

Response to Draft Local Plan Issues and Opinions Consultation

I wish to register my strong opposition to plans to release Green Belt land for housing and other development in Enfield. The large proportion of the borough that is supposed to be protected from development because it is in the Green Belt is a priceless asset, that benefits Enfield residents more in its current state than the proposals to replace it with urban sprawl. I believe protecting the Green Belt for future generations is obligation not a choice.

I specifically make reference to the following parts of the plan, which I object to most strongly:

- 3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green' 'sustainable urban extension' referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town (Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11);
- 3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7,500 new homes right up to the M25. (Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10);
- 160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood (SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364);
- Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammey Marsh (SA52 page 372);
- 11 hectares of new industrial and storage and distribution use at what is currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase (SA54, page 374);
- a big expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25, comprising of 42.5 hectares of land, for "professional sport, recreation and community sports/leisure uses" (SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279);

Developing on the green belt is a contradictory position for a borough that has declared a climate emergency.

I also believe that the council has not proved in any meaningful way that the proposed plan is preferable, viable or better for the borough than meeting statutory house building targets by developing solely on Brownfield sites.

I also believe redeveloping on the Green Belt and converting land currently used for nurseries and garden centres in Crews Hill into housing, will fundamentally change the nature and character of Enfield – it is a seismic and irreversible change that has not been justified and requires significantly more thought, investigation and debate than a relatively short consultation.

I also voice my concern at the quality of the plan. I draw attention to the language used in the plan. It is full of euphemistic and obfuscating language that lacks real meaning and I believe would be confusing to many people. For example, in the spatial strategy, section 2.4 page 13, point 7, the following phrase is found "Crews Hill will be regenerated and extended to form a sustainable rural gateway settlement". I do not believe that 'sustainable rural gateway settlement' is phrase or concept in popular usage or is widely understood. I would interpret it as meaning 'housing'. This is one example, but there are many more. The plan reads more like a marketing brochure than a genuine attempt to explain the housing plan for Enfield. As a result of the lack of clear and simple language, I do not believe the council are making an authentic attempt at engaging with the residents of Enfield. I do not believe the plan is of sufficient quality or clarity to meet its purpose and I consider it deficient and no basis for which to base future development on.

I also wish to state that I disagree with the approach taken by the council in the production of the plan. I do not believe presenting and consulting on only one overall 'option' is in the best interests of the borough. Given the impact of the changes proposed is so large, I believe a

genuine debate and discussion can only be achieved if a range of different /competing options are explored, proposed and consulted on. I believe it would be a more democratic and transparent way to find a way forwards for Enfield residents.