

I wish to object to the Local Plan and have highlighted the sections below

- [section 2.4\) \(Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11\)](#));
- [Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10\)](#));([SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364](#));
- ([SA52 page 372](#)) ([SA54, page 374](#));

LEGACY: The green belt is sacrosanct and we are failing future generations if we are to build on it. It currently enjoys protected status and is there for a reason. Once we encroach on it, it's gone forever, and, under the current proposals, it could eventually disappear altogether, as further assaults will undoubtedly be made on it in the future, as the pressure on the land increases.

BUILDING HOMES/DIVERSITY. These should go ahead in areas where there is current infrastructure, and the proposals fail to take into account the unique characteristics which differentiate between metropolitan and rural Enfield. Urban sprawl is a real danger.

SOCIAL HOUSING/AFFORDABILITY: I fail to see how much provision is made for low income families and those in first jobs. Would they be able to afford the costs of such homes? Probably not as they are likely to be prohibitive. I would submit that my son or daughter, both whom are either studying/in the first job, would be unlikely to afford to live in the areas designated for development. I can only judge by the prices of properties in leafy areas such as Trent Park development.

INFRASTRUCTURE: To support up to 7,500 homes in Crews Hill is a massive undertaking. Where is the money for things such as doctors' surgeries, schools likely to come from, and at a time when the government is likely to be increasingly cash-strapped in the post pandemic era? Will we be at the mercy of the private sector?

TRANSPORT: Many of the narrow, single carriageways in Enfield are former farm/cart tracks and are already heaving under the strain of heavy traffic. The main road arteries linking Crews Hill to Enfield and surrounding areas aren't immune from this. There is likely to be considerable congestion and increased pollution from increased car volume, and, in the worst case scenario, there is a potential for gridlock, and particularly where traffic merges from three different directions (traffic heading to and from Enfield Town plus traffic coming from Carterhatch Lane). It's my firm belief that the emergency services will also be impeded in their duties by slowing traffic. The fact that car journey times have gone up in the borough also supports this - due also to a combination of road closures (LTNs) and the introduction of the cycle lanes. It's a perfect storm.

CRIME: The police budget in Enfield is seriously underfunded and we can agree that LBE has to cater for an expanding population. However, the police are clearly over-stretched which has been compounded by the closures of certain police stations such as Winchmore Hill and Southgate. I have yet to remain convince that the crime clear up rates of the police are all they should be, and these flawed proposals would expand the borough but without addressing the necessary crime response times. Again, it's a perfect storm: an over-stretched borough and an over-stretched police force.

LEGALITY: The current plans are likely to be legally challenged, which could mean crippling legal fees for the council. The Mayor of London has been lukewarm to the proposals and he has set out his stall in the London Plan. It could develop into a cause celebre, which would see sections of the community, and pressure groups from outside the borough, unite in a common cause. The Enfield 'example' could be derided as a way not to do things, and give LBE a bad name both nationally and internationally.

I rest my case.