
I am a resident of Enfield and live on the Ridgeway. I have read the lengthy consultation documents and tried to study the map which to my not untrained eye (I am a geographer and work in the property sector for close to 30 years) was illegible. However, despite all this, I have been able to digest the elements of the local plan, and I respond to sections relating to it below.

Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87 of the draft local plan on a plan to build 3,000 houses on precious greenbelt land roughly between Oakwood station/Trent Park all the way to the east towards the Ridgeway and north to Hadley Road (Chase Park). **I am against building at this location.**

Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 of the draft local plan to build 3,000 houses on precious greenbelt land at Crews Hill, and to displace current businesses. **I am against building at this location.**

I am against building on the greenbelt, and in particular in these two locations. Enfield has the amazing asset of a green lung

I am adamant that we must protect the greenbelt and see building on it as the last and only option, not as the easy option. Once greenbelt land is built on it is likely to be lost for future generations and permanent damage done to the environment. Whilst any new housing will serve households that will have a home in those locations, it will do a disservice to the rest of the population, the environment and wildlife in general within and outside the Borough.

Building on the greenbelt will harm biodiversity further (it is already suffering generally). Building housing on the outskirts of London will promote more cars on the road as in reality most households will have one or two cars as primary form of transport, leading to more traffic and pollution, whilst noise and air pollution (including fine particulate matter) are due to be reduced and the council is likely to miss targets that will be set on this in the next few years. I doubt that more than a few of the new residents would work at Chase Farm NHS or the private hospitals located nearby.

Other options to house the population are possible, building new housing is not the only option, and is not the most environmentally-friendly option. All housing has embedded carbon in them, and demand new roads to be built. Pressure could be put on the national government instead to promote a wider re-use of redundant commercial assets in a responsible manner which would likely be less environmentally damaging. There could be a policy to ban combining houses and flats into a larger space (above a certain threshold). The government could offer a stamp duty free move or subsidy to people over the age of 50 if they were to downsize or move out, for example to designated areas where the population is stagnant. The government should stop policies that push up house prices such as help-to-buy (at least it would help affordability for households). Underused spaces such as parking garages / blocks of garages behind blocks of flats could be filled with gap homes as the initiative in Bristol aimed at providing truly affordable housing. The government could provide subsidies or make planning in favour of splitting large homes into flats where appropriate. Vacant homes are rarely returned to the market through

intervention of local government. Currently new build homes do not attract VAT, but refurbishments do have the option to recoup VAT, making refurbishments often commercially unviable. By allowing refurbishments to recoup VAT a more level playing field is achieved. Brownfield sites could be better used, or infill of existing schemes. The government could make living outside of London in areas less in demand more attractive, thus reducing pressure on London's boroughs.

In addition to the houses planned in the draft local plan other schemes are already taking shape, for example at the former Royal Chace hotel, and I have seen signs that other agricultural land is being prepared to be sold off for development, too. In reality the impact on the greenbelt is wider than the 6,000 currently showing in the draft local plan.

I am in favour of building residential towers, or reducing the very high number of golf courses in the borough and using a section of these for housing. Public access to golf courses would make these more democratic and a bigger asset to the wider community.