

To Enfield Council

Draft Local Plan

In general terms, I am writing to object to the following Policies: SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11; Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10; Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364; Policy SA54, page 374; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose to take Green Belt land and use it for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough.

Firstly, I have a general comment on the way the plan is written. It uses terms that may be relevant to planners and architects but are incomprehensible to the general public. While there is a glossary, it is inadequate in that it omits many of the terms used. I have e-mailed the enquiry point for the Draft Plan to seek clarification but have received no reply nor even an acknowledgement. As examples, “placemaking”, “biophilic”, “SPD”, “sustainable connections”, “green and blue infrastructure works”. In addition, some of the figures in the plan (eg Fig 3.10 Concept Plan) have no key and are therefore rather meaningless. The plan appears therefore to make it as difficult as possible for the public to frame comments.

On the specific part of the plan that interests me (Policy SP PL9 pages 77 – 80, Crews Hill) I object to the plan to build houses on the Green Belt here. While undoubtedly there are parts of the local Green Belt that are poor quality and could be used for very small housing developments the large swathe of green belt that is proposed to be used for housing around Crews Hill cannot be justified. Once part of the Green Belt is given over to large scale housing development, it opens the door to incremental further development and thus the complete loss of this amenity. The style of housing envisaged in paragraphs 5 to 7 on page 77 will be out of the price range of most Enfield residents and run counter to paragraph 2.1.13 in that they are not the types of housing the Borough needs to alleviate the shortage since they will not improve the ability of people who grew up in the Borough to stay and raise a family here. This will not deliver “Enfield Homes for Enfield People”.

The plan is weak on how the proposed Crews Hill housing development would be serviced with infrastructure. Walking and cycling will not be the natural choice for journeys from Crews Hill with existing roads and footpaths that are unsafe for cycling and do not link well to the “employment floorspace” proposed for town centres and existing employment areas. Public transport based on the compact buses now used on Route 456 would not be adequate and local roads are not suitable for larger buses. Where would the schools, surgeries, and food shops be? Can utilities such as water, sewerage and electricity cope without extensive enhancement and therefore disruption to surrounding localities? Since

the indication of the plan (if I read Fig 3.10 right, see above) is for transport connections to be East-West rather than towards the centre of Enfield, improvements in local roads would be vital, even to allow construction on this scale to begin in the first place. This is hinted at in the need for improved corridors to the West, but under or overbridging a railway is very expensive and requires even more land to be taken from the Green Belt.

I have also noted that references to London National Park City have been disowned by the parent organisation but that the Draft Plan has not removed them despite a request from that body – a further example of how the plan is misleading.