
I'd first like to say that I aimed to input all comments into the online survey form, as I presume it's much easier to process and collate, but at the end there was no warning it was about to be submitted and there had been no opportunity for general comments.

Therefore I'm sending this email in addition to my response there.

I believe there is a lot of great work in this plan and much of it will be very beneficial to Enfield.

My main concern is over the Chase Park development.

Starting at a high level, why do we need the 3000 homes it could provide? Following COVID, people no longer travel to work in the City as much or travel to work at all. The early evidence is they want to move further out of London for more space and affordability.

Why therefore do we need to plan to provide 25000 homes rather than the basic 17000 London plan over the next 10 years, and then re-evaluate?

We should only be committing to sacrifice green belt if absolutely necessary. I do not understand the keenness to over-deliver up front.

If Enfield does need 25000 homes, but can't build them, then why can't they be in other areas outside Greater London? The report says no willing partners, but that should be up to central government to sort out. An arbitrary target for one borough, no matter what, is ridiculous.

I'm not against new development and recognise the need, particularly for affordable housing.

I don't think the plan says enough about how to maintain and improve existing housing stock e.g. improving environmental performance of all the 1930s homes – or is that central government funded?

I think the Crew's Hill development makes a lot of sense due to its existing level of development, rail station, and location on the edge of the borough.

It's a strange quirk that it currently has so much development for garden centres despite being in the green belt.

Other existing hamlets further out could be expanded into communities e.g. Botany Bay. I believe this was mentioned in an earlier consultation.

I am also happy with that part of the Chase Park development SOUTH of Enfield Road, currently a private horse paddock. Campaigners have been against developing this field, but I believe it has no public benefit/use at present and it makes perfect sense to develop it.

But the NORTHERN (larger) Chase Park development on Vicarage Farm has numerous disadvantages:-

- Destroys open countryside area – to argue it's already developed on 3 sides doesn't

reflect its actual feel and expanse.

- Maintaining a green pathway through to Trent Park through the development is not the same as keeping the existing Merryhills Way & open space.
- Public Transport links – it is not a short walk to Oakwood or Enfield Chase stations as asserted! Commuters don't have time for that walk or to catch an additional bus.
- Local road overload – Enfield Road, Slades Hill, Ridgeway and Bincote Road are already overloaded at busy times
- Adding better cycle lanes, which would be nice, would only make road traffic worse if it made them narrower.
- Local facilities overload - No firm commitment to corresponding facilities for 3000 homes – schools and doctors are only “in line with evidence of need”
 - Where would new residents shop – the small Sainsbury at Highlands Village? Via car?
- Loss of green belt land
 - Rewilding of watercourses does not offset loss of large open grassland/farmland
 - 10% net gain in biodiversity target surely can't be achieved – and offsetting with a different location is not acceptable
 - The enforcement and auditing of this 10% target has been called into question at other recent developments nationwide (per BBC Countryfile report).
 - Effect on air quality and overheating – building here expands London and worsens the microclimate of the whole city in terms of overheating in future.

I'll be open that I live on Bincote Road, and value the open country currently at the end of the road. But my objection to Chase Park isn't just “NIMBYism”. It could be a nice place to live, but it brings only disadvantage for the existing local residents and infrastructure.

The report clearly says developments should benefit existing local infrastructure.

Particularly affected would be Bincote Road / Worlds End Lane which would be the only route for new residents to travel South/East to N Circular, Winchmore Hill etc. It's a narrow, residential road not designed as a through-route and already suffers badly with traffic congestion.

Regarding Vicarage farm I also find it very suspicious that a quick internet search reveals it's been owned by developers for years, and also hasn't been fully utilised for farming, perhaps deliberately. But signs were put up asserting private property to make sure nobody could be said to be benefitting from accessing it in 2020.

Why would developers have bought green belt land unless they had some assurance of its future development?

I don't suppose this will ever be answered!

Golf Courses

I strongly believe that suburban North London should look at the mandatory conversion of golf courses into either public accessible green spaces OR housing, shops etc. The amount of land given over to an activity only accessed by a few people is ridiculous. I realise most courses must be privately owned but nevertheless some sort of purchase / compensation scheme should be funded. Even one course would probably equate to Chase Park!

Station car parks

I'd also like to mention the ongoing conversion of tube station car parks to housing – this seems

ridiculous, I know many people that use these as a way to drive in and access the London public transport network e.g. at weekends. How can they do that in future?

Thank you for the opportunity to reply to the plan