

---

Dear All,

There are so many aspects of this draft local plan threatening the future prosperity and quality of life in our borough that it is difficult to know where to start, but perhaps the most heinous proposals are those which would destroy large tracts of our precious Green Belt, specifically:

2.4 Policy SP PL10 pages 80-87 and Figure 3.11 proposing three thousand houses on beautiful green belt, agricultural land at Vicarage Farm ('Chase Park').

Policy SP PL9 pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10 proposing 3000 and thereafter potentially 7500 houses at Crews Hill on green belt land which currently hosts nurseries of regional importance.

SA 45 page 364 proposing 160 houses on green belt land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way in Hadley Wood

SA 62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 proposing additional and artificial pitches to extend the Tottenham Hotspur training ground at the expense of a public park and golf course.

SA 54 page 374 proposing industrial and office development on green belt land at Holly Hill Farm. (This proposal is not surprising since the Council have for some years now been turning a blind eye to the gross and obvious breaches of planning conditions for the processing of green waste there which is supposed to be only ancillary to the farm user. In fact, the user has already developed into a, no doubt, profitable business, run on an industrial scale. Countless HGVs rumble up and down The Ridgeway from the M25 to visit every day carrying, one suspects, more than just green waste, the location being conveniently out of sight from the public.)

All of these proposals would fatally scar our local environment, driving a dagger through the heart of the Metropolitan Green Belt, the lungs of London, a policy which has been honoured and cherished by all political parties since 1938 to prevent the continuing sprawl of the London conurbation. It appears our current left wing Labour Council do not value the opportunity for future generations to enjoy the expansive green and open spaces of Enfield's countryside, nor the loss of habitat for wildlife, the loss of agricultural production and local employment. Two farms gone, half of Whitewebbs Park gone, so too a public, pay as you go golf course – a relatively rare animal for golf to be enjoyed by the less well-off – an equestrian centre, to say nothing of the historic Enfield Chase, beloved by so many long standing Enfield residents. But perhaps this is all to be expected when Hass Yusuf, the Cllr for Chase Ward no less, is publicly quoted as saying, "there are parts of the green belt that are a disgrace." It appears these values and attitudes are shared by those Labour Cllrs still taking the party whip.

None of this is necessary. The level of new housing proposed in this draft plan need not have been adopted. It is not viable, and takes no account of the interests of the vast majority of the current residents these Cllrs represent. And even then, required new housing could and should be for more affordable homes – it's a pipe dream to think the developers who are salivating with

joy at these proposals will agree to build more than a token few on precious green belt land – and they could and should be built on brownfield sites and other previously used land possibilities, where there will be existing infrastructure to serve such new development, and which will regenerate deprived areas, not ransack the green belt. Even Labour’s own Mayor of London appears to agree with this.

Think of the practicalities in this respect, in particular the proposed massive development at Vicarage Farm. There is already serious traffic congestion at rush hours around the the Chase Farm Hospital site which will get far worse when the existing development there is finished, all the houses occupied – how many of them are affordable! – and the new schools are fully functional. Then, add into the mix three thousand new home a bit further down Hadley Road needing cars to commute, even travel into Enfield – no, hardly any will cycle to work, the supermarkets or school, even if it was safe to do so, to believe that is living in cloud cuckoo land – and you will end up with chaotic congestion on a dystopian scale! How can any one who has real concern and the interests of the current residents in mind conceivably propose this? The publicly quoted comment of Cllr Nesil Caliskan, Labour’s Council Leader, is instructive in this regard, “if it is ok for there to be density around Edmonton Green then it is ok for there to be density around other stations.” Why not work to improve conditions there rather than destroying the green belt in the north and west of the borough?

So, no, no, no, to all the above proposals and all others in this draft local plan that would help to ruin our green spaces in Enfield, even more precious now, as we deal with the pandemic.

And, finally, reference pages 156-60, Figure 7.3 and 7.4. and policy DE6 and SA2 page 321 which ‘encourages’ tall buildings in the Town Centre and conservation area. How can anybody with the long term interests of Enfield at heart seriously suggest this? Tall, high rise living is appalling, nobody should have to endure it – quite apart from the aesthetic aspects and the blot on the landscape this would inflict on our historic town. No doubt Cllr Caliskan’s quoted comments go some way to explain this awful proposal, but your efforts Cllr should be to improve Edmonton Green, not seek to reproduce it in Enfield Town. So, it’s a no, no, no to that to!

Roll on the next elections when the Cllrs responsible for these proposals must answer to the voters, unless they see sense at the eleven hour and present a sensible local plan.