

---

I strongly object to the plan for the following reasons:

The 'Spatial strategy' (section 2.4) which identifies how growth will be distributed across the Borough over the plan period and gives rise to the strategies for housing, employment, town centres and countryside green belt;

My response: there's unsurmountable evidence that allowing developers to build expensive homes will not benefit the local economy and will not deliver affordable homes. Studies have shown that homes built on green field sites are expensive and not affordable, and by linking this development to the need to build affordable homes, I believe this is factually incorrect.

3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green' 'sustainable urban extension' referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town (Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11);

My response: this would be a disaster for the local area as the traffic volumes are already out of control between London Road and Ridgeway, with particular nuisance, pollution and dangerous driving on Uplands Park Road. Additional homes would bring larger cars and SUVs, and result in even greater traffic volume, worse air quality and more danger to the existing residents who have to try and cross congested roads that are used as race tracks at all times of the day and night. The Council should be looking at ways of controlling the traffic within the west of the Borough rather than allowing even more cars and vehicles to pollute, congest and create a hazard for existing residents.

We live close to where the homes are planned and this would destroy our local area. I take my young children walking in these areas and they are very socially conscious, and are very concerned about the environment. If Enfield Council chooses to take the short term gain of a financial incentive over the needs of its young residents, this would be a very poor outcome. I'm also aware that previous situations of a similar nature - where a council effectively hands over control to a property developer based in a tax haven - never ends well. The council loses control and ends up with poor housing that nobody wants, the environment is destroyed for good, and the financial incentive never quite works out as hoped

If Enfield truly wants to meet its residents' desire for affordable housing to meet a social need, it should either (a) build its own affordable housing or partner with a socially responsible housing trust; (b) be honest in that the proposed developer does not want to build such housing as it would not benefit them economically - i.e. the houses will be on sale for many times more than a typical family can afford; and (c) be honest and truthful with its existing residents, and consider their situation more keenly than the sales pitches offered by the property developers. As has been pointed out, if this goes ahead, the west of the borough will be destroyed as a green and pleasant area forever. A few "wild" places will not negate the destruction brought by thousands more cars, houses and miles of congested roads.

The Green Belt is there for a reason - and if it's gone, it's unjustifiable for the vague benefits sketched out in the underdeveloped plan.

3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion (Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10);

My response: Crews Hill is a unique and important piece of Enfield - if this is removed, the Council runs the risk of destroying once and for all what makes Enfield unique. Look at the impact of uncontrolled development on areas such as Croydon to see what Enfield could easily become. If the needs of local residents are social, affordable housing, what is the point in allowing thousands of identikit unaffordable homes while destroying features that other boroughs would gladly have?

160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood (SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364);

My response: as before, studies have shown that the families desperately looking for appropriate housing would in no way benefit from building here. The infrastructure is not there. On the flipside, if Enfield Council is looking at ways to reduce its large deficit, selling out to a property developer is not the best long term solution, and it would only benefit their profits. The initial funds would soon dry up, and I have no doubt the Council will end up being sued by the developer if it attempted to safeguard any promises made to the residents. I do not believe this proposal is well managed or even sustainable, and it will be the Enfield residents who will lose out, even after this council has moved on. The legacy will not be a popular/successful one

Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Ramme Marsh (SA52 page 372);

My response: Enfield Council must show evidence there's a need for additional office space when much is already available and is sitting idle.

11 hectares of new industrial and storage and distribution use at what is currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase (SA54, page 374);

My response: this will simply add to the already uncontrolled traffic, noise and traffic pollution in the borough. The vague language around building jobs, etc. should consider the quality of the jobs, and the likelihood of firms bringing investment to the area - not just balancing "build lots of homes" with vague descriptions of benefits that would, sadly, be unlikely to materialise in their present state within this proposal

a big expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25, comprising of 42.5 hectares of land, for "professional sport, recreation and community sports/leisure uses" (SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277-279);

My response: allowing a large company to take over a large, public space for its own gain and position "girl's football" as the drive behind this is another attempt to link a surrender of shared space into private ownership with a token societal benefit. I do not play golf but enjoyed the open space and communal nature of the surrounding area. There is already more than enough urban sprawl within Enfield without allowing more to spread over the green spaces. In addition, "rewilding" is not just allowing verges to grow - it's leaving large areas to nature, not handing them over to firms that have no long term intention to lose money to benefit existing residents. It comes back to once it's gone, it's gone forever. Any poor decision made now hands over control to large firms that will happily walk away/make further demands/under deliver, and it will be Enfield Council that is blamed. Capitalism doesn't care one bit for the average man and woman, or Labour Council, and many well-meaning councils have discovered this too late

Encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area (see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321). A higher quality version of figure 7.4 is also available, showing proposed maximum building heights across the Borough.

My response: Enfield Chase is a unique, historic site. The two tall buildings already up - the Civic Centre and the flats near the Town Park - are both noticeably out of place, out of character, and plain ugly. Allowing further eyesores to be built - to the primary benefit of the developers, who will make lots of money from the council allowing them to build anything, anywhere - would destroy the look and feel of the town centre for ever. When we attended the event on Sunday where Church Street was closed to traffic, you got a feel for what Enfield could be if traffic was calmed and diverted away from the town centre. However, the approach instead seems to be to allow cars to race through the town, convert offices into uninhabitable flats, and allow towering buildings to dominate and destroy the out of London feel. Again, this will only benefit the developers and will leave Enfield with a legacy of ugly buildings that no-one actually wants or needs

There is a full list of housing development sites within Policy SP H1 on pages 183-185 (section 8.1). In total over 30,000 homes are planned for by 2039. This equates to around 1,500 homes per year over 20 years, but only 429 have been completed since 2019 (Table 8.2, page 186).

My response: this says it all, really - signing up the Council and Enfield to impossible figures, selling off prime assets for short-term gain, and putting the wants of developers ahead of local residents.

I believe in the societal benefits and need for equality across the Borough, but I do not have any faith in the proposal in its current form, the thinking behind the proposal, or the justification for allowing property

developers to build across large areas of the Borough that would only benefit them and their profits. As a Labour Council I think you've missed a trick and worry about the long term proposals for Enfield should this plan go ahead. It's sad to see the Conservative Councillors score such an easy goal against this proposal