
Dear Enfield planners,

From Clare Jephcott, 33a Cecil Road Enfield EN2 6TJ.

Policy SP PL 10 pages 80-87 and Figure 3.1

Does the vision for Chase Park set out an appropriate vision for the future of this place? If not, what components do you think should be changed or are missing? 2. Will the proposed placemaking policy for Chase Park help to adequately deliver the aspirations set out in the vision? If not, what proposed changes, omissions or additions are required in the policy to help deliver the vision?

Here is my response: I wholeheartedly object to Chase Park as you are proposing to build on the Green Belt.

My greatest concern is building on the Greenbelt in prime countryside near Trent Park which is an oasis in the grey and built up area. The Green belt is meant to be a check on development. To build on this will be a betrayal of current and future generations of Enfield Residents.

These virgin fields currently known as Vicarage Farm are remarkable not only in their historic significance as part of Enfield Chase but today in their beauty and tranquility where the skylark sings from March, swifts swoop low in late summer and the songbirds tweet and the sound of the stream nurtures you as you walk along the Merry Hills footpath from the 30s suburb along Trentwood Side to Trent Park. On the home trail at dusk watch out for the bats. The views from the entrance to the fields as you come out of the woods from Fairview Road are absolutely stunning-green fields, rolling across the hills with mature oak trees in hedges. It is priceless. To build on this land would be a catastrophic mistake. I attach a photo showing its beauty from the footpath looking westwards over vicarage farm fields that you propose to build on.

There are many daily visitors to this footpath and there would be many more if the footpath was promoted more for recreation- why do so many more use the overcrowded western Cockfosters entrance to Trent Park when they could use the one I use on Trentwood Side? My guess is they do not know about it. I get there on my bike. I absolutely love this tranquil place. It is the space to recharge and breathe in deep.parks do not do the same as countryside.

This is greenbelt land and it is absurd to assume you will increase biodiversity by building on it. It is absurd to see building on it as a sustainable, environmental option. It is absurd to use the designation as a London National Park City to justify building on the greenbelt. Leave the greenbelt as that - a belt of green to keep a check on the urban sprawl. A paved cycle path and pavement with houses does not make it better for the environment. Leaving it as a farm pastureland, or agriculture, stables or encouraging a wild flower meadow for bees for example keeps it green and sustainable. This is known to help our mental and physical health and it certainly has helped mine my partner's and my mother's and my late father.

These fields are extremely valuable for local dog walkers and other residents needing a

daily stroll, cyclists like myself and for the wildlife and peace. This is prime beautiful countryside. PLEASE leave it as the beautiful countryside it is. Your policy to build on 7 % of the greenbelt is deeply shortsighted and unlawful. You need to stop meddling with the boundaries and build more homes in the brownfield sites.

This area is a highly valued and rare part of our contemporary landscape as noted by Dr John Langton, Emeritus Research Fellow at St John's College Oxford. We need to keep Enfield Chase as Enfield Chase and not ruin it with a prettily described but essentially a residential suburb.

We really need this pastureland for local recreation we still need in this ongoing pandemic. We can no longer travel so far safely so we need local areas more like Vicarage farm for the benefit of all Enfield residents.

Developers must first be compelled to build on brownfield sites by cleaning them up and not be allowed to opt for building on virgin Enfield Chase land, which is the cheap option for developers and less beneficial for the whole of the community. Build on what has already been given permission. It is absolutely shortsighted and unnecessary to build on the greenbelt. Once this is concreted over you have lost a significant part of the historic Enfield Chase. You must not above all else build on the Greenbelt and especially not on these virgin fields that make up part of Enfield chase and make Trent Park a more substantial recreational space.

We may need to grow more food locally in the near future and these fields would be a good option.

Policy SPPL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10

I object strongly.

To build residential homes in Crews Hill would mean the nurseries would be displaced onto other green belt land which will downgrade the quality of the countryside and encourage further development encroachment. It is therefore very unwise to build on the land taken up by nurseries. The fields around the bridleway up to the M25 need to remain so that the lambs can frolic and cyclists, horse riders and walkers can continue to enjoy the countryside. To build on this site just because it is near the super loud M25 again goes against the Green belt policy.

It is also exceptionally unwise to build on the western side of the railway track between Crews Hill station and Gordon Hill on the golf course as this extends the boundary of built-up area into precious greenbelt land. This land should be returned to Enfield Chase woodland if it is no longer needed as a golf course. This is the green and sustainable option.

SA45 Page 364

169 homes in Green belt countryside on land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood

I object strongly. Again this is Greenbelt and precious countryside which should be protected as such. It is invaluable for dog walkers and recreational walkers, cyclists and wildlife - again it is greenbelt land and has all the benefits of being green belt land listed above. It needs protecting from development and preserving and promoting for walking and recreation.

SA52 page 372

I object to the policy.

Eastern Enfield also needs to be protected from infringement of industrial areas on the Green belt and this is one example at Rammey Marsh.

SA54 page 374

I object strongly.

East of junction 24 and on the southern side should be left a green belt agricultural land in Enfield Chase. It is historic and needs to be kept green. To allow a local hub for industry and storage would be catastrophic.

SA 62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279

I object strongly. Spurs wants to expand northwards and use what are fields. I agree the fields are currently neglected. It is rather unpleasant there as it is so close to the M25 but I have enjoyed cycling there on my way to Wormley woods and observed sparrow hawks hovering before a kill so it is still a wildlife haven and importantly proves a corridor for wildlife. Professional and community sport will prevent this corridor. There needs to be a wild corridor to allow migration of the wild life. It is green belt land so must remain green countryside with access for all and not green in the current sense of Spurs training ground that looks a bit like a luxurious suburb out of keeping with green belt policy.

Policy DE6 (pages 156- 160) and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre

I object strongly. DO NOT ENCOURAGE or allow tall buildings in Conservation areas. There is a really good reason as to why the conservation area exists- it is a prime area of interesting architecture and quirks- leave it as such and do not alter the character by allowing 13 stories plus to be build in it even if the blocks are not on Church Street. 4 storeys is enough. The view from Enfield Town Park and the market square, the library green will all be overshadowed by tower blocks. Edmonton has already been ruined with tower blocks so build some more there but leave Enfield Town, Southgate circus- an UNESCO world heritage site, alone. You will lose the heritage status as the area would have been downgraded and its importance reduced.

Appropriate locations for tall buildings in figure 7.4 on page 145

Oakwood does not have any high buildings so to build them there would completely change the character. Blocks of 4 storeys would be sufficient if they are the same height of Oakwood station. The station should remain the dominant building as it is of significant architectural interest.

Enfield Town station - a tower of 17 storeys is far too tall as it would again overshadow and dominate Church Street and Enfield chase, which lies in the conservation area. - This is not an appropriate area for high rise. Please keep Enfield town people friendly with people-centred building heights of a maximum of 5 storeys at the most.

People do not want to live in high-rise flats. They need high maintenance, a fire risk and difficult in this pandemic and future pandemics. I object to the statement that you have made rigorous assessment of townscape character and the sustainability of the location for higher density development. Had you done so you would have steered clear of high rise in or adjacent to conservation areas.

Policy SP H1 on pages 183-185 (section 8.1)

The alleged demand for houses in Enfield stated to be 30 000 homes by 2039 is a subjective number that was decided upon before the social changes brought about by the pandemic. People are moving out of London boroughs and able to work from home they no longer want to live in London boroughs. The demand stated is likely to have been inflated and needs to be reassessed.

Enfield Chase will also be gravely ruined by a tower block of flats by the station especially in its position adjacent to the conservation area . There is also a beautiful tall tree there that needs to be protected. - it looks like a grand cedar. here the limit should be 6 storeys at tops. and built keeping the tree safe and in tact.

Southgate Circus is a heritage site- to build a tower there will overshadow this and may lead to the removal of the UNESCO status like the unsympathetic modern designs in Liverpool has led to the removal of the UNESCO status.

Cockfosters station has an ugly 6-7 storey or so building that is an eyesore as you can see it from far and wide. This was a mistake from the seventies and the mistake does not need to be repeated. It should be replaced with lower blocks.

The areas where tower blocks could be build are where they have already become prominent such as in Edmonton Green or Ponders End Station. But tower blocks should be in the same area like the City of London or Canary Wharf. Having them dotted about make them eyesores that stick out like a sore thumb.

--

Clare

Picture on gmail courtesy of the artist Katya Mons-Rusby