

---

RE: Enfield Council: Draft Local Plan

Dear Sir/Madam

**Reference: Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11**

**Development on Green Belt countryside referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm): 3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green', 'sustainable urban extension' that is next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield Town.**

We would like to state our very strong objection to the above proposals which will destroy a highly valued area of Green Belt which is around 140 hectares and a vital part of Enfield's historic heritage. The historian David Pam (author of *The Story of Enfield Chase*) has already expressed his dismay at the prospect of losing forever a unique part of Enfield's heritage and the connections local people have with their own area. My husband, a lecturer at London University, moved to this area of Enfield in 1976 because of its uniquely 'green' character. We have lived at our address for over 25 years and the main reason we have remained in Enfield, loyally paying our council taxes, is because we can walk to our local green spaces. This is an essential amenity, particularly today, and in the future for our children.

A priority of the government, indeed all political parties, has been addressing the country's health crisis and the pressure on the NHS from rising obesity levels in adults and children. Encouraging people to take more exercise has been a high priority. The paths and green space we currently enjoy, along with so many other walkers, runners, dog-walkers and families and their children, provide the vital space we need to stay physically active and mentally healthy. We know that during the Covid Pandemic being able to access green spaces has been vital to maintain our physical and mental well-being. And out of a pandemic, many people cannot afford the high fees of a health club. Like many older residents, in the coming years when we are unable to drive to Trent Park, we will become totally dependent on these local green spaces that can be accessed on foot.

While we recognise the need for more homes in Enfield, the Council does not improve our borough by taking away the very precious and highly valued green environment that contributes to the physical and mental well-being and happiness of its residents. The Crews Hill development at least comprises neglected areas that need improvement and there is no similar network of established paths regularly used by local residents, as is the case with the proposed Chase Park development.

Enfield houses for Enfield people is not quite the true picture when the population of London has simply increased every year as all Londoners have experienced. There is an unrealistic expectation that greater London boroughs can be expected to absorb the huge increase in numbers. We need to address this whole question of growth as 'a good thing' against constant expansion that can lower the quality of life for everyone. We know that increasing numbers of people are moving out of London, prompted by the shift in working practices, such as working from home. So unless local councils protect the very assets they have inherited – and most critically our precious and life enhancing green spaces, they will lose the support of their own residents and can no longer take for granted that they will choose to stay.

Lastly, I would like to know why Comer Homes has issued an impressive brochure with detailed proposals for up to 5,000 homes on this site. A copy of this document can be read on the Enfield Society's website. I would like to ask how such an advert could be placed when these proposals are at a 'consultation stage' with Enfield residents. Would you please explain how this could have happened?

We look forward to hearing from you.