

Have your say on the Draft Enfield Local plan

I write this submission as a resident of Oakwood, living across the road from Trent Country Park. I have lived in Oakwood for thirty years but I have lived elsewhere in Enfield prior to that (Palmer's Green and Enfield Willow Estate for fifteen years and five years respectively). I am also a governor in a school near Edmonton Green and have served there for more than ten years. I therefore feel entitled to have my say on the Enfield Local Plan (ELP).

I have read the ELP and supporting documentation and consider that the proposals are ill-considered, heavy on political rhetoric and sprinkled with environmentally and green sounding sentiment but with little substance. There are many inconsistencies and contradictions in the ELP.

I think everyone would accept that housing has always been and will continue to be an issue for Enfield and London and what is required is a consensus approach to tackling this problem for the benefit of current and future Enfield residents.

The main thrust of the ELP is the removal of Green Belt land in Enfield. There are very few residents in favour of this environmental vandalism. If agreed, this proposal will change the character of Enfield for ever. What will be installed is a manufactured landscape of concrete, glass and some green areas and a combination of expensive properties for wealthy clients and poorer quality housing for the rental and social housing communities.

My comments below follow the sections in the ELP

I list out the points made in the Local Plan with my responses. I begin with a definition of the Green Belt land.

Purpose of Green Belt land. According to the National Planning Policy Framework

(NPPF), the Green Belt land serves five purposes:

- **to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas**
- **to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another**
- **to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment**
- **to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and**
- **to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling derelict and other urban land.**

By Gabrielle Garton Grimwood, Cassie Barton 30 November 2020. Green Belt land House of commons Library

Have your say on... Chapter 2

Page 33

“2.1.5 Approximately one third of Enfield is designated Green Belt land. The rural parts of Enfield accommodates a diverse range of activities, including farming, golf courses parks and woodland (including areas of Ancient Woodland). Notable attractions include Enfield Chase (a former royal hunting ground and deer park), Capel Manor and the registered gardens of Trent Park, Forty Hall and Myddelton House. Enfield also lies within close proximity to nationally or internationally important nature conservation sites, including the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Lee Valley (Special Protection Area) and Broxbourne Woods (National Nature Reserve).”

This paragraph 2.1.5 captures the essence of Enfield and this is what makes this part of London an attractive and desirable place to live and visit.

Comments on page 12 -33

“2.4.7 From Table 2.2 it can be seen that option 2 – the spatial strategy based on ‘Medium growth’ with Green Belt land released is identified as the preferred spatial strategy. “

The council proclaim they have green credentials - a Deeply Green place page 20 - section 11 and desire “To protect the Green Belt land and Metropolitan Open Land and local open spaces and encourage improvements to quality and accessibility to meet the needs of a growing population.”

The council propose destroying Green Belt land and at the same time want to protect Green Belt land. Given the dubious management of current Green Belt land and the rural landscape in Enfield, how can anyone believe their assurances?

“20. To draw on the valuable character and heritage of Enfield’s communities in managing growth.”

There are too many political slogans in this document and this one above is a prime example. **What does it mean?** What is the point of all these slogans? Who is the target audience? This report was produced I am sure at great cost to the tax payer and gives little insight into the council’s plans for Enfield in the future.

I have put in a Freedom of Information request to establish who produced this report and the cost, invariably, to the local tax payer. At the time of finalising this submission (8 September 2021) I have not yet received an answer from Enfield council.

Page 37

Have your say... 3.14 In relation to the proposed place making areas:
1. Have we included all appropriate placemaking areas in the urban area to accommodate growth?
2. Are there any proposed placemaking areas we have proposed that you believe should not be included?

Strategic Policy SP PL8: Rural Enfield – a leading destination in London’s National Park City

I am not sure what this means. What will happen to the land proposed to be turned over to a National Park City? How much will this cost the taxpayer? What benefit will be derived to Enfield residents?

Strategic Policy SP PL9: Crews Hill
Strategic Policy SP PL10: Chase Park

Both of these areas are on Green Belt land

Page 42

Have your say on Enfield Town... 3.1.14 In relation to the proposed Enfield Town placemaking area:
1. Does the vision for Enfield Town set out an appropriate vision for its future? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing?
2. Will the proposed Enfield Town placemaking policy help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?

The council has proposed constructing tall buildings in and around Enfield Town. This will destroy the character at the centre of Enfield. This type of development has been tried elsewhere in London and has proved unsuccessful in providing safe beneficial long term housing. The centre will eventually become a collection of soul

less buildings including towers of concrete and glass, traffic and pollution will increase and crime will rise. The council propose building up the local economy – these proposals will drive people away from Enfield Town. With the current decline in retail trade, these developments will accelerate this decline.

Page 46

Have your say on Southbury... 3.2.11 In relation to the proposed Southbury placemaking area:

1. Does the vision for Southbury set out an appropriate vision for the future of this place? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing?
2. Will the proposed placemaking policy for Southbury help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?

The council have proposed building tall buildings in and around Southbury and Ponders End. A few years ago, it was considered that large residential building blocks in cities and towns were undesirable dwellings leading to a lack of social amenities, closed communities and disaffected youth. We seem to be going backwards with these proposals

Page 51

Have your say on Edmonton Green... 3.3.12 In relation to the proposed Edmonton Green placemaking area:

1. Does the vision for Edmonton Green set out an appropriate vision for the future of this place? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing?
2. Will the proposed placemaking policy for Edmonton Green help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?

Making the area a more pleasant area to live and work in is to be welcomed. However, the proposals include phrases which are meaningless and do not convey concrete ideas. For example, what does the following phrase mean? Another political slogan

3.3.10 The Salmons Brook is a hidden asset that has great potential to contribute to the placemaking vision for the area and uncover part of the area's past through redevelopment, tying it back to the site's history and bringing a more heritage-led approach to the character of the district centre, whilst building in climate resilience in a public realm that creates a pleasant and distinctive environment.

What on earth does section 3.3.10 mean?

Have your say on Angel Edmonton... 3.4.10 In relation to the proposed Angel Edmonton placemaking area:
1. Does the vision for Angel Edmonton set out an appropriate vision for the future of this place? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing? 2. Will the proposed placemaking policy for Angel Edmonton help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?
3.4.6 Alongside this there is likely to be a significant uplift in proposed heights and densities. To maximise the opportunity for growth, well-designed taller buildings in the right locations will be accepted
3.4.7 Angel Edmonton currently experiences relatively high crime and anti-social behaviour, particularly on the council-owned estates.

The area has been neglected for years. Yes, a well designed and manageable environment will help build communities. Construction of tall buildings will not address the problem and is not the answer to long term bad housing.

Angel Edmonton is a main thoroughfare and provides an essential artery for the smooth flow of traffic around London, namely the North Circular Road. This essential facility should not be compromised because of political principles.

Have your say on Meridian Water... 3.5.13 In relation to the proposed Meridian Water placemaking area:
1. Does the vision for Meridian Water set out an appropriate vision for the future of this place? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing? 2. Will the proposed placemaking policy for Meridian Water help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?

The publicity blurb looks great and promises a great deal for Enfield residents. Apparently 10,000 homes will be constructed in this area. From supporting figures supplied in the ELP, the current average occupancy is 2.4 persons per household. That equates to potential provision of housing for 24,000 people. Therefore, why are the council proposing to tear up the Green Belt land elsewhere in Enfield?

13. contribute towards generating a mix of high-quality permanent jobs, jobs through meanwhile uses, and construction jobs. No less than 25% will be from local labour.

Economic forecasts are notoriously unreliable and projecting beyond five years into the future is a lottery. How can the assertion in this statement be relied upon to deliver the quoted figures?

As regards the environmental value of tall buildings (some call them skyscrapers) to people who have to live in them

“The main disadvantage of skyscrapers is how they can tend to take over a city. Rather than support ground-level interaction, they tend to isolate people with their omnipresence. Cities evolve when people interact, and skyscrapers do little to encourage that.”

THE PROS AND CONS OF SKYSCRAPERS

April 2, 2020

Page 65

Have your say on Southgate... 3.6.8 In relation to the proposed Southgate placemaking area: 1. Does the vision for Southgate set out an appropriate vision for the future of this place? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing? 2. Will the proposed placemaking policy for Southgate help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?
3.6.3 Whilst Southgate is a district centre with potential for increased densities and heights, this will need to be balanced against the need for proposals to sensitively consider the historic environment around the listed station building. The heritage value of the area defines the place quality and therefore all developments that come forward in the area must make a positive contribution to this to avoid detracting from the overall quality of place.

It is clear to me that the person or persons who authored this chapter have not visited Southgate for any length of time, or at all, or are writing about another town called Southgate. This district centre is a busy, active and important transport hub for Enfield. There are plenty of retail outlets in the high street, some active and others inactive and much residential building, some of which has taken place off Chase Road and the high street in recent years. ASDA the main supermarket for the area serves a large population and the car park provides much needed facilities not only for its shoppers but for other visitors making short term visits to Southgate. Taking the car park away and building further residential property is a mistake. Local medical provision is already stretched and an influx of more residents will add pressure to doctors' surgeries, schools and other welfare facilities.

Have your say on New Southgate... 3.7.6 In relation to the proposed New Southgate placemaking area:

1. Does the vision for New Southgate set out an appropriate vision for the future of this place? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing?
2. Will the proposed placemaking policy for New Southgate help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?
3. The New Southgate placemaking area contains a series of proposed site allocations. Are the site allocations proposed appropriate? If not, please set out why you do not consider them to be appropriate. Are there any further sites within the New Southgate placemaking area which have not been included, which are known to be available¹ for housing, employment, or a mix of uses – that you think should be included within the plan?

3.7.4 The area suffers from a lack of good community facilities and one of the key benefits from growth should be an improvement to the facilities for the benefit of existing residents as well as new residents.

New Southgate has been neglected for many years and had, until recently, the outward appearance of an industrial waste land. Much residential building has taken place – how much more can be built now? The North Circular Road dominates the landscape. It is a pity the council did not consider improving facilities for residents before allowing recent building projects so that an integrated plan could have been realised including recreational facilities.

Have your say on Rural Enfield...

1. Do you support the designation of Rural Enfield as a leading transformative destination within London National Park City?
2. Do you feel the policy covers the right area of the Borough? If not, what changes would you make?
3. Do you feel the policy could be improved?
4. Do the vision or policy miss any significant matters?

3.8.9 The National Park City designation has the potential to achieve a net increase of 25% green cover in Enfield, contributing to significant carbon sequestration, exceeding the Mayor of London's targets and achieving one of the highest net gain outcomes in the UK. In doing so, it will go a long way to mitigating the impacts of recreational pressure and air pollution on nature conservation sites of international importance, such as Epping Forest.

This paragraph sound like estate agent speak, gobbledygook. How can anyone allow the destruction of huge swathes of Green Belt land and then claim to increase green cover by 25%. The National Park City is a concept which has yet to take off and the

council has not adequately explained, in the context of Enfield, what it is, who runs it and who funds it. Little is known about it but it sounds good for promoting green credentials.

Page 80

Have your say on Crews Hill.... 3.9.9 In relation to the proposed Crews Hill placemaking area:

1. Does the vision for Crews Hill set out an appropriate vision for the future of this place? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing?
2. Will the proposed placemaking policy for Crews Hill help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?

This proposed development in the Crews Hill area is totally inappropriate. The area houses an established community in a semi-rural setting. The garden centres in the locality provide Crews Hill with its distinctive scenery together with the green vegetation in the surrounding area. The area is very popular with visitors who frequent the garden centres, cafes, eating places and recreation facilities. If there is any doubt about the area's popularity, try going there on any weekend, any time of year.

It is important for everyone to have a change of scenery from concrete, glass and tarmac and enjoy a natural and healthy environment. Crews Hill is a naturally green area, from an environmental view point. There is no need to add any more to the area but perhaps to consider managing the traffic flows and foot fall and better and provide more amenities and facilities for the many visitors and existing population.

17. Development proposals should facilitate a shift towards a net zero carbon future, with innovations in local horticulture, supply chain and support for household and community growing, facilitating people to produce or buy their food locally. New homes and facilities should be connected to the **Energetik heat network** (and any updating successor). The heat network can also enable the provision of affordable and sustainable heated growing space.

Enfield council appear to want to embark on another risky and expensive energy solution. What experience have they in managing the life cycle of such a project to eventual fruition? Recent headlines from another local council send a warning to Enfield taxpayers for now and the future. Again, another attempt to bolster the green and environmentally friendly credentials.

“Nottingham taxpayers to foot bill as council heating company faces problems Nottingham City Council plans to liquidate EnviroEnergy”

Source: Nottinghamshire Live News 31 August 2021

Have your say on Chase Park... 3.10.9 In relation to the proposed Chase Park placemaking area:

1. Does the vision for Chase Park set out an appropriate vision for the future of this place? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing?
2. Will the proposed placemaking policy for Chase Park help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?

This proposed development is wrong at all levels. I repeat the quote from the beginning of my submission.

1.1 Purpose of Green Belt land. According to the National Planning Policy Framework

(NPPF), the Green Belt land serves five purposes:

- **to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas**
- **to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another**
- **to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment**
- **to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and**
- **to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.**

Source: By Gabrielle Garton Grimwood, Cassie Barton 30 November 2020. Green Belt land , House of commons Library

The area from Enfield town, Enfield Chase, Chase Farm Hospital, Botany Bay and towards junction 24 of the M25 motorway provides that environmental buffer. The main thrust of the proposal from Enfield council is the wholesale destruction of the Green Belt land in the north of Enfield. This is tantamount to environmental vandalism.

What is environmental vandalism?

The **egregious or blatant destruction of delicate ecosystems**, especially in violation of environmental protection laws.

The proposal recommends a preferred option of building 25,000 new homes in Enfield. Existing planned building developments would accommodate the projected increase in population to the year 2039. But what is the projected increase in population that the council is working to? The council have suggested that one option would be to build 55,000 homes. Arguably if the council were to go to the trouble of digging up the Green Belt land, they would plan for far more than 55,000. This would lead to the wholesale destruction of Green Belt land with additional installations of new water supplies, waste services, gas, electricity, heating and new forms of energy generation and supply and installation of these facilities. Additional roads and walking pedestrian facilities would also be required. Not much greenery in evidence. However, for good measure, such services would be installed to cater for

far more than 55,000 homes not just in Chase Park but across the whole of Enfield. This would allow for future expansion beyond the 55,000 new homes.

The borough would become a semi permanent building and industrial landscape for years to come. Green Belt land and a pleasant environment enjoyed by millions (anecdotal evidence suggests more than 1,000,000 people a year enjoy the environment in Trent Country Park alone) would vanish. Future generations would look in awe at photos and pictures of Enfield past and the rich greenery which was swept aside and ask of our generation **“Why did you let this happen?”**

So, are we playing a numbers game? The proposal does not make mention of forecast populations. Yes there are some projections in the attached annexes. However, if we look at the ONS population forecast for Enfield this shows:

2021 - 336,242 (close to the current population)
2038 - 342,755 projection

Source:<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationprojections/datasets/localauthoritiesinenglandz1>

Working on the assumption that the average home occupancy is 2.4 per person per home with an increase population of 6,513 that would average an increase in housing of 15,613. Where is the extra demand for housing coming from?

Of course, making projections for more than five years into the future is fraught with difficulty. A few years back with a burgeoning population and additional young persons to be educated, many school places were expanded. **Unfortunately, that position reversed due to Brexit and other factors and there are now many schools that have excess school places which may not be filled for years to come.**

Chapter 4

Page 106

Have your say on chapter 4... SE1: Responding to the climate emergency
4.1.1 Are there any other measures that should be included in the Local Plan to help tackle the climate emergency? SE2: Sustainable design and construction
4.2.1 Is this the right way to support sustainable design and construction? Have we addressed the necessary key considerations? SE3: Whole-life carbon and circular economy
4.3.1 Is this the right way to reduce embodied emissions and help to embed circular economy principles in new development? Question SE4: Reducing energy demand
4.4.1 Is this the right approach to reducing space heating demand and in-use energy consumption? Questions SE5: Greenhouse gas emissions and low carbon development
4.5.1 Is % over Part L the right measure for reducing greenhouse gas emissions?

4.5.2 Is this the right approach to incentivise on-site renewables?
Question SE6: Renewable energy development
4.6.1 Is this the right approach to properly managing the potential impacts of renewable energy development? Question SE7: Climate change adaptation and managing heat risk
4.7.1 Does this policy set out a robust framework for managing heat risk?

Who is this section written for? There are so many references to technical processes and technical data. But who is this intended for? I think the ordinary person on the 121 bus would not be able to comprehend all this information and make an informed opinion on the council's true intentions.

For example

4.3.1 Up to a fifth of carbon emissions associated with UK building stock comes from embodied emissions associated with new builds...
3. Developments that demonstrate meeting **Passivhaus** equivalent certification, or subsequent replacement systems, will have demonstrated compliance with this policy.
Page 100 – managing flood risk
“4.8.1 The number of properties at risk of flooding is high compared to most other local authorities, due to the large network of watercourses in Enfield, which form a key part of its landscape.”
Page 103
1. A **Sustainable Drainage Strategy** will be required for all developments to demonstrate how the proposed measures manage surface water as close to its source as possible and follow the drainage hierarchy in the London Plan. All developments must maximise the use of and, where possible, **retrofit Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)** which meet the following requirements:

This all sounds environmentally friendly, credible and necessary. It also sounds very expensive. But is this really needed, how much will it cost and where are the true technical details to justify the benefits claimed?

Chapter 5 Addressing equality and improving health and wellbeing

Have your say on chapter 5...

1. How best can the ELP provide for our future community needs to secure a sustained high quality of life and well-being having regard to future growth?
2. Are there any specific issues regarding educational provision that you consider need to be addressed with respect to new development?
3. How do you consider that health issues should be addressed in the Local Plan? How can new development encourage healthy lifestyles?
4. Do you have any other issues/comments?

The council have a duty of care, if not legal obligations to look after **ALL citizens** in the borough of Enfield. This proposal has undoubtedly caused stress and confusion amongst many people in Enfield not least for the way the proposals have made its way into the public domain and the turgid text in the 413 page document. There are many inconsistencies and contradictions throughout the document.

Chapter 6 Blue and green Enfield

Page 113

6.1.1 As an outer London Borough, Enfield boasts some of the finest parks, gardens, woodlands and open spaces in Britain, attracting millions of visitors every year. This includes:

- over 1,000 acres of open space (the second largest expanse in London);
- over 300 hectares of woodland and scrubland;
- 20,000 plus street trees;
- reservoirs and six freshwater lakes;
- Green Belt land and Metropolitan Open Land (which covers over 40% of the total land area);
- 41 sites of nature conservation importance; and
- 100 km of watercourses - the greatest length of any London Borough.

The statement above could be an advertisement extolling the positive elements of Enfield as it currently is. Why put all this at risk for the sake of political expediency and what appears to be local councillors wanting to make a name for themselves?

Chapter 7 Design and character Introduction

7.2 One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is to secure high-quality development and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Design is not just about how a development looks, but is also about how well it works and meets the needs of users. It plays an essential role in the functioning of places. Well-designed buildings, places and spaces help to create attractive environments that set a positive context for the development of successful places and sustainable healthy communities.

7.6.4 Tall buildings are not the only solution to delivering high quantities of housing. In Enfield, tall buildings should form part of a comprehensive approach to development, such as an area-wide masterplan or site allocation.

1. Rear extensions a. Proposed extensions will only be permitted where: i. there is no impact on the amenities of the original building and its neighbouring properties; ii. adequate amenity space and the maintenance of satisfactory access to existing garages or garage/parking space is retained; and iii. there is no adverse visual impact

2. Side extensions a. Extensions to the side of existing residential properties will only be permitted where

So, not content with removing swathes of Green Belt land, the council is suggesting changes in the architectural heritage of the existing housing stock throughout Enfield. This housing stock would have been built up and developed over many years and although there has been minimal council intervention, housing communities have built up organically. Some properties have covenants and building restrictions placed on the properties to maintain the character of the individual streets and centres. There are many examples where properties and housing communities have not been well thought out or planned and developments have been allowed to go ahead for the sake of meeting political expediency and updating political tick lists.

Chapter 8 Homes for all

8.3 The Council has determined that to meet the level of need for housing in the Borough, there will need to be a limited amount and plan-led development and redevelopment on land currently designated as Green Belt land.

Housing delivery and targets

8.1.12 National policy requires local authorities are able to demonstrate a rolling five-year housing land supply from the date of adoption of the plan. This must take account of both the deficit accrued until that point and a 20 per cent buffer moved forward from later in the plan period

Clearly there is a need for additional housing but where is the excess demand coming from?. Section 8.1.12 states there is a requirement for a legal five year rolling programme. What the ELP proposes is a twenty year plan. Where is the demand for such an approach? Yes, look ahead to the future but work with the local communities and look for consensus on what the local population think can work.

8.2.12 The affordable housing mix should also reflect the need to provide larger family homes and smaller affordable units. Large groupings of the same tenure type should be avoided, wherever possible. Affordable housing should also be tenure-blind and well-integrated into the design and layout of the proposed development (including market-led housing) and the wider public realm, with access to communal spaces (e.g. open space) and management facilities.

It would be useful to see what data the council are viewing when they decide on these policy statements. There are suggestions that tall buildings, skyscrapers, are built on car park spaces at Arnos Grove, Southgate, Oakwood and Cockfosters tube stations. Who exactly are these proposed tall buildings supposed to house? Where is the demand for such housing? What are the consequences, in this case, for displacing people visiting Enfield and London and wish to park their vehicles in these station car parks? Have any impact assessments been carried out to check on the consequences of such irreversible decisions?

Chapter 9 Economy Introduction

9.2 The Borough needs to plan for more jobs to meet the needs of our growing population. This plan sets out a strategy to make the most of the potential of urban sites – including through mixed uses and intensification – before exploring the selective development of Green Belt land sites. The ELP’s evidence suggests strongly that we need to provide for more – not less – employment floorspace.

The local economy needs to grow organically with minimal intervention from the council. **If the council want to make an impact, look again at local business rates and incentives to assist genuine business initiatives.**

Chapter 10 Town Centres

Town centres and high streets Introduction 10.2 Town centres offer an accessible focal point of commercial premises, shops, community, leisure and recreation facilities for the surrounding communities. Attractive (sic) town centres can contribute to the image and character of an area and help to attract business and investment

Again, local town centres need to grow organically and the local council should not place unnecessary impediments in the way.

Chapter 11 Rural Enfield

11.1 The ELP supports the delivery of more homes that meets local needs and supplying a housing mix that adds diversity and affordability to the housing stock. The ELP also supports greater diversity in the rural parts of Enfield recognising that greater sustainability and resilience is achieved through encouraging a broader base of activities than has traditionally been accessible in rural areas

I could repeat the definition of the Green Belt land above but I would refer you to the previous entry.

Chapter 12 Culture, leisure and recreation

12.1 Enfield has a wealth of historic and culturally significant buildings, a thriving artistic community and a diverse range of leisure opportunities, green spaces, parks and watercourse, making it an attractive (sic) location for visitors. Creativity has the power to drive positive economic and social change in the borough and is intrinsic to our local identity

No comment other than let communities grow organically.

Chapter 13 Movement and connectivity

13.2 Enfield is committed to meeting the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy objectives to deliver a transport network that improves the health and wellbeing of all Londoners and to achieve an 80% mode share for active and sustainable travel by 2041. To achieve this target, a significant shift towards walking, cycling and public transport use is needed over the next 20 years. Development will be expected to contribute to these aims by enhancing local active and public transport networks, and minimising need to travel through good design and location.

Chapter 14 Environmental protection

Introduction 14.1 Most of the Borough has high environmental quality which needs protecting, and some areas that would benefit from improvements. Therefore, protection of the environment through maintaining or enhancing air quality, minimising or reducing nuisance which affects human senses (such as noise and odour), can protect health and safeguard residential amenity.

I do not think that restrictions on car parking, excessive use of cycle lanes and controlled parking zones help local communities, retailers who need to receive commodities and parents and carers who need to transport their children to and from school.

In Enfield we have one main cycle lane installed along Green Lanes which was constructed at great cost, is hardly used and was built despite over 80% of the local population stating they did not approve of its construction or use. We need less restrictions, not more. Also, **use of polluting vehicles should be curbed starting with red buses and taxis.** In Edmonton's Hertford Road, road narrowing has meant that traffic is delayed for greater periods of time especially when buses stop to pick up and drop of passengers. This is of major concern when those bus stops are located nearby and close to school playgrounds.

Chapter 15 Delivering and monitoring

One would expect council officers to carry out all policies and proposed plans with professionalism and a careful scrutiny of budgets. Major building projects have a notorious habit of eventually costing more than originally planned.