

Response to the consultation submitted by Ms Tricia Sharpe of 30 Stonard Road, Palmers Green, N13 4DP

1. I am writing to object to the following Policies: SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Concept Plan Figure 3.11; Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10; Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364; Policy SA54, page 374; Policy SA62 page 372; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose the redesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough. Once lost it can never be re-claimed.

This issue is not presented impartially in a way we have a right to expect from our Council. Right from the start in 2.2.1 page 17 it is dismaying to read that the issue is framed as ‘How to strike the right balance between meeting development needs through intensification within urban areas and allowing limited release of Green Belt land’. And the summary that was posted through our letterbox today plays the same card ‘We need a sound Local Plan to protect the majority of our Green Belt from the proposed national planning changes and the risk of uncontrolled development.’ This is manipulative language that serves to reveal that the Council has already made up its mind. And this declaration is in fact false: the National Planning Policy Framework and particularly the Mayor’s London Plan are adamantly against Green Belt incursions.

The Concept Plan, for which there is no ‘key’ and therefore is incomprehensible, and PL9 Section on Crews Hill are full of obfuscation. In this section – or on the section about Chase Park - there is no mention of the number of houses to be built. This is only revealed on page 188. The only way the Crews Hill area will act as a ‘gateway’ is for people coming in from outside the borough. And this of course is exactly what will happen. Despite the requirement for 50% affordable housing, development here on prime Green Belt will act as a magnet for the wealthy – much like Hadley Wood now. It is an outlying area of the borough that will most likely continue to require car travel. It will be beyond possibility for those in the borough who are in need of affordable houses within access of their employment. These will not be ‘new homes for local people’.

2. SP PL8 page 71 Rural Enfield has some interesting ideas but these can evolve over time as funding becomes available. There is no need to try to raise money for them on the back of developments such as the devastation of Crews Hill . Some of them are happening naturally already, such as the re-wilding of Whitewebbs now that the golf club is closed. I recommend a visit!
3. I object to Policy DM SE2 page 89 – why aren’t ALL developments (design and construction) – new, conversion, change of use and refurb – of all size and number of residential and non-residential properties required to meet the relevant industry standards of certification related to sustainability? We all know that a lot of developers will try to game the system for parcelling properties up into lots and this will be the only way to prevent them doing this.
4. I am also objecting to the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6. Fig 7.3 and 7.4 are incomprehensible; I see that Palmers Green is designated as having appropriate locations for tall buildings but I am unable to see on the maps where the specific areas are. Currently Palmers Green is

almost entirely low rise and the case has not yet been made that higher rise might be integrated satisfactorily. In Palmers Green there are several sites/large houses that have been bought by developers that are currently unoccupied and have been for years. Development boards go up and are then taken down. The number of 'windfall' sites listed in the plan (Table 8.2 page 186) is very low – fewer than 100 per year for the whole of the borough. These opportunities should be carefully examined before high-rise becomes the go-to solution.

5. I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement. In fact, I see that Whitewebbs is also listed as a golf course amenity! (page 278)
6. I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.
7. Some aspects that are underexplored in the Plan are: strategy for recycling and waste disposal, development of/support for electric car charging infrastructure and plans for systematic retrofitting housing stock in line with net zero carbon targets.