
These are my comments as a resident of Enfield on the draft Local Plan.

- Strategic Policy SS1: The Spatial Strategy:
 - NPPF - You say that the Spatial Strategy has been developed in the light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which has the presumption of development in favour of sustainable development. I fail to see how concreting over the Green Belt, is sustainable in the light of climate change, where more extreme weather will test built-up areas, and there will be greater need for “lungs” to give residents respite from heat, healthy outdoor exercise and hope for the natural world’s future. This land could also be more profitable and sustainable for the residents of Enfield if they are farmed and the produce sold locally, reducing food miles. Developing on Green Belt is not “effective mitigation and adaptation”, you will have to develop ways of “effective mitigation and adaptation” **because** you are developing on the places that already help to absorb the effects of climate change. This strategy is exacerbating the problems in the first place!
 - Brownfield sites - There are plenty more sites, smaller than the ones you have included in this plan, that are just as valid for residential development, why are these sites not in the Plan?
 - Affordability – The Green Belt developments, in particular, will not provide enough affordable housing that is needed in this borough. Despite what you state, developers will see the potential for premium housing in these desirable sites and the quota for affordable housing promised at the beginning will be reduced, as has been the case many times before.
 - Tall buildings – you do not need to build so high to get the volume of houses needed if you are more creative with smaller sites. Some of the high developments are in places where they will detract from the area and be eyesores.
 - National Park City – Your references to this scheme are frankly bewildering alongside your suggestion of concreting over the Green Belt. Please don’t take us for fools, the National Park City Foundation have seen through this misinterpretation of what the National Park City means.

- Strategic Policy SS2: Making good places:
 - The idea of “Place Making” is fine but where is the consideration for the impact on the amenity on existing quality of life of residents? Such large/high/intensive developments will change the character indelibly and Enfield will change its character. There should be more research done into this.
 - There was the Enfield Characterisation Study 2011, there doesn’t appear to have been any reference to this study. Surely this would inform us of the appropriateness of what you are proposing?

- Strategic Policy PL8: Rural Enfield:
 - I do not feel that the ‘improvements’ paid for by development match the fact that you are destroying large parts of the most beautiful and strategically important

Green Belt countryside

- Strategic Policy PL9: Crews Hill:
 - Although this area is not in the best state at the moment, the development of this area for a major housing cluster of 3,000 dwellings and no doubt later more industrial/commercial elements, just rips the heart of this area of the Green Belt. Looking to the future this area could well be revived as a horticultural base for feeding Enfield, this is surely nearer a Net Zero solution.
 - Just because there is a railway station at Crews Hill, does not mean that the area can absorb the type of development being proposed, there will be more traffic, causing problems on the roads.
 - Yet again, fine walks with views will be banished from Enfield which will spoil the area for residents. These walks are great for mental health and physical fitness and are some of the reasons people live in this area, why develop here when you **do** have enough space that can be used that is nearer facilities and infrastructure?
- Strategic Policy PL10: Chase Park:
 - Another of 3,000 houses concreting over an area full of heritage, biodiversity, agricultural richness and valuable Green Belt that will disappear for ever.
 - The value of Enfield Chase cannot be enhanced by development then you add remedial cultural sops to the heritage you have just destroyed/depleted. This is cultural/heritage vandalism and contradictory.

I moved to this borough because of its proximity to the countryside and have greatly benefitted physically and mentally from the walks and views over the years. It saddens me that the Council cannot see, or chooses to downplay the benefit to the borough of this wonderful Green Belt, the history of its creation shows great foresight by earlier planners as to the need for a buffer to development that benefits the residents of London.

I am no town planner, but I believe that this draft Local Plan is not serving the people of Enfield well. Yes, more houses are needed, but this plan fails to take a bold step towards a truly sustainable Enfield.