

Dear Enfield Council,

Thank you for your update on Enfield's Draft Local Plan that I recently received at our home in Enfield, EN2 7LL.

I would like to raise objections to the following in the draft plan

1. Policy SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11
2. Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10;
3. Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364;
4. Policy SA54, page 374
5. Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279

All of these plans involve the use of our well-loved, much needed and PROTECTED Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique and played an important role in the development of Enfield. This area is extremely important for current residents and their wellbeing and one of the main reasons why we have chosen to live in our area. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough and the wellbeing of its residents.

Green Belt lands should NOT be altered - they are an important feature in our lives and provide us and many wildlife birds and creatures with the required space and air to live healthy lives in Enfield.

There is already significant pressure on the local roads and amenities and the area cannot support the proposed 3,000+ homes, for the following reasons:

- There is already significant congestion and overcrowding in and around Trent Park, making it impossible for people visiting to find parking or use the park in the way it is meant to. Driving around the park is nearly impossible on weekends already and an additional 3,000+ homes right next to this would exacerbate this problem. Your theory that people would use more buses and less cars, therefore less congestion on the roads of Enfield is simply "beggars belief", on what basis or founding do you put this to? How do you expect an average family of 4 to do there weekly shop on a bus?
- There is already significant congestion around local shops such as those along the parades near Oakwood station, Southgate Station and Cockfosters station. Finding parking around these areas is already extremely difficult. More homes will undoubtedly cause more traffic which the area cannot support. One of the car parks at Oakwood station is already under development, where do you expect all the extra cars to go?

- There is already significant congestion around Enfield Town Centre and in/around/leading to the A10 retail park
- There is already significant congestion around the Crews Hill area. The shops there have an important function in the lives of current Enfield Council residents and provide employment for the area
- There is already significant strain on local services such as GP surgeries (long waiting times) and supermarkets
- There has already been so much building works along the cockfosters road/stagg hill, with turning all the mansions into luxury apartments that the road servicing them is no more than a car park, due the amount of traffic on them

In addition, according to your own assessment the proposed development will have numerous negative impacts such as those on biodiversity, flooding etc. With climate change so obviously apparent, why would we be adding to the problem, by cutting the biodiversity and increasing the chance of floods?

The plans sketch a vision where people will work from home and will not need to commute into London, which I feel is not a realistic image. People choosing and paying to live near a tube line do so as they have to commute into London and need the transport links, for which they pay a hefty sum in both house prices and transport fees. In addition, with no suitable amenities nearby people will still need cars to drive to hospitals, supermarkets etc. - one does not do a weekly foodshop for a family of four via a bus to Aldi on the A10.

There is no detail provided in the plan as to what roads / infrastructure, schools, shops etc. would be built to sustain and service this immense influx of people into the area.

6. Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement. Whitewebbs is a nature area that is used intensely by ourselves and people in our area, especially as Trent Park is already so overcrowded.

7. Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. As previously stated, Green Belt land should NOT be touched.

The developments proposed are too big for our communities to sustain. Instead, the council should focus on smaller developments in areas that are currently not in use and are not green spaces. There is plenty of land that can be regenerated and make better use of existing areas already built on to create more homes that has the infrastructure in place already to cope with more people

The comments provided in this response to the consultation are my own views

