

Members of BHORA submitted the following questions to the 2017 General Election candidates. All candidates were contacted and asked to respond. To follow are their answers. Please note that we did ask the Liberal Democrat candidate to provide answers as well but they have yet to be received.

Questions	Conservative Party David Burrowes	Green Party David Flint	Labour Party Bambos Charalambous
<p>BREXIT Could you explain how the Government will control immigration after Brexit because we cannot even police planning law-</p>	<p>Leaving the EU will ensure we can better manage European migration, attracting specific skills and sectors through rules laid down by Parliament in the national interest.</p> <p>The lack of enforcement of planning laws is a matter for the local Council. Whilst there has been considerable pressure on the Council budget, proper enforcement can be financed through civil and criminal sanctions. This is a question of priorities. I would encourage the Council to scrap its vanity magazine Our Enfield costing £100,000 and the cost of allowance for the Associate Cabinet Members (£22,800) and put that into priorities like enforcement.</p>	<p>I can't but neither can Theresa May. This is one of the many practical issues that is still unclear. But what's worse is that we don't really know what a May government would try to do. Would she still welcome foreign students? East European farm workers? Indian doctors? Without immigrants both businesses and public services will be in serious difficulties.</p>	<p>How ever many laws are made it is sometimes the enforcement of these laws that leads to their success or failure. This is true of planning law as it is true of immigration. If there is little or no investment in policing immigration then controlling immigration will be tougher. The Conservatives cut spending for the Borders Agency last year. Labour will recruit 500 more border agency staff to make our borders more secure.</p>
<p>We're all aboard the Brexit Bus, going we know not where. If the bus looks like it's going to crash, or the driver can't find the map, do we have the right to get off – or ask the driver to turn back?</p>	<p>Most MPs, whether they voted Leave or Remain, decided to legislate to trigger Article 50 to leave the EU, respecting the decision on June 23rd. So we are all aboard the Brexit Bus and the destination is clear - we are leaving the EU by the end of March 2019.</p> <p>The issue for this election is whether you want the driver to be Theresa May or Jeremy Corbyn. With these challenging negotiations commencing 11 days after the election, I know I want Theresa May</p>	<p>In voting for BREXIT we were buying blind. In the last year it's become obvious that the government is deluded about both the process of negotiation and the likely outcome. May refuses to recognise that whilst the UK sees the EU as a trading project the EU sees it as a political project.</p> <p>We believe that a Tory government would use the BREXIT negotiations as an excuse to reduce environmental and workplace protections and undermine</p>	<p>The misinformation that was peddled in the EU referendum was disgraceful and the truth about what Brexit really means for this country is only now coming out. There has to be a meaningful vote at the end of the Brexit negotiations with EU members. If the deal negotiated is a bad one it should be rejected and further negotiations held until a good deal is obtained however long it takes. Access to the European single market and freedom of movement of EU (and UK) nationals are two vital issues that have to settled to the UK's best interests.</p>

	<p>at the table to get the best deal for Britain. Voting for me strengthens her hand at this crucial time.</p>	<p>both our human rights and the sovereignty of parliament.</p> <p>We were, and are, against BREXIT and we think the British people should have a vote on the final deal with the option of staying in the EU.</p>	
<p>HOUSING ... for example how can any politician left right or centre explain how we allow a 1 bedroom flat in Pilgrims close to house 11 people?</p> <p>There is an urgent shortage of housing. What are your views about the recent contribution to the housing stock that has taken place in this ward?</p>	<p>There is an urgent shortage of housing. What are your views about the recent contribution to the housing stock that has taken place in this ward?</p> <p>I agree that the lack of affordable housing available to buy or rent is one of the major issues facing Enfield. I welcome the £3.15bn record level of funding for affordable housing, and our manifesto commitment to build a million homes by the end of 2020, and half a million more by the end of 2022.</p> <p>The problem with some of the new housing development in the BHORA area is that the Area Action Plan was ignored alongside local concerns. New housing should take account of the local environment, the link to green spaces and capacity for local services like healthcare and education.</p>	<p>Yes, it's crazy. The right answer is landlord licensing. We know it works because we have it in Croydon. License fees can fund inspections which can improve standards. Unfortunately the government is hostile. Could this be because one third of MPs are landlords?</p> <p>I am unhappy about the developments along the NCR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A noisy, polluted major road is no place for housing. • There are no new public services nor plans for introducing them. • Despite the Ritz Parade consultation there are no plans for community facilities. • Public transport is inadequate for the increased number of people. <p>The bottom line here is that we need pro-active planning by the local authority rather than a reliance on developer initiatives and goodwill. This should include a GP surgery and more and more frequent rail services.</p>	<p>We need more affordable housing in London because the people in Enfield Southgate need somewhere to live to provide the essential that keep our capital ticking over. Whilst more accommodation is welcome it is not at any price. We need well designed, decent, sustainable accommodation built to a high standard (such as the Parker Morris standard for house building in the Sixties). Passivhaus is certainly worth looking at for sustainable accommodation. Locally Notting Hill Housing Trust have built too much, too high and not to a high standard which has put them at odds with the local community and councillors.</p>

<p>ROAD CONGESTION</p> <p>A major arterial route, the North Circular, bisects the south of this constituency. But poor road schemes have turned residential streets such as Warwick Rd into rat-runs for that through-traffic, bringing pollution, noise, road-rage and other problems. And local people have been up in arms about it for 5 years. Do candidates agree that a position of “do nothing” (to quote an Enfield traffic briefing) is unacceptable? And if so, how will they help us transform the situation into one of “do something”?</p>	<p>I agree doing nothing is unacceptable and intolerable. There were serious concerns for the impact upon Warwick Road when the A406 road changes took place, and after years of challenging Enfield Council the decision was made to consider banning no right turn onto the A406 subject to consultation. Unfortunately the Council ducked making a decision when it received a mixed response to the consultation.</p> <p>What is needed is leadership from local Councillors. No right turn is a necessary first step. I have met with TfL managers on the A406 and urged them to keep this option on the table but the ball is in Enfield Council’s court. We also need a longer term plan with Haringey and Enfield Councils and TfL to reduce through traffic.</p>	<p>We completely agree that ‘do nothing’ is unacceptable. Locally our approach has four parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Get cars off the roads by improving public transport and encouraging walking and cycling. 2. Discourage rat running by a mixture of traffic calming and road closures. 3. Introduce 20 mph limits on all residential and shopping roads. 4. Enforce existing laws that are supposed to keep lorries off residential roads. <p>Local measures will not be enough so we would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsidise the scrapping of diesel vehicles, especially taxis, and extend the Ultra-Low Emissions Zone to the edge of London. • Take a strategic approach to goods distribution to ensure that much more long-distance movement is done by rail. 	<p>This is a huge problem locally and one that needs to be addressing. The solution must be for us all to use our cars less and use alternative means of transport where possible such as cycling. Changing the street that the traffic goes down is not a long term solution. I would be happy to meet with the residents of Warwick Road to discuss the problem in more detail.</p>
<p>PLANNING</p> <p>Can the existing planning procedure operated by Enfield Council be improved so that residents' views are given greater weight?</p> <p>Currently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • residents' views expressed at consultation meetings are routinely ignored.. • planning officers are extremely reluctant to discuss planning applications with 	<p>Neighbourhood Planning Laws enable forums to develop a Neighbourhood Plan. This plan ensures developers come to the forum before submitting a planning application and keep development in line with the Neighbourhood Plan. An additional incentive in the form of a community levy on developments would go to the Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>I would urge active residents associations like BHORA to consider developing a Neighbourhood Plan. DCLG funds for advice and support are available and</p>	<p>I agree that planning processes are unsatisfactory – and not just in Enfield. Unfortunately many major planning questions necessarily produce winners and losers and most are complex. Local people have a right to be heard and to have their concerns addressed but the Council has a duty to allow the development of new housing and new public infrastructure.</p> <p>So I favour a Citizens Jury approach, before the final decisions, in which ordinary citizens – some local, some</p>	<p>Residents views should be given the weight that they rightly deserve with any development but any objections should be made on planning grounds. There has always been a presumption in favour of planning. Due to the savage cuts to public sector funding planning officer time is very limited and so it is often hard to get planning officers to discuss applications with residents which is what used to happen. The time constraints about consultations and determining applications are set by the law.</p>

<p>residents in the period when officers are assessing the applications before framing their recommendations to the planning committee. This means that residents' views on issues are not taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> inadequate time is allowed to those opposing applications. 	<p>other areas in the Borough are considering this option.</p> <p>Planning Officers should be more transparent in the pre-planning committee stage to take account of all representations before a formal recommendation is made.</p>	<p>with a stake in the development – can hear the issues discussed in detail.</p>	
<p>RAILWAYS What advantages to the public and to the taxpayer would arise from the ending of the current franchising arrangements for Britain's railways?</p>	<p>Since privatisation, investment in our railway network has trebled, resulting in the fastest rate of growth among major European railways. Nationalisation would take us backwards, put investment at risk and increase the burden on taxpayers.</p> <p>The Conservatives are dedicated to delivering a better rail service, underwritten by a strong economy. We are working through one of the largest-ever investment programmes in our roads and railways, spending some £40 billion on transport improvements. We will review rail ticketing, removing complexity and perverse pricing, and introduce a passenger ombudsman to stand up for the interests of rail users suffering a poor deal.</p>	<p>Under privatisation we have the most subsidised railways in Europe with the highest fares and worst service. When the East Coast main line franchise was in public hands it was cheaper than when privatised and provided better service. A unified railway system would allow better long-term planning and simpler and more honest ticketing. And if we wait till the current franchises end it won't cost us anything!</p>	<p>I have always believed that if private companies can run public services for a profit then there is no reason why the public sector can't do the same and re-invest the profits back into providing a better service and not in paying shareholders dividends. When national Express walked away from running the East Coast mainline service in 2009 and the service was run by a Government owned company the service and customer satisfaction improved. There's no reason why this can't work again and hopefully we'll see cheaper train fares too!</p>
<p>PUBLIC SERVICES What will you be doing with police, NHS and fire brigade?</p>	<p>In the next 5 years, we will protect the police budget in real terms, funding more firearms officers and investing in training and equipment. Spending on counter-</p>	<p>We would reverse the cuts to these services (and to education). The horror in Manchester, knife crime in Enfield, resignations of nurses and teachers,</p>	<p>We need more investment in all our emergency services. Labour will recruit 10,000 more police, 3,000 more fire fighters and invest £30 billion extra</p>

	<p>terrorism is forecasted to increase by 30% over the next 3 years.</p> <p>I want England to be the first nation in the world to provide a truly 7-day health service. Increasing NHS spending by £8bn over the next 5 years will enable you to access weekend and evening GP services by 2019.</p> <p>Fire deaths and injuries are at near historical lows, having declined by 42% from 2005-2015. We must now further invest in preventative work.</p>	<p>difficulty in getting GP appointments, and excessive A&E waiting times all show the irresponsible folly of the cuts.</p> <p>It vital to recognise that the cuts are not simply mistakes. They are a concerted, and successful, attempt to reduce the public realm – to ‘shrink the state’ – in the name of a discredited economic ideology. The results show that no-one who now supports austerity is fit to govern us.</p>	<p>towards NHS funding. We have seen our safer neighbourhoods teams cut since 2008, and our local health services close to crisis point highlighted by last summer’s North Middlesex Hospital A&E fiasco where they were found to be risking patients’ health by making them endure long waits due to staff shortages. This is a direct result of lack of Government funding and the closure of Chase Farm Hospital A&E unit which some politicians said they’d save!</p>
<p>YOUNG PEOPLE In London, many young people face large student debt, soaring rents and house prices, and a highly competitive but insecure work environment, while at the same time their taxes are supposed to pay for an ageing population -- and Brexit might narrow their options. What hope can candidates offer young people at this time? Is it time for a New Deal for young people?</p>	<p>It is essential that we restore the contract between the generations, delivering opportunity and prosperity for younger generations whilst maintaining security for older people. More students from disadvantaged backgrounds are getting into university than ever before, with disadvantaged students 37% more likely to be accepted in 2016 compared to 2010. The introduction of T-levels will broaden students’ opportunities, with 15 routes including creative and design, digital and engineering culminating in 3 month placements. 3 million apprenticeships will</p>	<p>Yes. A combination of economics and cynical electoral calculation have concentrated power and wealth in the hands of an older generation who have imposed costs that they never faced on the young. We would remove tuition fees, reintroduce Education Maintenance grants and regulate rents. But housing is key and requires the construction of a lot more houses many of which should be council housing at affordable rents.</p>	<p>It is so hard for young people nowadays with them saddled with debt as a result of tuition fees and finding it hard to find long term work. Labour will abolish tuition fees for all students, bring back the Education Maintenance Awards and also abolish zero hour contracts. We will also increase apprenticeships and develop skills training for the jobs of the future. We will also ensure that there is more affordable housing for young people and reverse the ban on young people getting housing benefit. We will also reduce the voting age to 16.</p>