephams Sewage Works is undergoing a major upgrade which will significantly reduce odour emissions from the site. To ensure occupiers and users of future development in the vicinity of Deephams STW do not experience adverse amenity. | Enfield Council, Thames Water |
| MM19                | Chapter 10, Policy EL19 Changes to Policy EL19                | Amend the first three paragraphs of Policy EL19 as follows:  
The Council will continue to work with the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority to help deliver its Park Development Framework, and to identify the priority mix of additional recreation and leisure facilities at Picketts Lock.  
Picketts Lock is identified to deliver a significant new development that will provide a destination attraction for Edmonton Leeside and beyond. Picketts Lock is considered suitable for a potential range of new and improved leisure, sport and recreation uses, including a health and fitness centre, 5-a-side football pitches, a snowdome, an ice rink, conference/exhibition spaces, self-catering accommodation, a hotel and commercial ten-pin bowling.  
*Development proposals must have appropriate regard to Picketts Lock’s designation as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. In particular this means they must be in conformity with national Green Belt policy, including in terms of ensuring no net loss of site openness.*  
Development proposals must also demonstrate that they: … | To bring policy into conformity with national Green Belt policy | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
| MM19                | Chapter 10, Policy EL19 Changes to Policy EL19                | After final bullet point of Policy EL19, insert following text:  
*If development proposals exceed 2,500 square metres of gross floorspace for leisure use, they will be subject to a sequential and impact assessment* | To bring wording in line with NPPF and with wording change in paragraph 10.1.5 | Enfield Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM19a</td>
<td>Chapter 1, Paragraph 1.1.8</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL19</td>
<td>To change paragraph 1.1.8 as follows: Pickett’s Lock can be developed much further has the potential for further development as a leisure and recreation destination that draws people in from across the borough and beyond, supported by improvements to sustainable transport infrastructure and having appropriate regard and sensitivity to development constraints associated with its location in the Metropolitan Green Belt.</td>
<td>The current text does not take account of the restrictions imposed by the site’s status as a site in the Green Belt</td>
<td>Enfield Council based on Inspector comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM19a</td>
<td>Chapter 2, Paragraph 2.1.10</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL19</td>
<td>To amend first line of paragraph 2.1.10: Key areas for potential growth and change include: ... And amend text of 3rd bullet: • Pickett’s Lock – where the possible opportunity exists to add to the existing high quality sports and leisure facilities, with the potential to provide an offering with a much wider reach, subject to development constraints associated with its location in the Metropolitan Green Belt.</td>
<td>Update the text to recognise Pickett’s Lock location in the green belt</td>
<td>Enfield Council NLWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM19a</td>
<td>Chapter 5, paragraph 5.10.7</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL19</td>
<td>To amend paragraph 5.10.7 as follows: In the wider Edmonton Leeside area, the new open space at Angel Gardens has increased provision, while improvements at Pickett’s Lock have the potential to provide additional nearby recreational opportunities, having appropriate regard and sensitivity to development constraints associated with its location in the Metropolitan Green Belt and the need to preserve openness.</td>
<td>To reflect the position of Pickett’s Lock in the Green Belt and relevant considerations of national policy.</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM19a</td>
<td>Paragraph 6.3.9</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL19</td>
<td>To amend the final sentence of paragraph 6.3.9 as follows: Leisure and recreation uses could potentially will be further developed at Pickett’s Lock, subject to development constraints associated with its location in the Metropolitan Green Belt.</td>
<td>Update the text to recognise Pickett’s Lock location in the green belt</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To amend paragraph 10.1.1 as follows:

Pickett’s Lock Leisure Complex is identified as a Major Development Site in the Green Belt.

National policy on development within the Green Belt is set out in the NPPF. It states that local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.

It also requires local planning authorities to ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt in cases where new development may be proposed within it. The ‘very special circumstances’ under which development may be consented will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

While the construction of new buildings is regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt, provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation are an exception to this, as long as they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

Further exceptions potentially relevant for any development at Pickett’s Lock include:

- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development;
- local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location; or
- the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction.

Proposals for development at Pickett’s Lock must also have appropriate regard to Enfield Development Management Document Policy DMD89 Previously Developed Sites in the Green Belt, which states that complete or partial redevelopment of the Pickett’s Lock site will only be permitted where the proposal improves the character and appearance of the site and appearance from the surrounding Green Belt and that new development must not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

The principle of developing Pickett’s Lock as an area for the development of additional sports and recreation facilities is supported by Core Strategy Policy 33. Any development coming forward must be considered in the context of the Green Belt policy as set out above, and exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM19a                | Chapter 10, paragraph 10.1.2                     | Changes consequential to EL19 | To amend paragraph 10.1.2 as follows: 
*Pickett’s Lock occupies a strategic position in the Upper Lee Valley Corridor and the London Stansted-Cambridge corridor, offering an ideal opportunity to deliver a large scale development of a strategic nature, while having appropriate regard to the site’s location in the Green Belt.* | To ensure approach in conformity with national Green Belt policy | Enfield Council |
| MM20                 | Chapter 10, Policy EL20                         | Changes to Policy EL20 | Amend the first two paragraphs of Policy EL20 as follows: 
*Development proposals for the reuse or redevelopment of existing open space at Pickett’s Lock, having appropriate regard to applicable national and local Green Belt policy, will be supported and encouraged.* 
*Development proposals and supplementary planning documents…* | To ensure policy conforms with national Green Belt policy 
And to delete unnecessary reference to SPD | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
| MM20                 | Chapter 10, Policy EL20                         | Changes to Policy EL20 | Amend sixth bullet of Policy EL20 as follows: 
*Supporting and increasing of the accommodation options which are suitable to the nature of the open space and waterway;* | Minor amendment to improve clarity/grammar | Enfield Council |
| MM20                 | Chapter 10, Policy EL20                         | Changes to Policy EL20 | Amend eighth bullet of Policy EL20 as follows: 
*Encouraging new community and learning facilities to provide services, support and opportunities through a range of community development projects, for example in the form of ‘floating classrooms’ boats on the waterway.* | Delete overly specific/prescriptive policy | Enfield Council in line with Inspector |
| MM20                 | Chapter 10, Policy EL20                         | Changes to Policy EL20 | Amend final paragraph of Policy EL20 as follows: 
*This policy should be read in conjunction with Core Strategy Policies 34, 33 and 35, DMD Policies 71, 74, 76, 77, 81, and 82 and London Plan Policies 7.18 and 7.19.* | To correct minor typographical errors | Enfield Council |
| MM21                 | Chapter 11, Policy EL21                         | Changes to Policy EL21 | To amend second paragraph of Policy EL21 as follows: 
*Development proposals and supplementary planning documents should reference ‘Legible London’ guidance to create high quality streets and spaces. New developments must be connected across Edmonton Leeside, including to public transport hubs, the industrial estates, and Pickett’s Lock.* | Minor amendment to improve grammar and clarity 
And to delete unnecessary reference to SPD | Enfield Council |
| MM21                 | Chapter 11, Policy EL21                         | Changes to Policy EL21 | To edit the fourth paragraph of Policy EL21 as follows: 
*Development may be required to make a financial contribution to the provision and improvement of pedestrian and cycle routes and other infrastructure, as set out in the Section 106 SPD, in line with DMD Policy 47 and other relevant policies as shown below.* | To ensure EL21 refers to adopted policy rather than SPD | Enfield Council |
| MM21a                | Chapter 11, paragraph 11.3.2                    | Changes Consequential to EL21 | To update the first sentence of paragraph 11.3.2 as follows: 
*Sustainable transport will be supported through high quality public realm and a modal shift towards public transport.* | Update text to clarify the need for public transport as part of the modal shift. | Transport for London |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM22 | Chapter 11, Policy EL22 | Changes to EL22 | To change the reference to the Causeway in Policy EL22 to the Causeway Central Spine. To amend the wording of the second half of policy EL22 as follows: Planning proposals and supplementary planning documents to deliver these pedestrian and cycle routes must include will encourage:  
• Creation of well designed, high quality new links and pedestrian and cycle bridges, including mainline, Meridian Way and River Lee Navigation;  
• Clear and consistent signage throughout the route, including on-street markings for cycles;  
• Provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities, which integrate with the existing highway network;  
• Improved public realm; and  
Introducing interventions to discourage informal and on street parking, where this affects the route. | To reflect name change  
To add flexibility and clarify wording and to delete unnecessary reference to SPD | Ikea  
Enfield Council |
| MM22 | Chapter 11 - Policy EL22 | Changes to EL22 | To add the following bullet point to Policy EL22:  
Reference to the principles of the Mayor’s Healthy Streets approach, in particular taking account of the 10 Healthy Streets indicators. | To further recognise that the environment for cyclists and pedestrians below and alongside the North Circular Road should be improved | Canal and River Trust |
| MM22 | Chapter 11 - Policy EL22 | Changes to EL22 | To add the following bullet point to Policy EL22:  
Improved public realm, including where routes pass beneath the North Circular Road; and  
| To recognise the Mayor’s Healthy Streets approach | Transport for London |
| MM22 | Chapter 11, Policy EL22 | Changes to EL22 | Amend final paragraph of Policy EL22 as follows:  
This policy should be read in conjunction with Core Policies 24 and 25 and DMD Policy 48. | To correct minor typographical error | Enfield Council |
| MM22a | Chapter 11, paragraph 11.4.8 | Changes Consequential to EL22 | To update paragraph 11.4.8 as follows:  
New developments should provide must meet minimum standards for cycle parking should be adhered to for residential and non-residential development as per London Plan Policy 6.8. Cycle parking and other appropriate cycle changing facilities for cyclists in line with the London Plan should be provided to encourage more local residents and employees to cycle cycling. | To clarify wording, bring in line with London Plan and make consistent with changes to paragraph 5.8.20 | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM23                  | Chapter 11, Policy EL23                         | Changes to Policy EL23 | To make the following changes to Policy EL23:  
To change the reference to the Causeway to Causeway Central Spine  
And to edit the wording of the 2nd sentence of the 2nd paragraph as follows:  
The former will include a direct bus link between Meridian Water and Edmonton Green as referred to in Table 14.1.  
And to edit the wording of the 3rd paragraph and the first two bullet points after it as follows:  
The Council will continue to work with TfL, major employers and other stakeholders to ensure that:  
• Integration of bus and rail services is improved, and seek to ensure that existing businesses and major new developments have good access of no more than 640m from the development to a bus stop;  
• Support is given to providing more direct and frequent bus services serving existing businesses and employment areas. TfL will be encouraged to extend the operational hours of such services to match employees shift patterns and time services to match employees travel to and from work to reflect demand;  
To reflect the name change to recognise the continued importance of existing businesses in the area  
And to improve grammar/clarity | To reflect the name change to recognise the continued importance of existing businesses in the area  
And to improve grammar/clarity | Enfield Council  
Ikea |
| MM25<sup>1</sup>         | Chapter 11, Policy EL25                         | Changes to Policy EL25 | To delete first paragraph of Policy EL25 ‘Design of the Road Network’:  
The Council will work towards developing a comprehensive network design within Edmonton Leeside, in accordance with the Road Task Force (July 2013) as summarised in the in the Edmonton Leeside Socio Economic supporting document (2016).  
To amend the second sentence of the second paragraph of Policy EL25 ‘Design of the Road Network’ as follows:  
Each development site proposal will be looked at assessed on its own merits and site characteristics.  
And to change the reference to the Causeway to the Causeway Central Spine  
Minor amendments to clarify text and intent of policy, and to delete unnecessary reference to Road Task Force  
And to reflect the name change | Minor amendments to clarify text and intent of policy, and to delete unnecessary reference to Road Task Force  
And to reflect the name change | Enfield Council |
| MM25a                  | Chapter 11, paragraphs 11.9.10 and 11.9.11     | Changes Consequential to EL25 | To delete paragraphs 11.9.10 and 11.9.11:  
11.9.10 The Mayor of London’s Road Task Force (RTF) report was published in July 2013 and provides a strategic review that sets out a vision of how London can provide quality streets to cope with the expected population increase and achieve economic growth in London. Outer London is identified as one of the strongest assets in London and a key to future success. The RTF aims to maintain and enhance a high quality of life and provide attractive places to live and work and raise families in outer London boroughs.  
11.9.11 The RTF proposes nine street types, defined by their “place” and “movement” roles, and are associated with a set of priority uses, strategic performance measures and potential types of interventions. They are intended for the purpose of TFL’s and boroughs’ planning and decision making, which include agreeing on priority functions and development of toolkit of measures.  
To remove unnecessary second reference to Road Task Force | To remove unnecessary second reference to Road Task Force | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comment |

<sup>1</sup> Please note that numbering of Main Modifications skips number MM24 to keep numbering of modifications in line with numbering of policies (i.e. MM25 relates to policy EL25), as there are no changes proposed to Policy EL24.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM26                  | Chapter 12, Policy EL26 Part A                              | Changes to Policy EL26 | Amend text of policy EL26, part A, as follows:  
Part A: Developing the **Lee Valley Meridian Water** Heat Network  
The Council supports the development of the **Lee Valley Meridian Water** Heat Network (**LVMWHN**).  
This will include safeguarding and securing:  
• The establishment of an energy centre on the EcoPark site;  
• A network route linking the EcoPark energy centre to the Meridian Water development; and  
• Future connections towards other suitable developments, once they are identified, for example towards Almo Estate and Haringey/Northumberland Park.  
The Council will continue to work with its partners and stakeholders to ensure that opportunities to establish connections across waterways, highways, railway land or private land interests allow for the future implementation of the **LVMWHN**.  
Proposals for major developments which produce a significant amount of heat should supply heat to the **LVMWHN** or another **DEN** unless it can be demonstrated that this is not technically feasible or economically viable, in accordance with policy DMD 52. | Update and clarify text relating to the heat network  
And to add flexibility | Enfield Council |
| MM26                  | Chapter 12, Policy EL26 Part B                              | Changes to Policy EL26 | To change the reference to LWL (LondonWaste Ltd) in Policy EL26 Part B to LEL (LondonEnergy Ltd) to reflect the new name of the company as well as make other changes as follows:  
Part B: The **Eco Park EcoPark** Site and the **LVMWHN**  
To facilitate the delivery of the **LVMWHN**, development of the EcoPark site should:  
• Enable heat/energy from the new energy recovery facility (ERF) when it is built, to be captured and supplied to the **LVMWHN** energy centre, subject to a heat supply agreement being agreed. The DCO granted by the Secretary of State for the Eco Park site requires provision for combined heat and power. Note that energetik will reserve the right within the heat supply agreement with NLWA/LWL to adopt the existing waste (EFW) facility to supply heat to energetik’s energy centre such that if the new ERF completion is delayed, it has the option to receive heat from the EFW facility if it is economic;  
• Incorporate space for an energy centre, a connection from EFW, ERF sources of energy/heat into the **LVMWHN** energy centre, and pipe network leaving the site; and  
• Not prejudice installation and operation of the above mentioned **LVMWHN** energy centre. | To recognise the recent name change of a referenced company; to update reference to recognise the DCO granted; and to use the more appropriate term ‘DEN provider’ in place of ‘Energetik’  
And to delete policy text that is too onerous and prescriptive / inappropriate | North London Waste Authority  
Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM26               | Chapter 12, Policy EL26 Part C | Changes to Policy EL26 | To amend Policy EL26 Part C as follows:  
Development proposals which are connecting to the MWHN must demonstrate how they would to enhance the resilience of the LWMWHN and allow for provision of emergency back-up. This should include access to any development of over 300 dwellings with an individual connection to the network.  
A hardstanding area should be provided that could be used in an emergency to park a truck mounted boiler and which is located a sufficient distance from any building with opening windows or inlet fresh air ventilation, sized at 20 metres by 6 metres. This area should be:  
- Hardstanding, including any access road needed to link it to the road network;  
- Of sufficient size and configuration to allow an articulated truck to access and park within it;  
- Located at least 20 metres from any building with opening windows or inlet fresh air ventilation; and  
- Located within 20 metres of the pipework branch that connects the development to the LWHN.  
The Council will safeguard an “unobstructed” pipework route for the LWMWHN pipe network within the Causeway Central Spine within Meridian Water. “Unobstructed” here means a three metre wide zone with nothing built over it to a height of at least 10 metres.  
Amend title and text of policy EL26 Part D as follows:  
PART D: Connecting to the MWHN  
All major developments (defined as developments of ten dwellings or more, or of more than 0.5 hectares in area) shall connect to or contribute towards the LWMWHN or another existing or planned DEN supplied by low or zero carbon energy in accordance with Policy DMD 52 and the Decentralised Energy Network Technical Specification Heat Network SPD. Where a major development is expected to be completed before the LWMWHN or another DEN is able to supply it with heat then:  
- If there are firm plans to enable the site to be connected to the LWMWHN or another DEN within five years, the development should design for heat network connection from the outset and use temporary on-site boilers (potentially provided by the heat network operator) until network connection is possible.  
- If there are no firm plans for extension of the LWMWHN or another DEN within feasible and viable range of the development, provision of onsite Combined Heat and Power (CHP, with standby boilers) will be expected where the heating demand makes it technically feasible and financially viable. The development should also be future proofed for connection to a heat network. In such instances the council may agree with the developer that the installation of CHP can be deferred for up to five years (the development would use heat from standby boilers during this time) to allow time for the LWMWHN or another DEN to be extended and connected to the development. If the developer connects to the network within five years then the requirement to install CHP would fall away; if not then the obligation to install CHP would be triggered.  
This policy should be read in conjunction with Core Policy 20 and DMD Policy 52, and London Plan policies 5.5 and 5.6, and Enfield’s Edmonton Eco Park Planning.  
Update text to provide an appropriate level of detail for creating a resilient DEN.  
LaSalle Investment Management  
Aytans  
Enfield Council | | | | Update naming of the heat network to ensure EL26 refers to adopted policy rather than SPD, and to define major development.  
And to update policy, cross-reference text and remove unnecessary reference to SPD | Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM26a</td>
<td>Chapter 12, Paragraph 12.3.4</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL26</td>
<td>Amend title and text of paragraph 12.3.4:</td>
<td>Update text to provide a more accurate reflection of the heat network delivery and reflect its name change</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM26a</td>
<td>Chapter 12, Paragraph 12.3.5</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL26</td>
<td>Amend text in second, third and fourth sentences of paragraph 12.3.5:</td>
<td>To reflect the name change of the network and to update text to reflect that the DCO has been granted.</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM26a</td>
<td>Chapter 12, Paragraph 12.3.6</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL26</td>
<td>Amend text of paragraph 12.3.6:</td>
<td>Clarify the text and reflect the updated position</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM26a</td>
<td>Chapter 12, Paragraph 12.3.7</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL26</td>
<td>Remove paragraph 12.3.7:</td>
<td>The paragraph does not add further to Policy EL26 and has been superseded by the granting of the DCO.</td>
<td>NLWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM26a</td>
<td>Chapter 12, Paragraph 12.3.8</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL26</td>
<td>Amend text in first and second sentence of paragraph 12.3.8: <strong>As well as having standby plant via gas boilers within the Meridian Water development plantroom, and within the The Energetik energy centre at the EcoPark, and the network will must be designed to be resilient and energy efficient using the latest pipework technology with a life expectancy in excess of 60 years. In the unlikely event that the network cannot supply heat due to the need for maintenance, temporary boiler connections will must be included...</strong></td>
<td>Update the text to provide a more accurate description of the heat network delivery.</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM26a</td>
<td>Chapter 12, Paragraph 12.3.9</td>
<td>Changes Consequential to EL26</td>
<td>To amend paragraph 12.3.9 as follows: <strong>Energetik aim to deliver the first The early phases of the heat network, a local heat network and plantroom for gas boilers at Meridian Water, ahead of the completion of the should aim for delivery at the same time as the initial phases of the Meridian Water development so that all new developments can connect directly to the local heat network as a source of heat. This is needed to will avoid developments being 'locked in' to alternative heat generation solutions, which would reduce/delay the benefits delivered by the network (for example total carbon emissions savings) and potentially increase network development costs. The energy centre at the EcoPark and connecting heat network to Meridian Water will be delivered to coincide with around 1,500 homes having being built at Meridian Water, this being a suitable heat demand to warrant a larger heat network to be operated economically. This larger heat network will supply low carbon heat via CHP prior to the new ERF heat source becoming available.</strong></td>
<td>Remove overly prescriptive text</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM27</td>
<td>Chapter 13, Policy EL27</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL27</td>
<td>To update the third sentence of the first paragraph of Policy EL27 as follows: <strong>Development proposals and supplementary planning documents at waterfront locations must: ...</strong></td>
<td>To delete unnecessary reference to SPD</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM27</td>
<td>Chapter 13, Policy EL27</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL27</td>
<td>The wording of Policy EL27, second paragraph, will be updated as follows: <strong>Proposals for new residential moorings will be supported provided they are designed in a way which does not negatively affect the environment and meet the requirements of Policy DMD75</strong></td>
<td>To give added environmental protection</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM27</td>
<td>Chapter 13, Policy EL27</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL27</td>
<td>Update the wording of Policy EL27, 5th bullet point: <strong>protect and enhance habitats and biodiversity, through measures including softening of river channel edges where appropriate.</strong></td>
<td>Make the policy wording consistent with Policy EL12</td>
<td>Canal &amp; River Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM28</td>
<td>Chapter 13, Policy EL28</td>
<td>Changes to Policy EL28</td>
<td>To make the following amendment to Policy EL28, second paragraph: <strong>Development proposals and supplementary planning documents ...</strong></td>
<td>To delete unnecessary reference to SPD from policy</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM28                | Chapter 13, Policy EL28 Changes to Policy EL28              | To make the following additions to Policy EL28, 3rd, 4th and 5th paragraphs:  
  The land on either side of the North Circular Road to the east and northeast of Meridian Water has been identified as offering potential for the creation of new open space. There is also potential to improve the access and functions at existing green and open spaces including at Pickett’s Lock and Kenninghall Open Space. **Green and open space should be explored for multiple uses, including as providing potential flood storage capacity.**  
  Proposals will be supported that improve the access across and between existing and new green spaces, developing a network of ‘green chains’ comprising footpath networks and cycle paths. **Green chains can be used to improve east-west connectivity between the Lee Valley Regional Park and the rest of Edmonton Leeside and beyond.** Proposals must not generate negative impacts such as recreational disturbance on sites of ecological importance, including the Chingford Reservoirs SSSI and Lee Valley Special Protection Area/ Ramsar site at Walthamstow Reservoirs.  
  New development may be expected to make appropriate financial contributions to protecting and improving green and open spaces and biodiversity, in line with DMD 72 and other relevant policies shown below the Section 106 SPD.  
  This policy should be read in conjunction with Core Strategy policies 34 and 35, DMD Policies 71, 72, 76, 77 and 78 and London Plan Policies 2.18 and 7.27. | Update text to: provide a more complete position on the potential use of green and open spaces; for consistency of punctuation; to emphasise that development must not negatively impact on areas of ecological importance, particularly through recreational disturbance; to add further protection to biodiversity; to ensure EL28 refers to adopted policies rather than SPD and correcting typographical errors | Environment Agency, Enfield Council, Natural England, Enfield Council | |
| MM29                | Chapter 14, paragraph 14.2.3 Changes to Chapter 14 supporting text (no related policy) | Insert new paragraphs after paragraph 14.2.3 as follows:  
  **An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being developed to accompany the Council’s forthcoming Local Plan which will include details of infrastructure delivery for Meridian Water, building on the infrastructure work undertaken through the masterplanning process.**  
  The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will cover three schedules of infrastructure, namely physical, social and green. It will assess the planned provision, proposed location and timeframe of key items of infrastructure, for each one identifying the lead partner, delivery partners and stakeholders, estimated costs, funding sources, funding available, any funding gap and prioritisation of its delivery. Some initial considerations on funding sources, development phasing, delivery and key delivery bodies appear later in this section and will be useful as a starting point for this work.  
  **As new Masterplan options are developed and refined in consultation with relevant stakeholders, they will also be subject to site-wide development viability modelling, including soft-market testing, to provide confidence and certainty to all stakeholders that the preferred development option presented in the final masterplan document is deliverable and achievable.** | To provide additional clarity on the relationship between the AAP, Masterplan, Infrastructure Delivery Plan and viability work. | Enfield Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification No.</th>
<th>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Source of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM29</td>
<td>Chapter 14, paragraph 14.5.2</td>
<td>Changes to Chapter 14 supporting text (no related policy)</td>
<td>To add new paragraph after 14.5.2 as follows: <em>Projects which are pivotal to ensuring modal shift should not be restricted by limits on pooled development contributions. However, many of the projects identified in Table 14.1 below, particularly transport related projects, will be reliant on pooled contributions. The Council will therefore seek to secure other sources of funding for essential transport infrastructure are available to ensure that essential infrastructure will be delivered.</em></td>
<td>To recognise that if s106 pooling restrictions continue to apply, as they do at the time of writing, that the Council will seek to ensure that other sources of funding are available</td>
<td>Enfield Council in line with Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM29</td>
<td>Chapter 14, Table 14.1</td>
<td>Changes to Chapter 14 supporting text (no related policy)</td>
<td>To move the title of table 14.1 to the start rather than the end of the table and to make additions and amendments to text as follows: <em>Table 14.1: Priority AAP Projects</em></td>
<td>To reflect further work undertaken by / on behalf of Transport for London And to make minor corrections to grammar and punctuation</td>
<td>Transport for London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Meridian Water Development Zone</td>
<td>Lead Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meridian Water Highway Infrastructure</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TfL / Developer contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Borough-wide improvement of bus services focussed on the Lee Valley Corridor and orbital Links</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TfL / Developer contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Lee Valley transport modelling and bus priority study</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TfL / Enfield / Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meridian Water to Edmonton Green direct bus link</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Enfield Council / TfL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM29</td>
<td>Chapter 14, Table 14.1</td>
<td>Changes to Chapter 14 supporting text (no related policy)</td>
<td>To include a reference in Table 14.1 to the delivery of watercourse enhancements for biodiversity improvement as follows: <em>Provide watercourse enhancements for biodiversity</em></td>
<td>To further recognise the importance of the delivery of watercourse enhancements for biodiversity improvements</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification No.</td>
<td>Chapter, Section, Policy, Paragraph, Diagram, Tables, Figures</td>
<td>Proposed Modification</td>
<td>Proposed Change</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Source of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM29</td>
<td>Chapter 14, Table 14.1 Changes to Chapter 14 supporting text (no related policy)</td>
<td>To update the wording in Table 14.1 as follows: <em>Meridian Water Flood alleviation measures</em> Compensation Areas All Enfield Council <em>Flood alleviation measures to enable compensation area and enabling works for development in of the Meridian Water area to be in place ahead of development in any flood zone.</em></td>
<td>Clarification / correction of a name or reference</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM29</td>
<td>Chapter 14, Table 14.1 Changes to Chapter 14 supporting text (no related policy)</td>
<td>To amend the first line on page 156 and the second line on page 157 of table 14.1, changing all references to the Causeway to the <em>Causeway Central Spine</em></td>
<td>To reflect the name change</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>