

To whom it may concern,

I am a local Enfield resident and strongly oppose with many aspects of the afore mentioned Draft local plan for Enfield.

Key points of objection.

*In the light of the Government u-turn on planning laws, ie they are to be abandoned. (refer to article by George Grylls in Times) In particular the government setting of local targets will not be mandatory and the zonal system abandoned. This change is in part due to the fact that almost 244000 houses have been built in 2019-20 lessening the need for more intensive housing development of the nature proposed in Enfield's Draft plan. In light of this and the change in local demographics post Brexit (non return of EU citizens) and during the pandemic (the movement of people out of London) , the Council also needs to reconsider how much new housing is actually needed. The dropping of the Government's planning law changes now allows justified local objections to be taken into account.

*Enfield Councils Draft plan is contradictory .

The Council's draft plan to build on the Green Belt is inconsistent with the following:

To quote from Draft Plan:

*" By 2039 Enfield will be a place of growing opportunity for future generations, the green lungs of London where new homes and jobs help all residents."

Hence I oppose the Draft Plan 's proposed redesign action of large areas of the Enfields Green Belt & subsequent development on the Green Belt , Crews Hill, Vicarage Farm, between Enfield Town& Oakwood etc. The Green Belt IS the green lungs of the borough.

Nor is there any indication that the draft local plan (release of Green field areas for development) has complied with statutory requirements to comply with the London Plan and that it has been signed off by the London mayor.

This must be complied with.

* "These(proposed) green spaces, rewinding and new woodland creations play a part in reducing and mitigating climate change"

And (refer to Deeply Green Place number 11) and the creation of " new wetlands"

It is inconsistent to propose " new wetlands" while Draft Plan's proposes the development of burial grounds using some of the playing fields in the area by Firs Farm Wetlands. (refer to DM BG16) Furthermore (see SP CL 4) Firs Farm Wetlands has been identified as a contributor to the development of sport and leisure facilities

in Enfield..

I oppose the aforementioned development in or in vicinity of the Firs Farm Wetlands .

Building on the Green Belt would damage existing and much used green leisure areas.

* Proper consultation regarding flood mitigation in the borough does not appear to have been fully & comprehensively considered when making development proposals.

Areas of proposed development such as Vicarage Park Chase Park area as well as the Firs Farm crematorium/ burial ground proposal are part of the borough's Salmon Brook Flood Alleviation scheme. These upland area in north of borough are part of the soak away areas that provide essential runoff routes for water in the event of heavy downpours. (Such downpours being a likelihood with climate change and should be planned for)

I oppose any further house building & other development within Enfield until a proper consultation and assessment, regarding flood alleviation, take place with Environmental Agency and other relevant bodies .

*I support, over the next 20 years, the building on small sites (under 0.25 hectares.) see H4. The availability of figures in table 8.2 needs to be clarified as clearly there are more sites available for the building of properties over the next 20 years, buildings in keeping with rest of those in borough, ie not tower blocks

* I oppose the extensive plans for tower blocks/ tower blocks across the borough. Proposals include, amongst others include those at:
Meridian Water, Edmonton Green, Enfield Town, station, Southbury Road Silver Street, Edmonton, Cockfosters Station, Palace Gardens Southgate Circus, Enfield Chase station, Palmers Green Oakwood Station & Arnos Grove car parks, and supermarkets across the borough.

Tower blocks/ tall buildings will destroy the skyline of our beautiful borough and are not fit for purpose. most have only 1 - 2 bedrooms, no outdoor space for play and leisure. Local infrastructure, roads, schools, etc not considered in draft plan & need to be. The construction of such tall buildings is not a green policy, the opposite.

The pandemic showed the vital importance of the outdoor spaces for households of all sizes and especially for families with children. As far as I can tell there is no planning for parking spaces in these developments and this is exacerbated by the removal of many existing car parking areas. Commuters need to avail themselves of parking spaces at the borough's travel hubs.

The loss of supermarkets and other local commercial outlets such as B& Q to build tall buildings would be a great loss to the borough and myself and other residents who use and rely on them. I would have thought the Draft Plan should recognise and support local outlets as part of a thoughtful green policy.

I oppose the building of tall buildings as proposed in draft plan .

Lastly, the East West disparities within the borough are not addressed positively in the draft plan. On the contrary the proposals for tall buildings in the west where there are few at present, and building on the Green Belt represent a levelling down & not how parity should be arrived at.

I am yours sincerely,