
I am very concerned about the proposed means to meet the stipulated housing target in the Borough over the short, medium and long term.

The style of the consultation strikes me as one aimed to confound and deter residents from partaking. The volume of papers is not conducive to reading online. Having gone to the library to see the paper copy of the consultation I was shocked to see the quantity of documents involved. Whilst the format of the document may be suitable for presenting to Council/Central government it clearly is not user friendly and is likely to result in residents opening it and feeling overwhelmed and despondent. I can't help but feel that the intention was to prevent local engagement. This would certainly seem to be the case with respect to the low profile 'meetings' which took place in local libraries and were only notified (in the case of my local one) on the day before the event. Only 4 of these meetings were scheduled I believe and none in Enfield town centre. The planning staff attending were not well versed in the issues raised and I left the meeting not much wiser about the consultation than when I arrived.

The Plan does not appear to have taken into consideration the significant lifestyle changes which Covid has brought for Londoners. Working from home is likely to be a means which significant parts of the workforce will adopt going forward. This is likely to see people want to achieve more with their money, in terms of house buying, by moving out of the more expensive areas e.g. London. London housing may not be as in demand as previous estimates may suggest.

Covid has also brought about a new found appreciation of outdoor space and the need for all to be able to socialise distantly and take exercise in outdoor spaces. The enjoyment of walking and taking in our wider Green Belt area is something that is likely to remain important beyond the pandemic.

Prior to Covid, and not helped by the pandemic, we have seen the high street empty of businesses. There are so many properties which could be considered for conversion to residential use. This includes properties purchased by developers which remain undeveloped over many years. The old police station next to Sainsbury's (Green Lanes, Winchmore Hill) is one example of I am sure many. Southgate town centre has many existing, low-rise, former business buildings which have sat empty for years. Look to use these first before undertaking any new developments. This would be environmentally friendly in comparison to ravaging the Green Belt or building new homes from scratch.

Global warming has seen major changes in extreme weather and this year again we have experienced heavy rainfall. The proposed carving up of our Green Belt and large scale development will impact on this further as drainage of excess water will be impaired in and around those areas.

The Borough has so much history and buildings/areas of historical significance which will sit at odds with the proposal to have more high rise residential buildings. Enfield Town centre in particular risks being ruined and will cease to retain any reflection of the market town it was and I hope will continue to be.

The plans seem short-sighted in as much as the circular roadway around Enfield Town is now deemed to be a detriment and will be overhauled. Major work such as that, which causes so much disruption and traffic chaos to the town centre, should not need to be changed again. The scheme is looking to create a 'positive sense of arrival' in Enfield Town and I fail to see how that will be achieved with high rise dwellings. Edmonton Green is

an example of a centre with such high rises and I fail to see how any positive sense of arrival has been established there.

SP SS1: Spatial Strategy – Chapter 2

I disagree with the option (Medium Growth 1) selected by the Council. This gives up part of the Green Belt which will never be regained. The plan could still be found unsound and challenged by central Government. It fails to protect what residents value and what makes the Borough attractive both to residents and those outside of the Borough. The Green Belt is vital and needs protecting. This should be protected at all costs and fought for rather than being offered up immediately. What is done here cannot be undone.

My preferred option would be Medium Growth 2 which provides the same number of homes, considers itself future proof and releases no Green Belt. The Green Belt is protected. Crews Hill is an attraction for many and remains so all year round. Keen gardeners come from miles around to visit the area and this occurs all year round including at Christmas when the displays are an attraction with some centres specialising in having a Santa's grotto with reindeers. The area is an attraction even for those without green fingers as the centres all have other specialties, whether this be summer houses/sheds, furniture, reclamation etc. Forty Hall is an amazing asset to the Borough. We have a Farm Shop there which is recognised in the national press as being one of the best in the country. Forty Hall has the only London Vineyard. We have walks and farm land around Forty Hall and Trent Park which are the envy of other Boroughs. All of these things need to be protected, enhanced and promoted. Enfield could be London's larder. We have the ability to produce so much with the farm land currently at risk. Self-sufficiency is a strength and never more so than now when we have seen the impact of Brexit and the Covid pandemic on supplies and their delivery.

Readily giving up some of the Green Belt to build houses which are unlikely to be affordable and to instead create a 'national park city destination area' sounds irresponsible. We are a destination area already precisely because of the areas now placed at risk.

Proper management of the Meridian Water development should mean that the Boroughs quota of housing is well on its way to being met without risking any Green Belt. Perhaps the Council should concentrate resources on seeing this through efficiently rather than taking on other developments.

Policy SP PL 10 – pages 80 to 87

Giving up farm land which could be used as detailed above and which residents enjoy walking around would ruin that local area. Current residents enjoyment will be significantly impaired. I am against this for reasons detailed above.

Policy SP PL 9 – pages 77

Giving up Crews Hill, a major asset, will be devastating. I am against this for reasons detailed above.

SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre

Damaging the historic market aspect of the town with high rise residences and re-routing traffic to alter the current ringway will be damaging. The Enfield Council building is an eyesore. For the amount of service residents receive and again with homeworking being prevalent this building could be considered for residential use before any other is built.

SA32 – Sainsburys Green Lanes, SA 20 ASDA Southgate, SA22 M&S Southgate

These are major grocery stores which supply the Southgate and Winchmore Hill areas. I am very concerned to see that these will be given up/become mixed residential/commercial areas. Three major grocery stores disappearing or undergoing major works will significantly impact on the areas inhabitants. The nearest big supermarket will then be Morrisons in Palmers Green. Thanks to the LTN around Fox Lane, getting there to do a shop will involve sitting in grid locked traffic no doubt.

Of particular concern is the retention of the park area around Sainsburys Green Lanes. This enables this busy shop to reduce its impact on neighbours visually and aurally and is an attractive area around an unattractive car park.

I would have liked to respond more fully to the consultation but again reiterate that doing so is not easy. I hope, however, that my concerns and objections relating to the proposed Green Belt developments, Enfield Town proposals and the supermarkets detailed above will be taken into account.