
I object to the Draft local Plan for Enfield for the following reasons.

1. Policy SP PL 10 - Chase Park – Plan to flood Edmonton

This proposed development of Green Belt land not only contravenes the protection of the Green Belt but will give rise to extensive flooding in Edmonton. This area has long provided a collection point for rain water with normally slow release into the streams that link western Enfield with Grange Park and Edmonton. Heavy rains have historically resulted in flooding in Edmonton. Recent flood protection measures will become obsolete as the source of the floodwater will be concreted over by this proposal, be unconstrained by the natural drainage and which together with the increased levels of rainwater as predicted by global warming will inundate all areas downstream from Enfield Golf Course.

The plan fails to recognise the impact of traffic of such a large development on roads already struggling to cater with the existing demands. As a soulless community traffic egress must be a key consideration.

2. SA 62 and SP CL4

This would appear to be a sop to the extensive housing developments providing an area for sport and leisure with no recognisable access and remote from those areas needing local facilities. Are such remote locations really conducive to and accessible by walking and cycling in this hilly part of Enfield? How can the narrow lanes of Bulls Cross and Whitewebbs Lane provide public transport access to this area/

3. Policy DM6 Tall Buildings

The proposed development of Palace Gardens with high rise apartment blocks is totally out of character with the surrounding area. The existing eye-sore of Bovril House demonstrates that Enfield Council cannot be trusted with managing such a development. A comprehensive plan addressing Enfield Town as a focal point for Enfield for social, commercial, shopping, entertainment purpose with transport links to the rest of the borough appropriate to both daytime and evening use. Southgate and Edmonton should provide similar centres. The Draft Plan only pays lip service to these areas critical to the development of Enfield communities.

4. General

The Plan recognises that it is contrary to London Plan Policy and Secretary of State directions and as such should be rejected. The Plan misses an opportunity for making a real improvement to Enfield, in particular Eastern Enfield. Much of Enfield relies on housing built in the Victorian era. Adding a further 30 years to the timescale for tackling this ageing property is a missed opportunity. Enfield needs and deserves a challenging plan to tackle replacement of these old buildings and deprived areas with homes not only able to meet the increasingly important environmental goals but also providing communities matching the living standards and aspirations of the 21st century.

The large scale destruction of the Green Belt is to the long term detriment to the residents of Enfield and provides an “easy” option for the planners rather than tackle to real issues facing Enfield.

