

We wish to make one general point and discuss one section of the proposal in detail.

Firstly, we object to the following Policies: SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11; Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10; Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364; Policy SA54, page 374; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose the dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield. 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. In particular, the loss of Green Belt for recreational activities will have a serious impact on the physical and mental health of Enfield residents.

Secondly, we would like to consider in detail Policy SP PL9 pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10 which proposes 3000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7500 new homes right up to the M25.

PL9-1 and PL9-2. From Figure 3-10, all land north of Turkey Brook is to be released for development so that Hilly Fields between Turkey Brook and Strayfield Road and a significant part of Whitewebbs would be developed. This would be a major degradation of the natural environment in this area leaving just over half of Hilly Fields as an isolated park surrounded by housing. Figure 3-10 is very vague and a more detailed version should be provided indicating exactly what is to be dedesignated as Green Belt.

PL9-3. The use of the word predominantly implies that areas outside of Figure 3-10 can also be considered for development threatening even more Green Belt. Fill-in development will then transform this area into a number of isolated small parks in a sea of housing.

PL9-4. This section to us appears to be meaningless waffle to cover up the impact of the development. For example, more detailed information should be provided on how "development form and scale should respect the sensitive and more intimate nature of the landscape of Whitewebbs".

PL9-6. This sounds hopelessly idealistic given the pressure there will be from developers to maximise the number and minimise the cost of dwelling units. We cannot believe that there will be "covered public spaces, winter gardens and glass house space for every home". This is not a development in inner London for millionaires where such luxuries might be affordable.

PL9-7. This section states that "Development should take a consolidated and compact urban form" and so contradicts 9-6.

PL 9-8 to 9-10. This is very praiseworthy but provides no detail on what transport links will be provided. New and widened roads, cycle lanes and new footpaths will have a negative impact on the animals and birds in the area by increasing noise and pollution. The population of Crews Hill is likely to increase by 7000 to 10000 as a result of this development and, in reality, most journeys for work, shopping and leisure will be undertaken by car. It should be noted that at the moment there are often severe traffic queues on Cattlegate Road at rush hour.

9-11. The implication of this section is that a considerable area of land will be set aside for food production, horticulture and associated activities. This will restrict the land available for housing. Such activities may not be popular with residents due to noise, additional traffic and smells. Finally, there must be a high risk that the facilities for commercial use will be unused as no one will wish to rent them. This happens quite commonly in developments in Central London.

9-12. We do not understand the jargon in this section. Perhaps a concrete example could be provided.

9-13 to 9-14. This is very laudable. However, due to the relatively isolated position of Crews Hill as compared to suburban London, most journeys to work, shops and leisure facilities will be made by car. We note that no mention is made for the provision of parking space for residents or commercial activities.

9-15 to 9-16. This is a crucial point. Such a development will require a health centre, schools, shops and recreational facilities such as a gym. For example, will a large supermarket be provided ? Will there be a secondary school? Provision of these will reduce the land available for residential development. Additionally there will be increased traffic from users of these facilities from areas outside Crews Hill.

9-17. Encouraging people to grow their own food is a good idea but the provision of land for allotments and similar will mean less land available for development. In reality, the pressure that will be applied by developers to maximise their profit will result in only a token allocation of land for community food growing.

In summary, we do believe there is scope for a modest development of Crews Hill using existing brown field sites improving the area by the provision of good quality housing with some additional facilities and better integration with the Green Belt. However, we think the proposal for the 3000 unit "sustainable settlement at Crews Hill rooted in the existing identity and function of Crews Hill as a distinctive part of Enfield, and of London" as described in 3.9.5 is totally impracticable. We note that there has been no attempt to quantify any aspect of this project including land use, population increase and traffic

growth. In fact, much of the proposal consists of planning jargon and nebulous aspirations. In practice, we expect such a development will result in the destruction of a large part of the Green Belt in this area and its replacement by densely packed housing with minimal facilities as can be seen in the Chase Farm Development.