

---

Dear Sir / Madam,

Regarding Enfield's Draft Local Plan (for development) for the period until 2039, I've taken a look at [draft Local Plan \(PDF\)](#), [a summary leaflet \(PDF\)](#) and the [draft Proposals Map \(PDF\)](#).

I understand the need for development within Enfield, the planned provision of more homes to meet housing requirements and believe the majority of Enfield people would agree. Despite the obvious necessity I believe development should be limited though - rather than reaching saturation point, so I agree either option 2 or 3 should be pursued. Residents need to accept a level of change but not to the extent it drives them out of the borough though.

Having lived (almost all my life) and only ever worked, in Enfield I was proud to call Enfield my home; however, recent years suggest a decline around Enfield - highlighted by the number of shop properties now lying empty / disused in Enfield's Church Street and Palace Gardens shopping areas, perhaps indicative of people moving away from the borough and choosing to shop elsewhere. I realise this could be due to commercial property owners not offering enticing property rents and driving businesses away; so first up, I think it would be important if Enfield Council sought to encourage business back to the area - a starter to entice residents to stay in or move to Enfield.

Whilst I agree that development is required I'm mindful of the extent and which areas are affected so object to the following key policies relating to the Green Belt because they appear to remove them from the protected Green Belt and transform them into housing and industrial floorspace areas :

- Chase Park (pages 81-87, Strategic Policy [SP] PL10) - note page 84 mentions To realise the place vision set out Figure 3.11 development in the Crews Hill area - rather than the Chase Park area
- Crews Hill area (pages 75- 80, SP PL9)
- Land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood (page 364; SA45)
- Land East of M25 Junction 24 (page 374, SA54)

Enfield has a rich heritage / history and beautiful green belt and that's not something that can be replaced with pockets of development. Loss of any of our established green belt will cause loss of natural ecosystems / habitats, that cannot be recreated by desire / planning, or softened by time. If removed they, and Enfield's true character, will be lost forever. The green belt proposals seem to contradict [a summary leaflet \(PDF\)](#) which suggests the plans are to 'Protect Heritage', 'Invest in green spaces' and 'Enhance local wildlife'

I also object to the proposed allocation of the following spaces for development:

- Land West of Rammey Marsh (page 372, SA52): the plan contradicts 'Enhance local wildlife' and is more likely to drive it away forever - thereby robbing future generations of the opportunity to learn, and enjoy our wonderful and beautiful world. They should be empowered to learn and develop a sense of ownership and belonging near somewhere special, so that they too have a safe relaxing environment nearby to where they live.
- Whitewebbs Golf Course (page 378, SA57). I realise golf clubs may be less popular than they once were (formal interview entry process and joining fees seems to have been replaced by adverts for offers of no joining fees at local courses and in local paper); however, I don't understand why Whitewebbs was closed. I believe it can still be a facility that can be enjoyed by generations of golfers to come if given the required attention and management. Professional footballers train for limited time each week, perhaps it's an area THFC could take over the management of and offer as a facility to be used by their staff, visiting teams and the local population. I believe that would not only maintain but also improve the facility and attraction of the area.
- Alma Road Open Space (SA58, page 379), Firs Farm Recreation Ground (SA59, page 380), Church Street Recreation Ground (SA61, page 382) - all proposed areas for repurposing as Cemetery or Crematorium. All appear to be sport /recreation areas. Throughout my life playing fields appear to have been sold for development (housing , supermarkets etc) - not just within Enfield. I'm not suggesting it caused the obesity problem across the United Kingdom, but if we continue to remove such spaces, the population will be afforded ever reduced specialist provisioned spaces in which to relax and aim to keep healthy.

I view loss of these areas detrimental to the development and health of our population, both physically and mentally. I believe people need variety be that in landscape or activity in order to stay healthy and well, and removing the green belt and these other natural areas could have a significant impact on future generations.

I also object to the tall building policies (pages156-160) as I believe they would forever damage the character of the historic market town of Enfield, whilst also creating a travel / traffic bottleneck in our already over-burdened infrastructure.

In addition to the objections raised I also have the following concerns about the plans:

- Traffic issues around all proposed areas for development: Road travel around Enfield has appeared to very chaotic in recent years. All proposed areas of development would add to that issue. If areas are to be developed, careful consideration needs to be given to the issues of traffic dispersal and flow. The plan mentions proposed new residential areas being within 30-45 minutes of a station. Yes, we need to address the obesity issue and encourage exercise, but in today's world people appear to want a 'quick fix' - let's be realistic, will people walk that far

for a train service?

- Schools and associated infrastructure: they need to be incorporated into plans, not necessarily as a bolt on, but so they are at the heart of communities. For years Enfield Council has reported a shortage of school places, yet establishments such as Albany School (latterly Oasis Academy) appear to have closed. Before adding to the problem, it's probably wise to provision new schools and services at the start of the planning phase of development of areas, whilst also maintaining the character of the borough to attract teachers and education staff.

Having read Geographical Science at university, and written my dissertation on Urban Climate, I'm especially concerned that the development of Enfield will have adverse effects:

- Around 1967 T.J Chandler researched the Urban Heat Island effect and the effect of urban areas on the local climate - starting his cross London journey from Enfield
- Similarly, filling previously vegetated ground with concrete will alter the run off and throughput of rainfall possibly adding to flood risk

I realise that the impact of the proposals isn't on such a grand scale, but please be mindful that the changes will have an irreversible impact all aspects of Enfield.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

Regards