

RESPONSE TO THE ENFIELD DRAFT LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

The following is my response to the Enfield Draft Local Plan consultation.

8 September 2021

Before detailing my responses to the Draft Local Plan Document, I feel it important to state concerns about the Councils' Draft Local Plan consultation, as follows:

- Many local people are daunted by the sheer size of the plan document, which in many cases is deterring them from submitting a response
- It is regrettable that there is no Executive summary in the plan document to help guide the reader
- The method of response to the on-line consultation with yes/no answers is also a deterrent, particularly where the respondent wishes to make considered opinions known
- It is almost as if the Council is deliberately attempting to deter individuals from making an input.

I have set out below my concerns about a number of the Council's proposals contained in the Draft Local Plan. In each case, I have used the Council's policy reference.

Strategic Policy SS1: The Spatial Strategy.

This policy emphasises the protection of Strategic Industrial Land and gives insufficient consideration to the value that historic landscapes contribute to the history and character of the Borough. I believe that priority for future development should be given to brownfield sites. If the housing and population projections set out in the Plan prove to be correct the development of Green Belt land should be a last resort and only permitted after careful consideration of the strategic, ecological and historic importance of the land concerned.

Strategic Policy PL8: Rural Enfield – leading destination in the London National Park City.

This policy puts too much emphasis on 'improvements' paid for by developers which would despoil large parts of the most beautiful and strategically important Green Belt countryside. The improvements would make marginal difference to the rural area and would fail to compensate for the harm inflicted by development elsewhere in the rural area.

Strategic Policy PL9: Crews Hill.

Large scale development in this area would be unsustainable because it would be largely car-dependent and result in severe congestion at Botany Bay, Bulls Cross and Clay Hill. Increased traffic and congestion would severely harm the rural character of Whitewebbs Lane, East Lodge Lane and the Conservation Areas at Forty Hill and Clay Hill. Development of Crews Hill Golf Course would spoil the Chain Walk, a tranquil Public Right of Way that provides far-reaching views across Enfield Chase and the valley of Turkey Brook.

Taking account of the above reasoning, the proposal to allow construction of up to 3500 dwellings is unacceptable. I believe that some development of Crews Hill could proceed but, subject to the following considerations:

- Development should be primarily on existing brownfield sites
- No development on Crews Hill Golf Course, which it is important to retain following the Council's closure of Whitewebbs Golf Course and the increasing need for sport and recreation as the local population expands
- The site adjacent to the Plough public house should be used for residential development

Strategic Policy PL10: Chase Park.

Any development in this area would have a hugely damaging impact on the integrity and coherence of Enfield Chase, and the contribution that this land makes to the setting of Trent Park Registered Historic Park. This land is the finest countryside in the Borough, and strategically important Green Belt. The Merryhills Way (a popular Public Right of Way from the Ridgeway to Trent Park) would be completely spoiled by the urbanising effects of any development at Vicarage Farm.

The only development in this area that I consider justifiable is the land south of Enfield Road. This should be considered for housing and a future school site, as has been previously proposed.

SA54 (Land East of Junction 24)

I am concerned that warehouse/industrial development at this site would have an urbanising effect on the green gateway to Enfield Chase.

SA 45 (Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood)

If this site were to be developed it would need to be at low density to limit the increase of urban sprawl into an area of attractive open countryside. The potential adverse impact on the site of the Battle of Barnet would need to be taken into account.

Policy DEG: Tall Buildings

It is most welcome that the Council proposes to establish a Tall Buildings policy, restricting the heights of future tall buildings in specific locations within the Borough.

The indicative maximum building heights shown on Figure 7.3 within the place-making areas could have negative impacts on many of the Borough's centres. These building heights range between 9 storeys and 26 storeys, including a 13-storey tower within the Enfield Town Conservation Area and similar towers in the Southgate Conservation Area. It is noted that the London Plan figure for the maximum height within sensitive heritage locations equates more closely to 7/8 storeys.

I consider that the Enfield Town should have tall building heights restricted to 7/8 storeys, which would help mitigate the intrusion that such buildings would have on this important historical area that contains many heritage buildings.

I also consider that a similar height restriction should apply to development within or nearby the Southgate Conservation Area.

Additional Comment – added 13 September 2021

The Councils' proposed developments in the Green Belt are in direct conflict to the Mayors London Plan. I wish to make it clear that I do not support the Councils plans for development within the Green Belt, except where specified in my comments under Policy PL9 and PL10 above.