

## Enfield Draft Local Plan: Comments

---

I came to work and live in Enfield in 1972 intending to stay for 'two or three' years - and I am still here. I found it a good place it is to live, with both great countryside and easy access into the centre of London in minutes from my door, never more so than in the past year. I have valued the visible history and the unique character of being part of an old parish settlement and the landscape of Enfield Chase.

I understand the value of drawing up a local plan – and have done my best to read the documents associated with it, I understand why the Council contracts specialist consultants to undertake some of this work – but have to say that I have found that there is a lot of management and marketing speak which could apply to any place anywhere and obscures either the true meaning of what is intended or is so vague as to be meaningless. I would like to be confident that the Council is actively listening to and representing its residents rather than just 'spinning' its housebuilding and green credentials.

I have my doubts about the extent and quality of the consultation, concerned that we Enfield residents later find out that we have given tacit approval to something that we did not intend. Property developers and big businesses employ people to interrogate plans such as these. A consultation format that steers responders in a limited direction is false consultation.

I am particularly concerned that the Council seems keen to offer up significant areas of our Green Belt countryside for development. I value the Green Belt and all the benefits that it has provided.

In particular:

### SA62 p383 and SP CL4 p277-279 (Tottenham Hotspur expansion)

I have previously objected to the proposal to hand over public land occupied by Whitewebbs Golf course and surrounds to Tottenham Hotspur – this is a global business, whose principal interests are not in community sports participation or environmental protection. This land should be retained in public ownership.

### Policy SP PL9 p77-80 and Concept Plan Fig 3.10 (Crews Hill)

I like the current mix of land use at Crews Hill – principally a destination with useful businesses that people value. (It is little wonder that the 'Crews Hill landowners' consulted in the development plans are so supportive since these now appear to be largely property developers speculating on the Councils intention to release land). Planning new communities in any case is best not left to developers, whose house building profits are made from executive homes on very small plots with little attention paid to transport planning and essential social amenities.

I am appalled at the suggestion to build over Crews Hill Golf Course, not least for the wonderful footpath along the ridge with some of the best views of open countryside in Enfield.

I also do not support the green belt incursions set out in Policy SP PL 10 p80-87 and Fig 3.11 Vicarage Farm/'Chase Park'; SA 45 p364 Hadley Wood; SA52 p372 Rammey Marsh; SA54 p374 Holly Hill Farm.

I am concerned about the apparent enthusiasm for tall buildings, the plan seems not to offer the protections claimed. Tall Building Policies p156-60, Fig 7.3, 7.4, Policy DE6, SA2 p321

I had thought that the days for building these for housing, particularly family housing had now passed. I strongly object to high rise building in the historic Enfield Town centre, the existing Palace Gardens in my view is appropriate in scale and feel. High rise buildings seem also to create an adverse microclimate at ground level – hardly conducive for public spaces.

Also, post-Brexit and post-Covid, these draft plans need a rethink.