
Dear Local Plan Team,

I am a resident of the borough and writing to submit my concerns and feedback to elements of the proposed Local Plan.

My greatest overarching concern is that population growth, increased population density and intensification will destroy and permanently, irreversibly transform the character and quality of life in this borough. This is an Outer Suburb and Semi-Rural borough, NOT the Inner City. But your proposals, cramming in tens of thousands more people into an already crowded borough, with tall buildings and dense housing throughout would give it a more inner-urban character. Please do not turn Enfield into Tower Hamlets. Our borough contains the last surviving traces of rural Middlesex. There is already evidence and certainly a perception that Labour is interested in urban areas and the inner city and hates the countryside and wants to pave it over and fill it with blocks of flats. This Local Plan does little to dispel that perception.

I live in Winchmore Hill, and having the open space of Firs Farm Playing Fields to walk and cycle around was an invaluable lifeline during COVID-19. I cannot believe you want to take that precious green amenity away from us. Every inch of green space in the South East is precious and loved by local residents. Firs Farm is one of the best assets of the area. Taking it away from use for sports and leisure would be unforgivable.

Equally unforgivable is destroying Crews Hill. People from far and wide come to Crews Hill for its horticultural and agricultural businesses. Once again this looks like Labour is the party of urban city people and hates rural industries and countryside. The roads and trains are already overloaded and congested in this area, you cannot seriously put thousands more people there.

I love going for walks around the Vicarage Farm area, this access to the countryside is inherent to what makes Winchmore Hill and Oakwood and Enfield a good place to live. We don't live here for an inner-city, dense, urbanised life. Building on the Green Belt would be unforgivable and an act of vandalism. Did we learn nothing from the 1960s?

Furthermore, putting dense housing and tall towers at the heart of the beautiful semi-rural market town of Enfield Town would be OBSCENE. Did we learn nothing from the 1960s? Or are we going to do it all over again?

We BEG you not to destroy Enfield Town in the same way they destroyed Croydon, Lewisham and Stratford. These places will never be nice towns again. Please don't ruin Enfield Town forever.

The Local Plan also spells the absolute obliteration of our road network and transport network. The roads are already full, how are we going to cope if you bring in thousands more people AND narrow/reduce the roads? Are you trying to push private car ownership out of Enfield?

Like I said, what makes sense in one borough does not work everywhere. Those in Islington or Lambeth could conceivably cycle into town to work and live a compact, urban life. But we are much too far away from that, deep in the outer suburbs, that vision of hipster cycling lifestyle does not make sense here. It seems London Labour takes one transport policy cooked up for Lambeth or City Hall and expects it to fit everywhere.

Many people living in the Outer London boroughs are more orientated outwards towards their local towns, villages and rural areas than they are towards the city centre. Cars are obviously a legitimate part of that. Having a car in Enfield is no less appropriate than having a car in Swindon or Ipswich. This is not the inner city. But your policies amount to turning our suburban, outer urban borough into an extension of the dense, car-free, crowded inner city. WE DO NOT WANT THIS.

Furthermore, the trains and Tubes are ALREADY full and we are too far out to go into London by bus, it takes hours. The Moorgate line cannot increase train lengths or peak frequencies because of the complex Moorgate terminus tunnels which are already over capacity. So what you are proposing to do will wreck the already overcrowded services. The Piccadilly line is already full, and capacity increases consist of packing more people in standing like sardines all the way from Cockfosters and Oakwood to London. Like a developing country. It is unbelievable that you would build so many dense homes out in Enfield without providing any more road or rail infrastructure. Deeply irresponsible and reckless.

The tall towers planned at Cockfosters station car park are disgusting and deeply irresponsible and must be stopped. There is an obvious need for park-and-ride car parks at terminus stations, and Cockfosters is a semi-

rural village, NOT a site for thousands of flats in a monstrous development of tall buildings, blighting (PERMANENTLY) this green area, including Trent Park. Did we learn NOTHING from the 1960s?

The reduction of road capacity in Enfield Town is an act of vandalism promoted by anti-car activists that want to expel private car ownership from London. Everyone with eyes to see knows that it will not be sufficient capacity (in an already congested borough and region) and the resulting gridlock will force Enfield residents to give up their cars or their homes. How you can sleep at night putting people in that appalling dilemma I do not know. I have been suicidally depressed over this dilemma regularly - either you are leveraging your power to reduce and constrict road capacity to force people (including people who love and need it for their mental health) to give up their cars, or you are expecting them to be forced out of the borough by the pressure. It is evil social engineering. We need to convert more to cycling, I couldn't agree more, but that is to be done by providing more and better alternatives, not by forcing citizens of a democracy off the roads against their will.

The proposed developed at the corner of Great Cambridge and Southbury roads is a monstrosity, too. Yes, some more housing would be useful, but that amount right there with no green space and no amenities, trapped alongside the A10 without even a little park, will overwhelm the tiny local train station and they will have nowhere to go. It makes the town planning vandalism of the 1960s look like nothing, this is obscene.

Essentially I would summarise the problem with the following graphic which I have made:

POPULATION DENSIFICATION & INTENSIFICATION IN THE OUTER SUBURBS (ZONES 4,5,6+): CREATING THE *WORST OF BOTH WORLDS*

The upside of living SO FAR OUT from the city centre (typically 30-60+ minutes by public transport) in the outermost boroughs is a LOW-DENSITY, OUTER-SUBURBAN, SPACIOUS, SEMI-RURAL, CAR-FRIENDLY, QUIETER LIFE, AS CLOSELY INTEGRATED WITH THE RURAL TOWNS, VILLAGES AND FARMLAND AROUND US AS WITH INNER LONDON ITSELF.

BUT NOW COUNCILS PROPOSE TO MASSIVELY INCREASE THE POPULATION AND POPULATION DENSITY IN THE OUTER BOROUGHS, TRANSPLANTING THE INNER-CITY, CAR-FREE, CYCLING, URBANISED, HIGH-DENSITY, BUSY LIFESTYLE OUT TO THE SUBURBAN, SEMI-RURAL FRINGE, DISMANTLING THE BENEFITS OF LIVING OUT HERE, WHERE IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE, AND WITHOUT THE BENEFITS OF BEING CLOSE TO THE CITY



BEING EXPECTED TO BECOME LONDON CYCLISTS BUT WE ARE SIMPLY TOO FAR AWAY FROM THE CITY CENTRE FOR ORDINARY PEOPLE TO REGULARLY CYCLE IN

GREATER LONDON IS NOT AMSTERDAM. IT IS FAR TOO BIG FOR MORE THAN THE INNER CORE TO BE A CYCLING CITY.

MOST OF THE URBAN MOBILITY SERVICES (BIKE/CAR/SCOOTER-SHARING ETC.) BARELY EVEN EXTEND TO OUTER BOROUGHS AS IT'S JUST TOO FAR



AS POPULATION DENSITY INCREASES, SO DOES CONGESTION, SO INCREASINGLY WE ARE ASKED AND EXPECTED TO LIVE **WITHOUT HAVING A CAR**, TO GIVE UP DRIVING AND TO LIVE AN URBAN LONDON LIFESTYLE, THEREBY **SEVERING OUR INTEGRATION WITH SURROUNDING RURAL AREAS**. WE HAVE BEEN OVERLAPPING COMMUNITIES FOR CENTURIES. SOME OF US HAVE FAMILIES AND JOBS AND FAVOURITE DAILY SPOTS IN SECLUDED PLACES OVER THE BORDER. **MAKING THIS A HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT TO OUR CARS PUNISHES THIS BOND WITH THE IMMEDIATELY ADJOINING RURAL COUNTIES.**

Are you expected to stay inside Greater London most of the time if you live in Outer London?



- WE DO NOT BENEFIT FROM THE **EXPRESS NON-STOP** TRAIN SERVICES THAT SATELLITE TOWNS DO.
- WE ARE TOO FAR OUT TO GO BY BUS TO ZONE 1.
- WHERE CAPACITY INCREASES ARE POSSIBLE, IT MAINLY JUST ENTAILS CRAMMING MORE PEOPLE IN STANDING ALL THE WAY FROM ZONE 5/6 INTO LONDON, A LONG JOURNEY
- WE RELY ON THE SLOW, STOPPING TRAINS AND TUBES, INCREASING THE POPULATION DENSITY OUT HERE (ESPECIALLY WITH COMMUTERS RATHER THAN LOCAL WORKERS) WILL MAKE THESE TRAINS EVEN BUSIER FOR LONG COMMUTES



IDENTITY CRISIS: AS WELL AS PROVIDING HOUSING, THESE HIGH-DENSITY DEVELOPMENTS ALSO PERMANENTLY CHANGE AN AREA'S IDENTITY, LIFESTYLE AND CHARACTER. The quiet, green, spacious suburban character is permanently lost and replaced with crowded, brash, fast-paced, inner-city life. No longer the transition from urban to rural, rather an extension of the inner city: **the drawbacks of the inner-city, losing the integration with the countryside, without the benefits of being close to the city centre.**

I think the plan is highly destructive to the fabric and character and quality of life of the borough.

Thank you for taking my feedback into account in the consultation.

Yours faithfully