
Enfield Draft Local Plan

I am writing to express my general opposition to the current Enfield Draft Local Plan. I can only see it as a distinctly 20th Century response to the need for low-cost housing that is very unlikely to bring about that which it claims to wish for.

It has a lot in common to proposals frequently made by commercial developers - promising much but delivering little in terms of housing that can be afforded by those that most need it. There's also "green-washing" such as "healthy and inclusive environment supported by access to green space and nature" (much of which would be lost in the process), and "sustainable transport connections" (that would require considerable new road development).

I appreciate the council feels under pressure both from social demands and funding cuts, but I believe it is deceiving itself if it thinks this plan will provide homes that are genuinely affordable for more than a very few, and that eating into the Green Belt is a price worth paying.

Do we not now need a plan that is fit for the 21st Century, with action that focuses on sustaining and fostering an ecologically balanced environment? With skill and imagination, existing brownfield sites could be developed to provide dwellings that are economic, both in terms of construction and everyday maintenance. This is essential if we are to help mitigate the increasing devastation being wrought by global warming, as well as providing residents with manageably low-cost homes. Will this spread of urbanization that Enfield Council is proposing, along with the loss of green space it brings, be viewed as friend or foe by future generations?

I am not connected in any way to Enfield Road Watch but include their objections below as I agree with their opposition to these specific proposals. I hope the council will reconsider.

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The 'Spatial strategy' ([section 2.4](#)) which identifies how growth will be distributed across the Borough over the plan period and gives rise to the strategies for housing, employment, town centres and countryside green belt;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green' 'sustainable urban extension' referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#));
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7,500 new homes right up to the M25. ([Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#));
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood ([SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364](#));

- <!--[endif]-->Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammey Marsh ([SA52 page 372](#));
- <!--[endif]-->11 hectares of new industrial and storage and distribution use at what is currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase ([SA54, page 374](#));
- <!--[endif]-->a big expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25, comprising of 42.5 hectares of land, for “professional sport, recreation and community sports/leisure uses” ([SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279](#));
- <!--[endif]-->Encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area ([see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#)). A [higher quality version of figure 7.4](#) is also available, showing proposed maximum building heights across the Borough.

