

---

Individual response to consultation:

At first read there are many aspects of the draft plan which are eminently reasonable and are to be applauded there are however a number of major contradictions and inaccuracies in the council's draft plan.

The proposals to develop significant areas of green belt are justified by reference to governments targets and requirements which are incorrect. In any event the performance of the council in failing to meet previous planning commitments gives no confidence that they will be able to meet their own stated objectives.

There are numerous references to the London National Park City initiative which have been taken entirely out of context and have caused the Foundation to write a letter of correction to the council. These inaccuracies in the draft plan are inexcusable and amounts to a serious misrepresentation of the true position.

The contradictions in the councils positions are demonstrated by the references to the proposed developments of green belt land in Crews Hill, the lease of Whitewebbs golf course to Tottenham Hotspur FC (THFC) which are in contrast to the statements around rewilding and planting woodland to restore chase forest.

Some development on green belt land may be acceptable where it is already in residential, commercial or light industrial use but I am opposed to the scale of proposed development on undeveloped land. Green belt land and the public use of it should be protected and enhanced.

Specific:

SP SS1

Crews Hill - the proximity to the M25 and impact of noise and air pollution in the area of the proposed development is glossed over. There are limited routes through the area at present which carry a heavy volume of traffic; the station is a minor one at which many trains do not stop; This part of their borough is not well connected and the job opportunities are very modest the councils stated ambition of making this a sustainable settlement supporting food production and locally employed residents is pie in the sky. The area seems particularly ill suited to significant development.

Vicarage farm - another area with limited infrastructure potential, the traffic on the Enfield road is already very heavy, a substantial development will undoubtedly create much more local traffic and increase demand on already busy trains and tube services. This is undeveloped farm land which forms the boundary between Enfield and Oakwood and signals the beginning of the green belt, I am opposed to these proposals.

The focus should not be on building on the green belt but on the redevelopment of brownfield sites. In particular the redevelopment of town centres and former retail areas should be the priority not building on the green belt.

SA 62 / SP CL 4

An area of sporting excellence is identified adjacent to the existing THFC training ground, there is little detail but it seems to be centred around the club's interests. They already have an agreement in principle to develop part of Whitewebbs golf course (which is described in the plan as a local amenity, although it is now shut) The council seems in the thrall of THFC, there are other sports than football and THFC have a history of taking on recreational land and selling on for development (both the former training sites in Chigwell and Cheshunt were developed). What benefit is there for the local population in these plans?

SP PL 1

3.1 Enfield Town

There is much to commend in the concept for the town although I have significant concerns and doubts over the heights of proposed developments. The revised plans limit new development to 17 storeys at Enfield town, 13 at palace gardens and 11 at Enfield chase all of which are far in excess of any neighbouring buildings, development on this scale will completely dominate the skyline and literally cast a shadow over the town. The existing scale, style and architecture of the town centre needs to be reflected in development plans.

3.5 Meridan water - the much vaunted development here has been extremely slow to progress yet the council is the largest landowner and has the ability to drive the development but has been unable or unwilling to do so and now seems to prefer giving developers the easy and profitable route of developing green belt land instead. The focus should be on maximising the use of existing development sites.

#### SP BG 1

The blue green proposals sound great in theory, but the National park city concept is taken out of context and the proposals are contradictory to the plans to develop near by green belt land.

#### DM BG 9

Allotments are protected from development due to food production - yet hundreds of acres of farmland are to be developed at Vicarage farm. This does not appear to be logical, how much food is actually produced on allotments.

#### BG10

Whilst respecting the wishes of various faith groups the idea of using undeveloped green belt land in Crews Hill as additional burial space is unnecessary. Making more intensive use of space in existing sites and encouraging families to use crematorium is far preferable.