
Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

I was born in Enfield and have remained living in Enfield my whole life. In fact I am third generation of Enfield residents. My grandfather started his business from Enfield and grew it to be across the whole of North London. We are Enfield people through and through. So I feel strongly and compassionately about responding to you regarding this important consultation.

I am formalising in writing my objection to the following Policies: SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11; Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10; Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364; Policy SA54, page 374; Policy SA52 page 372; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose the dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

Most of the sites you propose to redevelop are parts of the historic Enfield Chase. With Enfield being one of only two surviving examples of a chase left in England, this is something that should not be relinquished easily.

Enfield Chase has already played an important role in the development of Enfield but enough is enough.

What is left of Enfield Chase is rare and unique and loved by the people of Enfield and the surrounding area.

During the past 18 months many people who hadn't experienced the open Green Belt in Enfield prior to the pandemic took the opportunity to exercise and explore these wonderful spaces. It was essential not only for their physical health but equally for their mental wellbeing. It's ironic that at a time when we are so busy studying and researching climate change and the mistakes that homo sapiens (*Latin for 'the wise human'*, the irony does not escape me) have made, that it would be considered the right thing to do, to declassify more Green Belt space to build on.

In an age when we have many safeguarding policies in place to protect the vulnerable we should equally need to embrace the policies regarding the Green Belt areas to protect our environment.

Once Green Belt has been built on, there is no going back and we should and must retain this for future generations. In fact I will go further and suggest that it is our responsibility to make sure this doesn't happen as it will be detrimental to the very character of Enfield. We are purely guardians of the Green Belt and need to take this responsibility seriously.

While I recognise the housing needs and support housing development, I do strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes, for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall set a new higher housing target of 1,246 houses per year, however, when you analyse the numbers in the Enfield Council's Draft Local Plan it doesn't equate:

- City Hall target is based on 10 year plan, for example: 10 x 1,246 which totals 1,246 houses
 - City Hall target based on 18 year plan, for example: 18 x 1,246 total of 2,2428 houses

 - Enfield Council's proposal of 25,000 over 18 years, broken down over 10 years, totals 1388.89 houses per year
 - Enfield Council propose to deliver 25,000 new homes across the borough by 2039 over the next 18 years

 - Based on the Local Plan, Enfield Council is planning to provide 2,572 more homes than the required target set by City Hall
2. Enfield Council's circular said that by 2039 Enfield's population is expected to have grown by 50,000
- What is this based on, as there was no evidence to quantify this in the circular?
 - So if the need for 25,000 new homes is based on the assumed population increase, the average family size in the UK is 2.4, therefore there would only be a need to build 20,833 new homes which is 4,167 less than the 25,000 target
3. Planning permission has already been granted for a number of existing sites, for example: Travis Perkins in Winchmore Hill, Colosseum Retail Park and yet no work has started on these?
- Travis Perkins, Winchmore Hill: 18 residential units
 - Colosseum Retail Park: planning permission granted for 1,800 new homes, work to commence 2022
 - Cockfosters Station car park: application for 351 new residential dwellings
 - Cock Tavern, Palmers Green: 54 flats
 - Brimsdown Station: planning application for 148 residential units
 - Royal Chase Hotel: 64 planned residential units.
 - * Chase Farm Hospital development: planning permission for a three-form entry primary school and 500 residential units, 138 homes having been built up to November 2020. So taking 138 houses out of the remit still leaves 362

* As of November 2020, there is now a revised masterplan for the land at Chase Farm Hospital with a planning request for an additional secondary school

Total for the above planned sites = 2,797 and these are just the sites that I know about.

Note: do all of the numbers above come off the 25,000 that is marked as needed in the Enfield area?

4. The Campaign to Protect Rural England identified areas of brownfield sites that could accommodate at least 37,000 new homes and this is a conservative estimate. I suggest that this this would be a better route to take under the circumstances
- Look and examine more urban and brownfield sites based on the above information
5. Enfield Council's circular states: That they are committed to delivering 50% of new homes as genuinely affordable to rent or to buy
- The suggested development on Vicarage Farm and Crews Hill would not lend itself to affordable homes. None of these homes would be affordable. The planned site is in an expensive part of Enfield, adjacent to Trent Park with good links for commuters to London. These will not be cheap homes and will not be affordable because of the

surrounding area, the cost to buy or rent in this area will be out of reach for most.

6. Enfield Council's circular states: Improve biodiversity and invest in our natural green spaces...

- This contradicts what is planned for Whitewebbs Park, leasing acres of park which includes ancient woodland to Spurs Football Club.
- Biodiversity already exists in Whitewebbs Park so why destroy this
- 78 species of birds spotted just in 2020
- 8 species of bats have been identified, in particular around the lake and also on the copses of the golf course

7. The Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan

8. Even Syed Khan, the Mayor of London opposes plans to build on Green Belt areas unless there are exceptional circumstances to justify it

Traffic along the Ridgeway in both directions is already a problem. With the development of Chase Farm Hospital for residential purposes plus the school being built and then add in the new plan (November 2020) for a secondary school on the same site, the volume of traffic will be unimaginable.

The same applies for the end of Hadley Road out onto Stagg Hill, a continuous flow of traffic both ways along Stagg Hill.

Both of the above routes are main roads from the M25 Potters Bar roundabout and already has a strain put on them. Using more of the Green Belt, in that area will have an extreme knock on effect to an already extremely busy area and will only increase the traffic volume dramatically, slow the flow of the traffic down considerably and increase the pollution rates and impact on people's health.

I strongly believe that there are other alternatives available to meet the housing needs and that the Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved.

There are many places around Enfield, urban, brownfield sites, areas that are in dire need for regeneration. Surely that would be a much better alternative and more cost effective.

The people of Enfield's Green Belt is far too valuable to lose for all the many environmental, ecological, economic and public health reasons.