

I refer first to The Spatial Strategy (Section 2.4). I can find nothing in this document that will enhance the quality of life in the borough I have lived in for 58 years, and I see nothing here that will create a better, greener future for the many people who live on the eastern side of the Borough and who lack access to good quality, affordable housing and access to leisure facilities. The needs of young people are conspicuously ignored.

I have no idea why 3000 new homes, at "Chase Park" are going to be deeply green (Policy SPPL 10,pg 80-87 & figure 3.11). The document does not outline why the proposed settlement at Crews Hill is sustainable. Policy SP PL9,pg 77-80 & Concept Plan Fig 3.10 proposes another 3000 new houses, with potential for another 7500 homes in Crews Hill, pushing up against the M25. I have consulted the Mayor of London and his office's response suggests that Enfield's plans do not accord with the Londonwide plan that the Mayor has produced. The loss of Green Belt also does not address issues around climate change. I would have thought paving over a flood plan is not a good idea. When I then noted the proposed development at Hadley Wood (SA 45, Land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, pg 364), and the extent of the land given over to industrial, storage & distribution space and yet more office space (SA52, pg 372, SA54,pg 374), I was horrified. I cannot understand why a Council would wilfully destroy what are the green lungs of the Borough.

If you expand all the above, expect more traffic, more pollution. Nothing is mentioned about the pressure on medical services, education and infrastructure. Enfield has already become a miserable borough in which to live, with roads crumbling, neverending roadworks and high levels of pollution. The local plan addresses none of these challenges. Neither is it likely that people currently residing in Enfield, especially in the east, will be able to afford any of the dwellings on these private developments

I understand that there will also be a huge expansion of the Spurs training ground at Whitewebbs. The plan talks about the community accessing these amenities, but again where is development and regeneration in the east of the borough? I also understand that much of the training ground is likely to be Astrourfed - again, how does this recognise the effects of heavier rainfall, flooding and problems for surrounding areas?

The idea of building upwards in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area (pg156-60 & pg 321) is frankly crazy. It might work in Hong Kong or Shanghai but tall apartment blocks won't work in a market town setting, and in the shadow of the Grenfell scandal, how does the Council propose to make private developers fully accountable? What about the safety and security of residents in high rise blocks?

Finally, in the context of proposals to build over 30000 homes by 2039, if only 429 have been completed since 2019 (Table 8.2, pg 186) how is this rush to build compatible with high quality dwellings and no cutting of corners. This local plan is full of lost opportunities. Where are imaginative plans to regenerate the many areas in Eastern Enfield that are crying out for sustainable high quality job opportunities for young people and for low cost, well built housing for families and individuals who are languishing on lengthy waiting lists?

I have been a Labour supporter since I was able to cast a vote. Is this Local Plan the best that the Labour Council can come up with? I reject this Plan in its entirety. The only people to benefit from it will be the private developers whose main motive is profit. I cannot believe that the Council is content to have this sorry plan as their legacy