
I am responding to Enfield Council's draft local plan and wish to raise particular concerns about the Council's proposal to build new homes on protected land on the Green Belt in Enfield. I am responding specifically to:

Policy SP PL10, pp.80-87 and the proposal to build 3,000 new homes at Vicarage Farm. This band of countryside between Enfield and Trent Park is of historic and ecological importance, not only to the borough, but nationally too. This kind of open countryside within the boundary of the M25 is extremely rare and should not be built on but rather cherished and protected by you, its guardians. This area of the borough does not have the infrastructure needed to support the arrival of these new homes and the congestion and pollution created by the arrival of thousands of new cars into this area would be significant (it is not unthinkable that every one of these 3000 new households would have a car). Public transport infrastructure in this area is poor and driving by car would be a necessity for most residents. There are plenty of "grey sites" within the borough which are much better situated near transport hubs, shops and schools. I do not understand why this particular area of countryside, next to Trent Country Park, is deemed by the Council as suitable for house building. I am fully aware of the need for new homes, but this site seems to me to be wholly unsuitable for such a project. Not only does it make a mockery of the Council's claims to be interested in environmental issues, but it also shows little thought to the wider impact on the infrastructure of schools and medical facilities in this part of the borough. Commercial developments and warehouses would also bring large vehicles onto the roads around here, including The Ridgeway which are already heavily damaged by the load of the traffic they bear.

I would also ask the Council to give further scrutiny to the height of the developments proposed in the centre of Enfield Town (**paragraph 7.6.2, page 159**). Enfield Town is a predominantly low-rise urban area, with a few exceptions. Large towers in the centre would fundamentally destroy what is left of the historic market town centre. The Council seem to have given little regard to Enfield historic architectural importance, or are willing to overlook this. As with the Green Belt and historic Chase, we are at an important moment when we have the chance to preserve our area for future generations and protect what little of this precious environment we have remaining. We are now fully aware of the impact that our built environment and green spaces has on the mental health and wellbeing of citizens. I, therefore, urge Enfield Council to protect the unique and special countryside and historic character of the borough. This is a valuable landscape, but not only in monetary value. Once it is built on and turned into private dwellings or commercial property, only very few can enjoy it. Many of the proposals outlined in the plan will only benefit a few people at the cost of the access, enjoyment and benefits of thousands of residents.

I notice that these views are shared by important local and national societies and bodies, such as the Enfield Society and the London National Park City Foundation.

I must also say that the Council has not made it easy to understand the proposals or to respond to them. I have a PhD in the humanities so I am used to reading long and complex documents. However, the lack of summary, the frequent use of technical language without explanation for the layperson and the poor quality of the figures and maps make it a very

difficult read. In the interest of equity, access and transparency, I ask you to present such material in the next stage of the consultation in a format that allows the people that you serve and represent to engage in the process much more easily. It is a daunting prospect to be able to engage fully with a 413-page document which is only available online (therefore restricting access to those that have computers and decent wifi).