



**Fox Lane and District Residents' Association
London N13 & N14**

Consultation on Enfield's Blue and Green Strategy: valuing our parks, trees, open spaces, routes and watercourses

Enfield is happily one of London's greener and bluer boroughs, including a huge slice of Green Belt open land in the north of the borough and the Lea Valley wetlands and open space down its eastern border. The Blue & Green Strategy aims to pull together lots of different strands and data into some sort of coherent shape, and then generate forward strategies in the context of a climate emergency. There are related documents: an updated Biodiversity Action Plan (61 pages) and a Review of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (178 pages).

The consultation paper asked for responses to specific questions about the Strategy, on a five point scale. FLDRRA responded:

How far do you agree with the portrait given of the borough's blue and green network and summary of issues?

Strongly agree/AGREE/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the vision statement?

Strongly agree/Agree/Neutral/DISAGREE/Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the aims/objectives of the draft strategy?

Strongly agree/Agree/NEUTRAL/Disagree/Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with the proposed locations of strategic interventions?

Strongly agree/Agree/NEUTRAL/Disagree/Strongly disagree

How far do you agree with our approach to the delivery of blue/green infrastructure?

Strongly agree/Agree/NEUTRAL/Disagree/Strongly disagree

Do you feel our approach to funding will safeguard the right amount of investment?

Strongly agree/Agree/Neutral/DISAGREE/Strongly disagree

Our additional comments included:

We found the mapping of the borough's current assets valuable, with a very useful SWOT analysis. It is right that the considerations include, for example, health and wellbeing including mental health. We agree that much of the burden of ill health in Enfield could be prevented through the creation of greener, less polluted and physically active spaces, particularly in areas of the borough where such spaces are clearly lacking. However we felt that the vision for the future was rather parochial, with an ambition to 'be the greenest borough in London', when a wider perspective would have been better. The aims and objectives then came across as somewhat of a scattergun effect, badly in need of prioritisation between and within aims, with the need to focus on strongly Blue/Green actions adequate to the climate emergency and its impacts locally.

The Strategy frequently mentions the disparities in access and provision across the borough, generally much better provision in the west and much worse in the east of Enfield. We agreed that this disparity existed and it would be good to concentrate efforts and resources where they were most needed. We welcomed the levelling up agenda across the borough, sitting as we do in a privileged area between fine parks, Broomfield and Grovelands; but noted that the strategy's location of development nodes did not actually support that levelling up agenda by focusing on those areas of greatest need. The need for developments to be 'culturally inclusive' is mentioned but

does not then appear anywhere in the proposals; we noted that there is nothing very culturally inclusive about the commitment to restoring (white, English) historic parklands and properties.

Turning to the proposed locations of strategic interventions, we found this section of the report a bit of an amalgamated mess, suggesting the need for further work. The strategy also proposes borough-wide strategy projects: we strongly welcomed several of the points here, in particular Healthy Streets, subject to good community consultation, and the visible impact of the Enfield Chase tree plantings. We note that our own local jewels in the crown, Broomfield and Grovelands, have seen no progress over the last twenty years and more, sadly.

Funding to support a programme of improvement is in very short supply. We responded that the funding sources here are likely to prove wholly inadequate to the need but it is hard to see what else could be said. We were not clear to what extent Blue/Green projects would be prioritised over the many other claims for S106 and other development monies, which is suggested as a likely source of funding. We hoped that the partnership to be established to steer the Strategy forward would be powerful enough to make hard choices and bargain strongly for funds for high-return projects, such as hectares of new woodland in the north of the borough.

Finally, comments were invited on the paper as a whole. At one point the portrait of the Borough states that in a few short years by 2050 Enfield will be experiencing a climate like Barcelona has now; what are the implications of such dramatic climate change? An initial list would be massive heat island effects no longer mitigated by many current trees and green cover which would not survive the very high summer temperatures, the impact on watercourses and biodiversity, as well as further very urgent need for outdoor space close by for everyone, as the document mentions. Climate change has already happened and continues to happen at an increasing speed. It is likely to lead to an increasing number of crises in Enfield - many health issues and indeed deaths in summer heat as happened in France a few years back, overwhelming flooding from extreme storms, the list goes on. The council and the Blue/Green Partnership have no time to waste.

We are angry that this strategy comes from the same council as continues to support the Edmonton Incinerator project. The incinerator is provably completely unnecessary and will cause more damage to Enfield and the planet than all the proposals and aspirations in this strategy paper put together.

We look forward to further involvement in this strategy, which we will endeavour to support wherever we can. We commend also the feedback from our local partners the Friends of Broomfield Park.

RT for FLDR January 2021