



To Whom It May Concern:

Response to the Blue & Green Strategy Consultation 2020 – Appendix to online survey

EnCAF (Enfield Climate Action Forum) thanks you for the opportunity to respond to the Blue and Green Strategy Consultation.

We have completed the survey on behalf of members and 100+ affiliated organisations in Enfield, some of whom have submitted individually.

What follows is our summary and then a more detailed response to each section of the survey, our suggestions and specific recommendations about ways in which we think that the strategy could increase its impact.

SUMMARY

VISION, AIMS & OBJECTIVES

THE BLUE AND GREEN STRATEGY SETS OUT OUR LONG-TERM APPROACH TO PROTECTING, MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING ENFIELD'S BLUE AND GREEN SPACES AND ROUTES

The Blue and Green Strategy has real strengths in providing for cycling, water and flood management, climate emergency friendly transport and urban greening. It's ambitious, with laudable goals and intentions.

Nevertheless, on close reading there are some significant questions regarding specific content, and we feel that some of the benefits anticipated for the strategy are over inflated: the SWOT analysis is rigorous and rings true but the eight strategic programmes, the emerging priorities & areas of change, the individual components of

the blue-green infrastructure do not seem to fully address the identified weaknesses and threats, particularly re the impact on health inequalities and carbon emissions.

Neither do they build on acknowledged and important strengths and opportunities such as the use of farmland in the green belt for agriculture, agroforestry and market gardening; providing locally sourced, sustainable supplies of food and timber, supporting the local economy and employment. These latter are overlooked in the strategy which, post Covid 19 particularly, are of vital importance to our young people.

Enfield has a rich farming heritage going back centuries. As acknowledged in the foreword, though not entirely accurately, the blue, green and silver stripes on Enfield's official crest actually represent the New River, the Green Belt areas and open spaces in general and have indeed left an indelible mark on the landscape. The upfront ambitions in the foreword describe the corporate desire to remediate degraded environments; increase biodiversity and food production; celebrate our rich landscape heritage and promote green tourism.

In its present form, we feel that the strategy overlooks these ambitions and is more a presentation about parks, open spaces, pathways and (some) waterways than a workable strategy either for the long-term preservation and enhancement of all the borough's public and private green and blue assets or for making a significant impact on the climate crisis.

The sense of a long-term all-embracing strategy to fulfil the admirable ambitions in the foreword is absent. The single overarching ambition is stated as becoming the greenest borough in London, at the cornerstone of London's national park. Since Enfield is already, at 900 hectares of parks and open spaces, the second largest expanse in London, this feels like a limiting ambition. Our concern is that **all** the land in Enfield should be considered part of the strategy and its use be addressed comprehensively and creatively.

We feel that these oversights are largely a result of the failure, at a sufficiently early stage, to consult communities, residents' associations, environmental groups or even local politicians in scoping the Blue Green Strategy. A huge amount of local knowledge and evidence has been overlooked.

OUR PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS

These practical suggestions **are necessary priorities** to achieve the ambitions in the foreword (as above) and Aims 1 and 2 in “Shared vision and aims”, which are to “Achieve a 25% increase in blue-green infrastructure in Enfield, whilst **protecting existing assets**” and “Ensure our residents can access blue and green spaces **within 15 minutes walking distance of their homes**”

- Place Enfield’s farms at the heart of the strategy
 - ~ provide local food for local consumption
 - ~ boost the local economy and provide skilled jobs
 - ~ use the authority of the council as landowner to establish regenerative farming practice to increase carbon take up/ sequestration and other environmental benefits such as for wildlife, flood resilience”
 - ~ be a London Market Garden centre of excellence
 - ~ promote green tourism
- Create woodlands **where they are most needed to address health and social inequalities**
 - ~ locate them in the east of the borough in the form of “tiny forests” e.g. in existing parks and playing fields (e.g. Durrants, Jubilee, Albany, Bullsmoor Lane, Bellmore playing fields, school playing fields, in the two new parks (Edmonton marshes and Brooks) or as a continuous swathe across Lee Valley to Epping Forest
 - ~ use naturally regenerative processes in preference to manual planting to improve resilience and carbon capture
- include policies about existing green spaces
 - ~ front and rear gardens to prevent permeable green space and habitat being lost
 - ~ management of verges to benefit biodiversity
 - ~ school playing fields and other wide open spaces in the east of the borough for “tiny forests”
- commit to register all permissive footpaths in the borough to become rights of way by the 2026 deadline
- create **new** foot and cycle paths to improve accessibility and ensure that “accessibility” embraces the rights of those with disabilities and are wheelchair and pram friendly.
- Specifically
 - ~ New River path from Enfield Town to Waltham Cross
 - And, as recommended and scoped by The Enfield Society

- Crews Hill path from the Golf Clubhouse to Cattlegate Farm entrance, parallel to Cattlegate Road, as there is currently no pavement.
- The suggested footbridge across the Lea Valley railway line, at the end of the Boundary Ditch should also cross Meridian Way.
- Green bridge across A10 at Colosseum to access sports village
- Pathways through Rammey Marshes

In terms of the specific content, our comments below fall into 8 sections which underpin and amplify our priority recommendations and offer further suggestions. They are classified according to the consultation headings.

SECTION 1 OF CONSULTATION

VISION, AIMS & OBJECTIVES

THE BLUE AND GREEN STRATEGY SETS OUT OUR LONG-TERM APPROACH TO PROTECTING, MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING ENFIELD'S BLUE AND GREEN SPACES AND ROUTES

1. Food Production

The consultation home page includes 'sustainable food production' as one of the ten goals of the strategy but the strategy then includes food production only as a small-scale activity to encourage outdoor exercise and social interaction. Apart from brief mentions under Strengths [p26] and Opportunities [p27] there is no mention of commercial food-production, historically, now or in the future, on public or private farms or at Crews Hill.

Recommendation

- This aspect of the strategy needs to be expanded with input from the many organisations dedicated to sustainable farming. These include local experts such as those at Forty Hall Farm, Capel Manor and Organic Lea and national organisations such as CPRE and The Nature Friendly Farming Network.

2. Farmland and Agriculture

Enfield's farmland is written off as poor quality without any source evidence. Experts now consider the ALC system is based on outdated source data and is limited to quality for cropping only; such land should be evaluated for multiple ecosystem services including food production and other environmental benefits such as carbon and water storage. Apart from a brief mention under Opportunities [p27] there is no apparent ambition for any of the public or private farms to be worked commercially or used as model sites for sustainable farming practices.

All the council farms seem designated for woods or parkland. It is implied that the tenant farmers are all in agreement with this move. However, the Audit does not even look at the Council's farms. There is no policy to work with private landowners [Vicarage Farm, etc.] although much of the private farmland is included in woodland and/or habitat expansion zones and the North-South B-line.

Tree planting, laudable though it is, shouldn't exclude wider consideration of food production and farming generally and its role adding to or reducing emissions. Trees provide multiple benefits beyond carbon but so too should sustainable farming and horticulture including for flood mitigation, wildlife, clean air, landscape etc as well as social benefits of access to fresh healthy seasonal and affordable food, meaningful and decent work. Opportunities should be sought to integrate tree planting within farming use of the land via agroforestry to deliver these benefits

Recommendations

- An appendix should be added to the strategy document listing the farms in the borough, how they are currently used and what opportunities they offer for sustainable farming, agroforestry and other climate-friendly purposes.
- County Farms are farms owned by Local Authorities and let out to young and first-time farmers, sometimes at below-market rents. They're a vital 'first rung on the farming ladder' for newcomers to a sector that has high up-front capital costs: by providing the land and buildings, the public sector is helping get fresh blood into an industry where the average age of farmers is 60. As one of only two councils nationwide that is landlord to substantial farmland that is not obliged, statutorily, to report to parliament under the "County Farm" legislation, Enfield should actively consider, seek advice on and consult the community (especially Capel Manor College) on ensuring Enfield's farmland supports new entrants to farming and horticulture. <https://www.cpre.org.uk/discover/county-farms-a-potted-guide/>

- Consider alternative uses of land which meet local needs and provide employment e.g. projects such as Organic Lea at Hawkswood Farm in Waltham Forest, pet “hotels” perhaps, a different sort of employment likely to be very desirable to young people and for which there is a market. The “bunds” currently being built serve a purpose but we feel it is possible to go beyond that.

3. Crews Hill

Crews Hill is not mentioned, even historically, as a centre for horticulture; and in some of the maps appears to have been removed from the Green Belt. [Figure 21 p 47]

Post war the Lee Valley and Crews Hill were the largest source of tomatoes in England, providing cucumbers and tomatoes for the London food market and more recently Crews Hill has been identified as the biggest collection of garden centres nationally. This horticultural heritage, hectares of land (though largely privately owned) and largely derelict greenhouses could be the basis of a significant re-generation programme providing jobs and supporting the local economy.

The government is urging a “blended” approach to land use, encouraging sustainable farming that maintains food production and enhances the environment and there is a demand in the London area for good quality salad ingredients, more sophisticated than in the post war years: capsicums, wide variety of lettuce and tomatoes, spinach etc not to mention heritage strains.

The GLA Environment Committee in Dec 2018 in “Helping London's Green Belt farms to prosper” concluded that “Selling food as local, sustainable and healthy can help farmers get a better price for it; so can selling more directly to the consumer”

Recommendations

- Given the need for food security and a reduction in ‘food miles’ the strategy should include a vision to reinstate Crews Hill as a centre for local food and horticulture. At the very least a feasibility exercise into the use of land at Crews Hill, and the availability of central funding to support such a programme should be undertaken as part of the Blue Green Strategy.
- Enfield should become part of a London Market Garden City and part of a resilient food supply <https://www.sustainweb.org/news/aug20-fringe-farming-breifing-published/>

4. Addressing Health Inequalities

The emphasis on 'fairer distribution' and equality is positive unless in practice it means there is insufficient intervention where it is needed and, potentially at least, levelling down across the borough or even exacerbating the inequalities

The SWOT analysis repeatedly underlines the critical need to address "stark health inequalities" between the east and the west of Enfield and notes the "strong correlation between health inequalities, open space deficiencies, poor quality environments and levels of deprivation", citing [1.3] the benefits of the Blue Green Strategy in addressing this disparity.

It is important to bear in mind, before over-attributing either cause or cure to natural environmental factors, that such profound inequalities arise also from social and economic factors, decades in the making as revealed by research such as that described in "The Spirit Level".

The Aims and Vision section [3.1.2] establishes relevant outcomes: "The longstanding gap between affluent (in the west) and deprived (in the east) wards in terms of access to open space and nature *will have been narrowed*. People in the borough will *live longer and healthier lives*, benefiting from cleaner air, water and improved access to open spaces and water spaces. *Obesity rates will be closer to the London average.*"

Our concern is that the strategy as it stands is insufficiently focussed on achieving this vital, and commendable, ambition to "narrow the gap". Our fear is that as the majority of interventions (and hence resources) are focussed on the west of the borough the gap will not be narrowed at all. It is regrettable that the photographs are, we believe, all of the west. Is the imagery meant to indicate the transformation that will occur, when it merely underlines the reality that there are "Significant deficiencies across the urban area in terms of access to open space and nature (notably deprived wards in the east)".

The bulk of the investments described in the 8 "strategic programmes" benefit the west. The Chase Restoration project to repurpose most of the farmland in the west of the borough to woodland is misguided. We could have both farmland and woodland; and opportunities to integrate tree planting within farmed use of the land via agroforestry can deliver benefits unacknowledged in the strategy. Not least in providing jobs that would benefit the east, particularly when comprehensive east-west blue green corridors for active travel are established.

The lack of woodland for shade in the East of the borough is a major health concern given the changes in climate and the mid-summer temperatures that we're already experiencing; Chase Restoration does little to address this. There is already 500 hA of woodland in the west, so spending the grants available on the west and not the east seems inconsistent with the data on inequality.

References to no net loss of green space and the possibility of selling council land to developers and agencies suggest taking green space away from the west to fund projects in the east, which would not be acceptable.

It's clear that the appetite for walking has been stimulated by the tragic circumstances of the pandemic and that there is no room for removing any green space, wherever it is, so we applaud the aim "to increase blue-green infrastructure in Enfield by 25% whilst protecting existing assets". We urge the council to determine a metric that could monitor and ensure that the 25% increase is in the east.

Recommendations

- A more detailed focus on greening the east of the borough is needed in the strategy with specific projects and timelines. There is a lot of green space on the eastern side of the borough and there are some simple solutions for linking to Epping Forest and the Lee Valley, which should be listed and targeted.
- There should also be an exploration of innovative ideas such as Tiny Forests in the east.
- There should be a project to introduce water sports in the east of the borough.
- The proposed 25% increase in blue green infrastructure should be targeted to the west and programmes closely monitored to ensure that this is so.

SECTION 2 OF CONSULTATION

ENFIELD'S BLUE & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK

The proposed locations of the corridors, nodes, areas of change and the emerging interventions are hard to understand without a detailed knowledge of the areas concerned. The maps which seek to convey detailed information are hard to interpret because the details are too small (even when digitally enlarged), sometimes contradictory (e.g. the extent of the Chase restoration) and the keys are ambiguous.

However in principle we endorse the concept of a Blue Green infrastructure.

There is no mention of disability access and we have to hope that when the term “accessibility” is used it embraces our community diversity in all respects.

SECTION 3 OF CONSULTATION

HIGH-PROFILE PROJECTS

IN ADDITION, WE HAVE IDENTIFIED SEVERAL HIGH-PROFILE PROJECTS TO DELIVER MULTIPLE BENEFITS ACROSS THE BOROUGH'S BLUE AND GREEN NETWORK.

- 1. EXPANSION OF THE CYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN NETWORK**
- 2. ENFIELD SPORTS VILLAGE**
- 3. EXPANSION OF THE OPEN SPACES AND ROUTES INTO THE LEE VALLEY REGIONAL PARK**
- 4. GREEN LOOP**
- 5. ENFIELD CHASE**
- 6. GREY-TO-GREEN GATEWAYS**
- 7. WETLAND AND RIVER RESTORATION**
- 8. HISTORIC LANDSCAPE RESTORATION**

All the projects are important, subject to appropriate local stakeholder consultation. The projects have not yet been discussed with local stakeholders; this doesn't augur well for future partnerships. The consultative survey consists of 5 closed questions and space for just 255 characters (approx. 30 – 60 words) in a further 9 questions which is rather limiting.

However, initial funding and design and long-term maintenance could be an issue with most of them, especially given the Council's reduced staffing and expertise in certain areas.

It's notable that the majority of them favour the west of the borough (2,5,7,8), or are already largely in existence. Half of the proposed "Green Loop" is part of the London Loop, another quarter is the River Lee Navigation footpath; of the new path a substantial stretch, Pymmes Brook, is in Barnet (not listed as a partner) and the rest depends on what happens in the Meridian Water development.

There are already substantial sports facilities in Enfield Playing Fields (not easily accessible from the East across railways and the A10) and there appear to be no intentions to consult on the existing facilities (St Ignatius Rugby Club, Enfield Town Football Club) or with potential users e.g. rifle, archery, cricket clubs, about present provisions that could be harnessed to enhance Enfield Playing Fields while placing the Sports Village to the East where it is needed. We're surprised that the proposed Sports Village isn't sited at the Lee Valley Athletics Stadium.

5. Chase Restoration

With regard to **Enfield Chase Restoration**, it is an eye-catching project for the many and varied benefits it will bring, but it will require long-term management, which cannot come only from volunteers. The Council's parks staff are already stretched to maintain the existing portfolio of parks and open spaces and have been unable to keep up with habitat maintenance, such as that recommended in the Trent Country Park Habitat Survey 2017. They will need full-time experts added to their roster.

As mentioned in item 2, it appears that almost all of the Council's farms are designated as future woodland as part of the Chase Restoration project. This is fundamentally inconsistent with the aims and ambitions of the project in respect of food production and health inequalities between the east and the west of the borough as described in the Foreword and Aims 1 – 4 [Figure 1].

More information is needed about this plan – for instance, given the latest research about the importance of natural forest regeneration for carbon sequestration, will these areas be re-wilded and allowed to regenerate naturally? What scientific expertise will be brought in to oversee the project long-term and keep up with scientific advances?

Reference is made in the Blue Green Strategy to Enfield's Climate Action Plan to the over-riding imperative to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. And rightly so.

Woodland creation is offered as a significant element in offsetting carbon dioxide. Our concern is that there is a risk that the contribution of offsetting by planting trees is exaggerated in the minds of the public, to the extent that it is seen as a solution that mitigates the need to do much more.

We think that it is important, not only to represent the figures realistically in context, but also to recognise that yes, trees capture carbon dioxide, but so too does soil. To be meaningful therefore, calculations of emissions must include this component and the factors that affect it.

Since it's not clear where the quoted figure of 3.9tCO₂e offset per hA pa of broadleaf woodland comes from, and the two references to it in the strategy are contradictory, we are left guessing about the scope of the figure and its provenance.

We're not sure whether it includes carbon in woodland/forest/farmland soils.

Recent research (2012) from the Forestry Commission reports that carbon sequestration rates vary and depend on tree maturity so it will take some years to reach the figures quoted. And, further, that where permanent grassland is manually planted, carbon will be lost by disturbance due to planting so will take some time for net carbon gains.

To be confident about the claims being made for the efficacy of Chase Restoration in significantly mitigating the council's carbon emissions we need better information about the assumptions made, the trade-offs and other pertinent considerations: integrating trees with food production (agroforestry); replanting and better management of hedgerows; natural regeneration; carbon capture in soils and wetlands.

The checks and balances of carbon offsetting need to be transparent. For instance, using the figure of 3.9tCO₂e offset per hectares per annum and the proposed planting of 300 hectares, we can calculate a rough estimate of **1000 tCO₂e** (actually 1170 tCO₂e) carbon sequestration each year beginning, presumably, on maturity? Say, by 2040, since the planting isn't expected to be complete by 2030.

Enfield's Climate Action Plan gives some figures about emissions.

- Scope 1 and 2 emissions produced by the council's own activities are currently **21,907 tCO₂e** each year.
- Scope 3 emissions (indirectly from the council's activities) are currently

81 257 tCO₂e each year

- Borough wide emissions (that's us) are currently **939,440 tCO₂e** each year.

This is not to say that woodland planting is a bad thing, but carbon offsetting is not going to dent our emissions or help us realise the 2030 and 2040 targets, and there should be transparency about this.

Further, it's important to emphasise that sequestration in soil and trees depends on these stores being preserved forever - or at least until we have beaten the climate emergency - say, 2200. If the trees are felled or the soil ploughed they are lost, at least partly. These natural stores are threatened by development, eg housing, rail, roads and, of course, by climate change. In short by economic growth and the pursuit of ever increasing GDP and consumption.

Recommendations

- Clarify the basis on which the calculations about sequestration of carbon by woodlands are made.
- Contextualise this within the real challenges of becoming carbon neutral by 2030 and 2040.

SECTION 4 OF CONSULTATION

DELIVERING THE STRATEGY

SECTION 5 OF THE STRATEGY SETS OUT HOW WE WILL WORK WITH THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS TO DELIVER AN INTEGRATED AND MULTI-FUNCTIONAL GREEN AND BLUE NETWORK ACROSS THE ENTIRE BOROUGH

6. Expert Advice

The Council has been without a Biodiversity Officer for some time and what environmental expertise remains is scattered in different departments.

The documents talk about working with 'practitioners and academics' [P14] but list only two organisations and no other source material is referenced. It is hard to accept conclusions (for example, the quality of local soil, the offset value of 3.9tCO₂e per hA pa of broadleaf woodland) without knowing the source of the information. Please see item 2 for some suggested expertise, but there are many more.

In particular it is disappointing that the very up to date and often visionary research and development on farming, agriculture and land use in London has been overlooked. Enfield Council has a significantly large agricultural landholding leased out on agricultural tenancies and holds the third biggest area of farmland in London and the fourth largest number of holdings.

And the most recent research regarding the benefits of naturally regenerated woodland compared with planting manually indicates that the former is much more effective regarding carbon sequestration.

Rewilding Britain describes the Government's plans to focus on "manual tree planting" as "a quick fix" and "unambitious". A Rewilding Britain study to be published later this year shows that allowing and enhancing natural regeneration – supported by native tree planting in suitable sites – would be the most effective long-term approach for landscape-scale reforestation.

Recommendations

Please refer to the following (there is much more still)

- GLA Environment Cttee « Helping London's Green Belt Farms to Prosper Dec 2018
 - <https://www.london.gov.uk/WHAT-WE-DO/environment/environment-publications/helping-londons-green-belt-farms-prosper>
- CPRE Reviving County Farms 2019
 - <https://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/reviving-county-farms/>
- Sustain London Food Link
 - <https://www.sustainweb.org/londonfoodlink/>
 - <https://www.sustainweb.org/news/aug20-fringe-farming-breifing-published/>
- Rewilding Britain "Natural regeneration key to doubling woodlands and saving Britain's crippled forests"
 - <https://rewildingbritain.org.uk/blog/press-release-natural-regeneration-key-to-doubling-woodlands-and-saving-britains-crippled-forests>
- Woodland Trust
 - <https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2020/11/wood-wise-woods-in-waiting/>
- Earthwatch
 - <https://earthwatch.org.uk/get-involved/tiny-forests>
 - <https://earthwatch.org.uk/component/k2/tiny-forest>
- NFU Growing Success in the Lee Valley
 - <https://www.nfuonline.com/about-us/our-offices/east-anglia/east-anglia-news/growing-success-in-the-lea-valley/>

- OrganicLea is a community food project based in the Lea Valley producing and distributing food and plants locally, with a workers' cooperative at its core.
 - <https://www.organiclea.org.uk/>

7. Increased community engagement and use of local knowledge

Delivering the strategy depends on 5.2 “working with our partners”. Section 5.25 refers to “diverse events programme (e.g. festivals, carnivals and charity functions) that will maximise the positive use of Enfield’s parks and open spaces as destinations of enjoyment and relaxation, citing the Parks and Open Spaces - Outdoor Events Policy (July 2020).

Events in the parks have become a very controversial issue, especially very largescale events such as Elrow in Trent Park, which caused havoc locally and probably made very little money for the Council and did not have the support of residents or community groups.

It is hard, therefore, to support this goal as part of the strategy without a better definition of the type, size and location of the proposed future events and a definition of terms like ‘active management’ of parks. Also without a commitment to listen to the concerns of partners and respect their expertise. Given the importance of the borough’s parks and green spaces during this Covid year, it is to be hoped that any events will have public health and welfare and protection of our environmental assets as primary factors.

Community input seems to be lacking in general which is short sighted as there are residents’ groups with enormous knowledge of Enfield who could usefully have been involved at an earlier stage than formal consultation.

We note, however, that the 3 audits were submitted in November (SINC appointed June 2020, report submitted 27 Nov; Blue and Green Infrastructure Audit submitted 27 Nov, Review of Biodiversity Action Plan submitted November 2020) and the Blue Green Strategy published on 30 November. It’s hard to see how the three documents informed the strategy as intended and there is no evidence of community involvement in the preparation of these audits either.

The list of Borough-wide strategy projects, such as Enfield Sports Village, Chase Restoration, and the Historic Landscape Restoration have not been discussed with local stakeholders; this doesn’t auger well for future partnerships.

The consultative survey consists of 14 closed questions and space for 255 characters (approx. 30 – 60 words) in a further 9 questions.

We also recognise the very difficult circumstances presented by the Coronavirus pandemic and look forward to much greater community involvement as the strategy is revised and implemented.

Recommendations

- The consultation documents call for more public engagement in decision-making and design. A commitment to this goal written into the strategy would be welcomed as would a list of obligatory local community consultees; especially given the fact that many community groups such as CAG (Conservation Advisory Group), Green Belt Forum and Transport Users Consultative Group have been subsumed into the single Environment forum.

8. Funding

We have concerns that reliance on development fees and levies to fund the projects and relevant staffing will result in the de-designation of some Green Belt sites for development and Green Belt swaps from west to east, despite protection in the new London Plan. Footnote 12 in the strategy explains the two types of contribution: the community infrastructure levy and section 106 agreements.

Recommendation

- That the approach to developer contributions is reviewed to ensure that the aims of the Blue Green Strategy are properly recognised and supported.

Finally a few comments about the **supporting appendices**: -

The **Biodiversity Action Plan Review** looks rigorous with some solid criticisms [such as data collection and sharing, maintenance, in-house expertise, etc.] and detailed guidance for future management and policy.

The Blue and Green Infrastructure Audit looks thorough except for the complete omission of the Council's farms or any overview of privately-owned farmland.

The **SINC Review** recommends the status quo with a couple of additions and appears sound.

We will look forward to a final strategy that incorporates our suggestions.
Regards

Enfield Climate Action Forum

Website: <https://www.encaf.org/>

Facebook:

<https://www.facebook.com/search/top?q=enfield%20climate%20action%20forum>

Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/encafnetwork/>

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/GlobalNet21>

Enfield Blue & Green Strategy consultation survey

1. Would you like to be kept informed about the work on the Blue and Green Strategy in the future?
 - Yes or No

VISION, AIMS & OBJECTIVES THE BLUE AND GREEN STRATEGY SETS OUT OUR LONG-TERM APPROACH TO PROTECTING, MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING ENFIELD'S BLUE AND GREEN SPACES AND ROUTES

2. How far do you agree with the portrait of the borough's blue and green network and summary of the issues and challenges it faces?
 - Strongly agree / Agree / Neutral-Unsure **Disagree** / Strongly disagree
3. Do you have any other comments on the vision of the strategy?
 - Please see above
4. How far do you agree with the aims and objectives of the draft strategy?
 - Strongly agree / Agree / Neutral-Unsure **Disagree** / Strongly disagree
5. Do you have any other comments on the aims and objectives of the strategy?
 - Please see above

ENFIELD'S BLUE & GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK

6. How far do you agree with the proposed locations of the corridors, nodes, areas of change and the emerging interventions?
 - Strongly agree / Agree / Neutral-Unsure **Disagree** / Strongly disagree
7. Do you have any other comments on section 4 (Enfield's blue and green infrastructure network) of the strategy?
 - Please see above

HIGH-PROFILE PROJECTS

IN ADDITION, WE HAVE IDENTIFIED SEVERAL HIGH-PROFILE PROJECTS TO DELIVER MULTIPLE BENEFITS ACROSS THE BOROUGH'S BLUE AND GREEN NETWORK.

1. EXPANSION OF THE CYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN NETWORK
2. ENFIELD SPORTS VILLAGE
3. EXPANSION OF THE OPEN SPACES AND ROUTES INTO THE LEE VALLEY REGIONAL PARK
4. GREEN LOOP
5. ENFIELD CHASE
6. GREY-TO-GREEN GATEWAYS
7. WETLAND AND RIVER RESTORATION
8. HISTORIC LANDSCAPE RESTORATION

8. If you have any comments on the borough-wide strategy projects identified in appendix 2, please use the space below.
 - Please see above
9. Do you know of any additional sites or projects that you would like to see identified? If so, please use the space below
 - Please see above

DELIVERING THE STRATEGY

SECTION 5 OF THE STRATEGY SETS OUT HOW WE WILL WORK WITH THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS TO DELIVER AN INTEGRATED AND MULTI-FUNCTIONAL GREEN AND BLUE NETWORK ACROSS THE ENTIRE BOROUGH

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

- *Strongly agree / Agree / Neutral-Unsure Disagree / Strongly disagree*

11. Do you have any other comments on section 4 of the strategy?

- Please see above

12. Do you feel that our approach to securing funding will safeguard the right amount of investment?

- *Strongly agree / Agree / Neutral-Unsure Disagree / Strongly disagree*

13. Do you have any other comments on the approach to funding and delivery set out in section 5 of the strategy?

- Please see above

14. Do you have any further comments on the draft Blue and Green Strategy and its supporting appendices?

- Please see above