

To whom it may concern

I would like to raise an overall objection to Enfield Council's proposed draft local plan.

I strongly object to your plan to urbanise protected green belt. This goes against government advice as set out in the Green belt policy, which aims to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It also states the use of brownfield sites should be considered before proposing changes to Green Belts. Your current draft local plan does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and is in direct opposition to the housing secretary's position on the protection of green belt land. I also note during recent Mayor of London questions that he objected to your plan as he was “committed to preserving and enhancing the green belt” and would be surprised if the council continued with plans to de-designate parts of the protected area to allow homes to be built.

I don't understand your thinking and strongly urge you to reconsider your plan to ruin Enfield's landscape and ask you to explore all other options for housing.

I object to the following:

- 1. Chase Park (Vicarage Farm)** 3,000 new houses at a ‘deeply green’ ‘sustainable urban extension’ on Green Belt next to Trent Park along the A110 between Oakwood and Enfield town ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#))

We do not have the infrastructure to support so many new homes here and there is no mention in the local plan of how this might be achieved.

Getting school places, and medical care is already difficult in the area. The A110 is regularly logjammed with existing traffic volumes and both Enfield Chase and Oakwood station are oversubscribed with passenger numbers during rush hour.

Since the development at Trent Park, and the closure of the Snakes Lane carpark, the Trent Park car park at Cockfosters Road is oversubscribed on a daily basis. There has been a huge increase in the number of walkers parking in Trentwood Side and Grafton Road to enjoy this green and pleasant land – again adding to congestion on the A110.

I use this historic green space on a daily basis, for walking, for my mental health, and to enjoy the variety of wildlife. The Merryhills Way paths were popular before – and during lock-down became a life-saver for me, and many others in the borough –

demonstrated by how well-worn the footpaths now are. Your proposals would change this land forever. Your plans are contradictory in that you talk of improving the quality of green spaces - by building on them? I wholeheartedly support the objections raised by Dr John Langton, in that 'Enfield possesses an extremely rare and very valuable landscape asset. It would be a great pity to lose part of what is left of it to housing development.'

2. **New Cottages and Holly Hill Farm** ([SA54, page 374](#)) Why not consider brownfield sites for industrial usage, rather than protected Green Belt areas?
3. **Tall Buildings** ([see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#)). Enfield is a small market town, and the addition of tall buildings would alter the landscape and character and goes against the idea of conservation. Whilst I support regeneration, I believe it can be achieved with sympathetic aesthetics, which does not include tall buildings.
4. **Spurs Football Training Ground** expansion ([SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277-279](#)). Previously enjoyed by many, myself included. I do not support the loss of this green and open space.

I hope my objections and concerns will be given the consideration they deserve. I chose to live in the beautiful Borough of Enfield because it is '*en-field*', with a richness of open green spaces and natural habitats to be enjoyed, and respected. If these destructive plans go ahead the character of the surrounding area will be lost forever and I respectfully urge you to reconsider turning the area into '*en-build*'.