
Dear Enfield Council

As a regular user of the many and varied green spaces and footpaths in Enfield I have serious concerns about the policies in the draft plan which will result in the loss of Green Belt to housing and other purposes. The policy in relation to tall buildings is also an area of concern. Further details of these concerns are set out below:

Chase Park (Policy SP PL10 pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11)

- The loss of Green Belt land will have a detrimental impact on the wider setting of Trent Park and Enfield Chase, a rare and valuable landscape.
- The Merryhills Way a popular public right of way which has been invaluable for mental and physical wellbeing during the recent lockdowns will become an urban walk way.
- The land at Vicarage Farm currently sustains a wide range of birds, insects and other flora and fauna which would be lost to urban infrastructure.
- The distance of the development from local train stations and shopping and entertainment areas will result in increased traffic congestion on the A110 particularly at Oakwood and the Slades Hill/Windmill Hill area which are both already congested. This will not be “a place where walking, cycling and use of public transport is the natural choice”.

Crews Hill (Policy SP PL9 pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10).

- The businesses of Crews Hill provide employment and a resource for the people of Enfield and should be supported by the Council.
- A housing development of the size proposed for Crews Hill would lead to traffic congestion on the surrounding roads. Public transport is limited and the proposed development is some distance from major shopping and entertainment centres.
- A significant amount of Green Belt land would be lost including the public footpath across Crews Hill golf course with its far reaching views.

Hadley Wood – Land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way (Policy SA45: page 364),

- An attractive open countryside area of Green Belt will be lost to urban sprawl.

Land East of Junction 24 (Policy SA54, page 374)

- Industrial development of the Land East of J24 would ruin the green gateway to the borough and lead to traffic congestion on the Ridgeway.

Tall Buildings (Policy DM DE6 pages 156-160)

- The policy is not clear but appears to suggest that there will be different definitions of tall buildings across the borough.
- Living in tall buildings can be detrimental to physical and mental health and over the long term, given the choice, most people would rather not live in or near them.
- Tower blocks often comprise studio or one bedroom units which are not suitable for family accommodation. Other high density configurations incorporating more family accommodation should be considered and fully evaluated against proposals to build tower blocks.
- Tower blocks in the Trent Park, Enfield Town and Southgate areas will detrimentally impact historical rural and heritage settings.

Summary

Whilst I support housing development and the Council's commitment to meeting Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. The Green Belt has many environmental, ecological and public health benefits and has played an invaluable role during the pandemic. It is a precious resource that should be preserved for future generations and the Council should explore alternative options to meet the Borough's housing needs and exercise its duty of care for the Green Belt by removing any intentions to release parts of it from the local plan.

Consultation process

I would also add that the sheer size of the plan document and supporting evidence, together with the continued use of jargon and acronyms make it very difficult for members of the public to fully engage with the consultation process. Similarly, the questions in both the plan and on the digital engagement platform are hard to understand and the amount of "planning speak" is off putting.

Yours faithfully