

---

Dear Sir / Madam,

I have now had the opportunity to review the above and have set out my comments below.

Whilst I understand the challenges faced by Enfield and other local authorities, I consider that a more radical re-think is required. For example, Brexit, the Covid pandemic, and even the stuck cargo ship in the Suez Canal have shown us that supply chains can be easily massively disrupted with significant consequences. The draft plan talks a lot about sustainability, and so it should as the span of this document might prove to be the make or break years for our planet. It therefore seems contradictory to me to talk about sustainability on the one hand but also be actively building on large tracts of our green belt land and destroying arable farmland near Chase Farm and land near Crews Hill that can be used for growing local produce for our increasing population with minimal impact on the environment.

It is noted that the Chase Park proposal talks a lot about "high density", presumably meaning lots and lots of housing but also talks of having significant protections in the form of the SDP and National City Park. Interesting, then, that before the Local Plan was even out for consultation, Cromer Homes had already published its vision for 5000 new homes on the Vicarage Farm site.

The local plan talks about the need (rightly) for new homes to be adequately supported by community centres, shops, and healthcare facilities but Cromer Homes seem to mention a school but nothing else.

The vision is for an Enfield where the vast majority walk, cycle, or use public transport and this is to be commended. However, it is unrealistic to believe that people will suddenly give up their cars for this. Will people walk or cycle to the A10 for the nearest supermarket and do their weekly shop that way? It seems much more likely that we will have thousands more cars travelling up and down the road between Cockfosters and Chase Farm, either that or supermarket delivery vans doing the same thing. More traffic, more pollution. If we look at the new development at Chase Farm as an example we see that the streets are already too full of cars, even before all the housing has been built. 5,000 new homes is very likely to mean at least 5,000 new cars and it's already very difficult to find street parking anywhere near the hospital or the train stations. The existing local shops, e.g. Shell garage, are significantly more expensive and carry very limited stock. The whole staff of Chase Farm hospital currently have one Costa Coffee concession to go to, so there would need to be significant investment in the community infrastructure to make this work as envisaged.

Some of the assumptions on sustainability seem to be based on surprising statistics. For example, I would be interested to know which three train stations people can walk to in 30 minutes as shown in the Chase Park chapter. Gordon Hill is probably do-able in 30 minutes but even then, is it realistic to think that people would do so? Having formerly lived around 25 minutes walk away in a different direction, I don't know any of my old neighbours who would have thought about walking there.

I note that 50% of the homes to be built will be affordable. This is important as house prices increase well beyond the reach of many. However, what protections will be built in

at the Chase Park or Crews Hill developments for instance? If the Trent Park development is anything to go by, I note that Teslas, Porsches, and BMWs are the norm with one bedroom flats starting at well over £500,000 and properties going up to £2m.

I note that the proposals to build on the Green Belt are contrary to the London Plan and that national planning law requires exceptional circumstances and reasons to build on green belt land. For example, it is not clear enough to me why the brownfield sites in the borough are insufficient, especially as noted in the draft plan, where we are having to re-imagine our high streets as a result of Covid and the massive hit to traditional retail. Why are we not using disused shops and the likes of the derelict British Legion for housing? What about office space being converted into flats with more flexible working space or small business hubs created instead? We talk about increasing biodiversity and green spaces yet the plan calls for the destruction of large parts of the biodiversity and green spaces we already have.

In summary it seems to me that the current plan whilst trying to grapple with significant challenges nonetheless has some key inconsistencies at its heart: the desire to be sustainable and support green spaces whilst destroying green spaces and building at high density, the desire to provide affordable homes whilst the track record of new housing shows it is anything but, the aim for everyone to live more locally and sustainably where recent history suggests that what people are really doing is driving more and using public transport less, and having more local community centres, shops, schools, and healthcare where the reality is that Enfield's residents are having to travel further and further afield for those same things. Far better, surely, to make the most of the assets we already have - ensuring that the arable fields of "Chase Park" and the growing areas of Crews Hill are used to grow local and sustainably produced food for the people of Enfield.

Yours faithfully