

---

I object to the following aspects of the draft Local Plan.

1) Strategic Policy SP PL10\*. P 84. The large development on Green Belt land, using areas of farmland on which to build vast quantities of housing contradicts P72 which states the Policy will protect and enhance the Green Belt. I do not want Enfield Council to build on the Green Belt. The Green Belt makes Enfield Borough the lovely place it is to live and work in. Also this policy contravenes the London Plan, as drawn up by County Hall under the London Mayor, Sadiq Kahn who has stated that he objects strongly to any London Boroughs within the GLA building on the Green Belt, which are the lungs of London and are a major factor in alleviating air pollution.

2) Draft Policy DM BG10 - Proposal to build a crematorium on Firs Farm Wetlands. This should be removed from the Draft Local Plan. I object to this proposal as:

a) Enfield already has 2 Crematoria in close proximity, on the Great Cambridge Road and at New Southgate. Both cater for diverse needs of the community and there is no need for further crematoria to be built in Enfield either on Firs Farm or on the recreation ground adjacent to Latymer school in Edmonton. Edmonton Cemetery has also been extended to accommodate more burials.

b) Firs Farm open space is a resource essential for the health and well being of the community. Enfield's assertion that it wants to promote the health of local people by tackling obesity through exercise is challenged by the fact that it wants to build on land used by local people who actively use that land for that purpose. Draft Policy DMBG10 also contradicts Strategic Policy SP CL4 which highlights Firs Farm as contributing towards developing sport and leisure facilities in Enfield.

c) Enfield Council supported the Friends of Firs Farm Wetlands in their successful application for funding from Sports England for new changing rooms and the enhancement of the sporting facilities available on the exact site that the Local Plan proposes to build the Crematorium, and Enfield Council knew that Firs Farm had been awarded this grant, yet it still proposed the building of a crematorium on the site. An embarrassment for Enfield Council, which makes it look uncoordinated and unprofessional.

d) The proposal will reduce the biodiversity and nature conservation aspect of Firs Farm Wetlands, which is a local Site of Interest for nature Conservation, contrary to several other policies in the plan.

e) Enfield Council has spent more than £1 million on the flood alleviation scheme at the Wetlands and this proposal will affect the effectiveness of this scheme.

f) Having a Crematorium in Firs Lane will increase traffic and as there are traffic calming measures already in place in this road there will be an adverse effect on local roads. This has not been assessed or considered when making this proposal.

g) The policy will endanger funding for projects secured by local community groups e.g grants from Thames Water, which have already been endorsed and supported by Enfield Council.

3) Policy DM DE13 P.175. Firstly, I object to the building of Tower Blocks. If any residential development is to be considered, priority should be given to family houses, with

gardens for children to play in. Children should not be raised in flats high in the air with little or no access to outside space. The lessons of Grenfell Tower and associated dangers of fire in tower blocks have not been learned nor the effects on mental health imposed by the restrictions a pandemic causes to those trapped in small flats.

The tower blocks proposed have no access to electric charging points. Despite Enfield's promotion of walking, cycling and using public transport, it ignores the fact that people have cars and will always want the convenience of having one. There is no parking provision for the flats proposed and further congestion will be the result of those residents driving around looking for a place to park within a reasonable distance to where they live. There are only two trains per hour from Enfield station, which is unsatisfactory for commuters who would likely take to car use to get to work.

4) Policy SPH1 Page 183. The Plan proposes to build 1800 homes annually. This is significantly more than that required in the London Plan (Table 4.1 Ten Year Targets P.163) which puts the target at 1,246 per annum. I object to Enfield being over developed and running contrary to the London Plan. There is no mention in the plan of developing vital infrastructure alongside the increase in homes the Plan, e.g additional Doctor's surgeries, Dentists, Fire Engine services, hospital places etc. In my view, Enfield should assess how many properties in Enfield are permanently empty and requisition those privately owned that have been empty for more than 3 years for social housing. I object to this proposal as Enfield's housing numbers plan should not exceed the London Plan's projections.

5) Policy SP H1 P 183 The plan proposes building on the major food retailers in the area. I object to this proposal. I presume the supermarkets will be demolished and flats built there. This is not clear. Just where does Enfield Council suggest we buy our food from if all the retailers are removed for housing? Even if it is possible to retain the supermarkets, it is likely that any space for food shopping parking will be minimised. This is detrimental to the increasing number of elderly and disabled residents in particular who rely on easy access parking to buy essential food. I object to these policies if it results in food retail parking space. Site SA1 (St Anne's School) should not be built on as, with the proposed increase in housing planned for the centre of Enfield, secondary schools need all the spaces they can get. Plus this is a Catholic school and religious groups' education requirements should be catered for and it has a playing field, which is something else being increasingly eroded by Enfield Council. Site SA37 Main Avenue. This development of flats originally replaced well-built Victorian Houses with gardens. This development is less than fifty years old. I presume, it was shoddily built (it certainly looked like it, when they were being built) to necessitate a further redevelopment of the site. My objection to this would be that if it was developed, there should be the same density of housing on a similar elevation to surrounding Victorian properties.

### The Consultation

This was very poorly conducted, I suspect with a view that if too many people knew about it, there would be a flood of objections. It was badly advertised with only a limited poster campaign. It was only by word of mouth that I found out about this consultation.

