
I would like to object to elements of the draft local plan as detailed below:

1. **General.** It is unreasonable to expect members of the public not familiar with planning to be able to fully comprehend all the implications of a plan that is 400 pages long and full of technical jargon. This is very poor communication and creates the impression of a council trying to hide something. The points raised below represent only a few of my objections but there has been little time to review such a large document. In addition the on-line survey is very long and complicated which does not encourage responses.
2. **Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11.** There is a complete disregard for the London Plan and the Green Belt in general, with the proposal that 3,000 new houses be built 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. It is the Green Belt that has stopped London becoming a sprawl in the same way as Los Angeles. It is also one of the few benefits of living in Enfield as well as being the lungs of the city.
3. **(SA54, page 374).** More destruction of the Green Belt by having 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. Other brownfield sites should be explored more fully first.
4. **Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10.** When Whitewebbs Golf Course was leased to Spurs an alternative cited for residents use was Crews Hill Golf Course. Now you are trying to build on this. Golf gets people out, keeps them healthy both physically and mentally. The land also helps maintain the countryside for wildlife and nature. Why destroy this by building 3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion.
5. **Pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321.** I object to the encouragement for tall buildings, especially in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area. I have already lived through an era of tower blocks for people to live in. A lot have now been pulled down because they didn't work and these new proposals will destroy the feel and character of Enfield while not providing decent accommodation for residents.
6. **SA32 Sainsburys Green Lanes.** This will create a loss of a major supermarket in the area, forcing people to have to drive further. This would

affect elderly and disabled residents in particular and increase car usage. It will not only be the elderly and disabled affected as heavy shopping is common to all shoppers. In addition, further housing, without other facilities, creates major problems for local services e.g. schools and GPs. This development will lead to the destruction of habitat and woodlands – the site is home to at least three different species of woodpecker, as well as trees with protection orders. The green space is particularly important for residents who live in the surrounding flats and do not have gardens