

---

The proposed local plan shows a woeful disregard for the terrible impact it would have on Enfield's unique conservation areas and its much admired green belt land. It seems unaware of the Mayor of London's statement that the London Plan "aims to accommodate all of London's growth within its boundaries and without intruding on its green belt or other protected open spaces". Indeed, the Mayor has clearly stated that building on the green belt should only be considered in exceptional circumstances, when the land in question is derelict. However Enfield Council wants to build on many areas of high quality open countryside. The council should be actively considering other sites which would be much more suitable for development, such as Brimsdown and sites within Lee Valley such as Harbet Road.

### **Strategic Policy PL8 Rural Enfield**

This illustrates just how out of touch the council is with the history and culture of Enfield, of which they are but temporary custodians. Councillors come and go, but Enfield Chase has been a significant feature of our borough for hundreds of years. It is not at all clear how the beauty of Enfield Chase would benefit from a visitor centre or a sculpture park, and such additions would in no way compensate for the loss of green space which the council is contemplating. How many voters have contacted the council requesting these "attractions"? We should instead be protecting this valuable land by retaining it for use by local people to walk, cycle and ride. The pandemic has taught us just how important green space is for both physical and mental health. Climate change has taught us about the importance of increasing biodiversity instead of removing wildlife rich areas, and also how building over green fields will increase the risk of flooding. It is well known that disappearing habitats are helping to cause the loss of pollinator species, and according to an international panel of experts based at Cambridge University's Zoology Department this could have huge knock on effects for humanity.

Has the council made use of the new "fast track" form of planning permission via their brownfield registers? How much land is "land banked"? How many empty properties are there in Enfield? What brownfield sites have been considered and rejected by the council, and what were the detailed objections?

### **Strategic Policy SS1 The Spatial Strategy**

This is too cautious about protecting unused industrial sites, the reasons for this lopsided approach are not clear.

### **Strategic Policy PL9 Crews Hill**

See objections above under PL8. Due to the location, there would be high reliance on cars, and therefore there would be a huge increase in traffic if the council were to allow developers to build a housing estate here. The council's own consultants have said that it is not possible to minimise harm to the area, and it is strange that the council has disregarded the advice of their consultants and included the area in its local plan proposals.

### **Strategic Policy PL10 Chase Park/Vicarage Farm/Roundhedge Way**

See objections above under PL8. It is not clear why the council consultation refers to this area as Chase Park, as if there is already a housing estate there. Instead, it is a unique area of former royal hunting grounds within Greater London and is in fact beautiful green belt countryside. It is not derelict or unsightly - which the Mayor of London has said should be the only case where it might be acceptable to build on green belt land. It is a welcome lung of green space between Enfield and Oakwood and is so appreciated by Enfield residents. It is amongst the finest green belt countryside within the M25, something Enfield is well known for. It is recognised as being an area rich in wildlife and biodiversity, which a recent report said would be "irreplaceable". Again, consultants on land use say that the harm to the area resulting from development would be high or very high. It begs the question again, why is the council including this proposal in its plan?

### **Strategic Policy BG3 Biodiversity Net Gain**

The council says that Vicarage Farm is deficient in biodiversity, however the council could work with the existing tenant farmers to enable them to take advantage of Government subsidies for rewilding. This would be preferable to building a housing estate over farmland and then the developers creating "rewilding projects".

### **Strategic Policy DM DE6 Tall Buildings**

The proposal for 13 storeys within the conservation areas of Enfield and Southgate is out of step with the London Plan figure for such historically sensitive locations, which is 7 or 8 storeys. Furthermore, the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government has stated clearly that tall buildings should not be constructed in inappropriate areas and preferably should be within an **existing** cluster. This does not

apply to either of these two locations and therefore these proposals should not be accepted.

I have taken a great deal of time and effort over my response. I would like answers to the questions I have posed, and I think that as many of your proposals are so extreme and far-reaching, all residents should have access to all the responses you received, anonymised of course.

Regards