

---

I would like to make a few comments on the Enfield Draft Local Plan.

Strategic Policy SS1, paragraph 7

To suggest that Crews Hill will be regenerated and extended to a rural gateway settlement providing access to “rural countryside activities” is meaningless jargon, in my opinion. It is now part of countryside activities within the Green Belt with reasonable access to existing urban areas.

Para. 8 The proposal that Chase Park will provide “deeply green extension” to the urban area is equally unrealistic. However well it may be designed, it will appear as what it is intended to be, namely just another large extension to the existing urban area, actually involving the loss of deeply green space.

SP PL9 Crews Hill

The suggestion that development will respond to the “surrounding landscape character” is wishful thinking. “Including winter gardens and glasshouse space for every house” is unrealistic. The scheme will appear as low density high cost housing – just another section of suburbia.

SP PL10 Chase Park (page 86)

My criticism of Crews Hill proposals are similar here. The development will involve the loss of the Green Belt setting of existing well used footpaths. To expect a general lack of cars in this location is hardly realistic.

SP BG4 (page 121)

National Policy and The London Plan strongly support protection and permanent retention of the existing Green Belt. The Council Leader’s summary update letter says that “just 7%” of the Council’s Green belt would be lost. However, as at least one third of the borough is now Green Belt – quoted figures vary between 33% and 40% - this 7% loss would involve a very large area, which is particularly significant as most of it would be in two very large chunks in the heart of the existing GB. There’s not even the excuse of “just rounding off and filling in existing small sections”.

The proposed developments could not possibly be more inappropriate to the existing National Policy. I have seen nothing to convince me that very special circumstances exist to justify these proposed GB policies.

Tall buildings. Policy DE 6 (page 156)

The whole policy seems to encourage the erection of tall buildings at any site close to a railway station. In my opinion this is inappropriate. Enfield Borough is essentially a

suburban area characterised by generally low buildings. Whilst there may be circumstances where a very limited number of tall buildings can be justifiable, the suggestion that they may be acceptable in a large number of locations where no tall buildings now exist would totally alter the character of some areas, however well the building may be designed. The general need to increase densities in appropriate locations is recognised but the erection of tall buildings is not necessarily essential to achieve this aim, as is acknowledged elsewhere in the Draft Plan.

General comment. In my opinion the Draft Plan could be much improved by being written more concisely, in particular by the use of many fewer long-winded expressions or “jargon” that probably mean little to the average person. The Campaign for Plain English comes in to my mind in this case.