

---

I have a number of objections to the Draft Local Plan (DLP), as follows:

1. Strategic Policy SS1: The Spatial Strategy

I have lived in Enfield for 50 years and have never heard the expression 'Chase Park'. There is no such park, this is farmland and open countryside you are pretending is already designated as urban development.

You have not in this section given sufficient priority to the character of the borough, in particular its history and the value of its Green Belt. Specifically I object to parts 7, 8, 9, and 11 on 'Chase Park', Crews Hill, warehousing in the Green Belt east of Junction 24 of the M25 of the Ridgeway, and housing in the Green Belt at Hadley Wood.

You claim in 2.4.2 to be attempting to achieve a balance between growth and sustainability but it is clear that these proposals are fundamentally unbalanced and represent an inappropriate level of urbanisation that will destroy Enfield's character.

Your assessment of the options in table 2.2. is obviously biased and not evidence-based. Assertions like "Meets much of housing requirement" for the favoured option are not backed up and one of my objections to the DLP is that if delivered (which is a huge if), it will not actually meet Enfield's housing need, which itself is based on questionable projections.

In 3.2.9 you say "There will be a considerable increase in the number of tall buildings, which would be considered as anything above 15-storeys." I object to this definition of "tall". I'm sure most people around Enfield Town would consider the Civic Centre to be tall, at 10 storeys is it? A 14-storey building is tall, your definition here is out of touch (and seems independent of figure 7.3).

2. Strategic Policy PL8: Rural Enfield

In Part 2b you refer to a "new cultural gateway hub at Enfield Chase, including a new visitor centre and public art installations, in the form of sculpture, in a parkland setting." In 3.8.7 you refer to "a world-leading outdoor cultural and leisure destination". To me this shows that you have completely misunderstood why Enfield Chase is important. I live in Enfield Chase and value it highly but I am not arrogant enough to think that it has potential as a national or regional tourist attraction, and you seem to be using this argument to justify development and your proposals for visitor centres, rewilding and sculpture parks. Please explain why the Chase in its current form needs "rewilding"?

I object to your vision for Enfield Chase (page 70), which will sacrifice a prized local asset and focuses more on visitors from outside the borough rather than local people and existing users of the Chase.

3. Strategic Policy PL9: Crews Hill

I object to the removal of this area from the Green Belt. Development here will become urban sprawl and will cause serious traffic and other infrastructure issues.

4. Strategic Policy PL10: 'Chase Park'

I object to the description of 'Chase Park' as 'an area'. This has never been a defined single area before and is a fiction to justify your proposals. I object to your vision for Enfield Chase (page 82). Urbanisation will destroy the character of the area and your ludicrous claims for what will be achieved are pure fantasy. I object to the removal of this area from the Green Belt. Please explain how development of 'Chase Park'

facilitates “improved access to the countryside”.

#### 5. Policy DM DE6: Tall Buildings

There is little to argue with in 7.6.1 to 7.6.4 but the problem is this “explanation” does not directly refer to figures 7.3. and 7.4. These are both quite hard to read and have to be looked at alongside each other to try and decipher what is proposed where. Couldn't you have included a simple table? I have had these maps side by side on a large monitor and they do not quite match up so it is very difficult to make specific comments or objections based on these maps. I am not against tall buildings as a matter of principle but do object to tower blocks within the Enfield Town Conservation Area and Southgate Conservation Area, and other locations where it would adversely affect the character of the area.

#### 6. General

My main general objections to the DLP are:

- a. You have dramatically underplayed infrastructure required to support the proposed development
- b. It will not meet Enfield's housing need. Many of the new homes will be for outright sale or commercial rent, which will cause migration into the borough. Enfield has never achieved 50% affordable housing in sizeable developments, in fact this is true of nearly all local authorities
- c. In short the DLP is not wholly deliverable and piecemeal progress will destroy Enfield's character unnecessarily.
- d. The Council has not done enough to make this consultation accessible to lay people. The online survey is extremely difficult to use meaningfully. On the Council's website, there is a complete absence of any help with how to navigate the extensive evidence base, and to explain the relationship between the evidence and the proposals in lay terms. This evidence base runs to thousands of pages. To find it, one must navigate the pages on the Council's own website, there is no signposting or link from Let's Talk. The nearest thing to any explanation or guidance is the Housing Topic paper, which runs to 68 pages, and is clearly written by professionals for professionals. However this Topic Paper is merely listed along with all the other documents, there is no signposting. The limited number of drop in events are not taking place in the neighbourhoods most affected by the proposals. The summary leaflet on the “Let's Talk” website does not even mention the evidence base, nor does it mention proposed development in the Green Belt. And as I have already mentioned, the key maps are too difficult to read, in fact the Draft Policies map is illegible. It is clear from local social media that people have found the consultation process painful and have been discouraged. It has taken me several days to read and digest the documentation and prepare this response – it is unreasonable to expect lay people to find the time to respond in an informed and detailed way.