

To whom it may concern

I would like to document my objections to Enfield Council's proposed draft local plan.

I strongly object to your proposals to urbanise protected green belt. This goes against government advice as set out in the Green belt policy, which aims to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It also states the use of brownfield sites should be considered before proposing changes to Green Belts. Your current draft local plan does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and is in direct opposition to the housing secretary's position on the protection of green belt land. I also note during recent Mayor of London questions that he objected to your plan as he was "committed to preserving and enhancing the green belt" and would be surprised if the council continued with plans to de-designate parts of the protected area to allow homes to be built.

I don't understand your thinking and challenge you to reconsider your plan to ruin Enfield's landscape and ask you to explore all other options for housing.

In particular I object to the following:

- **Chase Park (Vicarage Farm) – 3000 new houses on Green Belt next to Trent Park, along the A110 between Oakwood and Enfield Town ((Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11)**
  - We do not have the infrastructure to support so many new homes here and there is no mention in the local plan of how this might be improved.
  - Our water supply is often under pressure as evidenced by many leaks leading to continual digging up of roads and repairs to pipes, causing significant disruption to everyone in the area
  - Getting school places and GP appointments are challenging enough at the current time and there is a distinct lack of local shops and other services.
  - There will inevitably be a huge knock on effect on traffic – this route is very frequently blocked with bumper-to-bumper traffic and is regularly subject to extensive traffic delays. This proposal would increase car and promote car dependency.
  - There are several primary and secondary schools located in Bincote Road, off the A110, which is often gridlocked with traffic, combined with secondary and primary schools in the Oakwood area, all adding to day to day traffic congestion.

- These proposals will put immense pressure on parking both in local roads in the vicinity of Oakwood Station and Enfield Chase station as inevitably people will opt to drive to their nearest station
- There will be additional stress on local bus routes already operating at capacity.
- Following the downgrading of our local hospital, the proposal to build on the A110 would negatively impact emergency services reaching Barnet General or other hospitals in time critical incidents, putting the lives of Enfield residents on the line.
- Existing local residents will suffer detriment for evermore, particularly through the build time with resulting noise and pollution, the area will be flooded with lorries and traffic restrictions, and in the longer term with considerably more congestion, noise and pollution that experienced currently.
- Enfield is renowned for its green spaces, and Trent Park and the surrounding green spaces are used and enjoyed by a great many people, both local residents and those coming from less generously endowed parts of London. Your development plan for this area would appear to fly in the face of your claim to improve the quality of green spaces – how can building on them achieve this?
- If the Green Belt loses its protected status, it will only be a matter of time before more extensive development planning applications arrive at Enfield Council offices that the authority will struggle to decline – the inevitable slippery slope effect.
- The green belt was designed as the lungs of the city – I cannot understand why it is under constant threat.
- The Green Belt Assessment previously commissioned by LBE states that release of much of this land would cause major harm to adjacent Green Belt, which would include Trent Country Park. There is compelling evidence that Enfield Chase is of not just local historic importance but also of national importance. Dr John Langton, Emeritus Professor St John's College, Oxford writes that "**Enfield is the only surviving example of a chase, within which rights to game and over vegetation varied slightly from those in forests. Thus, Enfield possesses an extremely rare and very valuable landscape asset**". This raises the question why aren't Enfield council working with residents to retain it in its entirety? How can the proposal to build so many homes possibly be presented as a way of increasing the biodiversity of this area when it is undoubtedly the best way of destroying it. Replacing farmland and open spaces with infrastructure, roads and housing would clearly have a negative impact on fauna, flora and wildlife.
- Additionally the London Mayor has expressed his opposition to this proposal, stating "The London Plan is clear that Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in exceptional circumstances. London's Green Belt prevents urban sprawl, driving the reuse and intensification of

previously-developed land. Prioritising development on brownfield land is a key part of the approach”.

- Enfield has plenty of brownfield sites that could be developed providing vital regeneration in run down parts of the borough that desperately need an injection of funds.

- **New Cottages and Holly Hill Farm** [SA54, page 374](#));

- The A1005 from Enfield to Potters Bar has significant traffic due to its connection to the M25, there is often heavy congestion on the road and this proposal would increase car dependency. The road is poorly maintained and regularly suffers from potholes.
- There is already ongoing relentless demolition of family houses to deliver more and more blocks of flats, none of which appear to be affordable – on what basis does Enfield think it can force developers to deliver affordable housing in this area when it has consistently failed to hold developers to account in this respect?
- There is very little in the way of infrastructure in the area , no train station and limited buses, so it would mean without doubt there will be more cars on the road.
- Following the downgrading of our local hospital, the proposal to build on the A1005 would negatively impact emergency services reaching Barnet General or other hospitals in time critical incidents, putting the lives of Enfield residents on the line

- **Hadley Wood** [SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364](#)

- This is a particularly pretty and beautiful open space area both for walking, cycling and driving.
- The loss of green belt land would significantly impact traffic in the area, particularly detrimental to the Cockfosters Road that is always very congested down to the Cat Hill roundabout.

- **Enfield Town and Tall Buildings** [pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#))

- The proposed tall buildings would be extremely detrimental to Enfield Town and surrounding areas, altering the landscape and character of our small market town forever
- There are sufficient spaces in and around the town that could be rescoped and developed more in keeping with the area and that would halt the underlying decline.
- Existing empty premises could be repurposed into the creative and business hubs desired by Enfield Council at significantly cheaper cost, more appropriately protecting the heritage of the area whilst delivering on sustainability

- Given the fire risks associated with high rise buildings, particularly following the Grenfell tragedy, it is ludicrously hard to accept that Enfield Council now believes that this is what Enfield town needs.
- **Crews Hill (SP, PL9):** The proposed large-scale development would significantly impact the rural character of the area, in particular Whitewebbs Lane, East Lodge Lane, Forty Hill and Clay Hill. Not all trains stop at this station and it could come under threat, and with just one bus route in the area it would most definitely increase car dependence. There is already severe traffic congestion in Botany Bay, Bulls Cross and Clay Hill which will be very significantly worsened. The area is home to a range of businesses, including gardening/nursery facilities, landscaping, building, aquatics companies as well as a collective of small businesses and cafes that is well known and attracts visitors from across London who visit and spend money in the area and this proposal would actively harm and undermine those services.

## Summary

I have lived in Enfield for 35 years during which time the local landscapes have without doubt suffered detriment at the hands of developers making significant profits at the expense of local communities. The proposal by Middlesex University to develop the Trent Park site to facilitate one campus was rejected resulting in the departure of the university from Enfield as they were welcomed with open arms by a neighbouring council who now enjoy the kudos, status and jobs that goes with having a university in their Borough. Enfield's decision not to support Middlesex University was, in my opinion, the single worst planning decision the borough has made that we now have to live with forever – we should have done everything to keep them in Trent Park – it breaks my heart every time I go to Trent Park and see the hideous housing development in its place. Your proposal would see this multiplied across the area. Additionally, the loss of access by car to Snakes Lane has negatively impacted local people accessing the Hockey Club and its facilities as well as the park – forcing all traffic to the already busy Cockfosters Road entrance.

Enfield needs to attract quality and prestigious employers and, on that basis, the likes of Tottenham Hotspur and Microsoft are positives provided they work to address residents concerns and do not excessively damage areas. However, some strategies pursued by the Borough have had a very negative impact on local businesses. For example:

- the cost of parking;
- the introduction of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and road closures that have increased congestion and pollution and impacted tradespeople and businesses alike
- ever increasing yellow box junctions that appear to be more about generating revenue than managing traffic
- road, cycling and pavement schemes that are confusing and muddled and

that put people at risk as there is often insufficient demarcation and right of way between driving, walking and cycling paths

Enfield has the traditional east west divide in the borough with significant disparities across the two areas. I believe the best way of reducing these disparities is to focus development on the east side, improving housing, business, employment opportunities and transport networks.

I hope my objections and concerns will be given serious consideration - while councillors and officers of Enfield come and go, there is no escape for the residents who have to live with the results of poor decisions for a lifetime.