

Dear Sirs,

Chase Park SP PL 10 Pages 80-87 Figure 3.11.

I object to 3,000 houses being earmarked for some of the most beautiful countryside the borough has and on agricultural land (Vicarage Farm) when the growing population are going to need food more than houses. How is this making Enfield a green borough if you are taking away a large part of the countryside next to the historic site of Trent Park. The area you wish to build on will not help the indigenous population who you are supposedly building these homes for as the area is very expensive so the average cost of a home up there will be over £800,000 so all you will do is bring more outsiders into the borough so how is that going to help local residents. More homes mean more infrastructure is required and that is something that is remiss in the plans. Sustainable suburban extension joining on to the limited amenities in this area, where are all the additional amenities for these people?. The schools and hospitals are full now so how are they going to cope with the mass additional footfall. No foresight for the future and the existing residents on how there area will change into a massive housing estate. How are you going to be a green borough that the Council keeps citing if you get rid of a large chunk of the countryside. The Council is very naive if they think these new residents won't have a car and are going to walk and cycle everywhere so you are encouraging more congestion on the roads around this area together with more pollution so how is this going to make the borough carbon neutral.

Crews Hill SP PL9 Pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10

I object to the 3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill. Part of the redevelopment is currently occupied by the various nurseries and other businesses and if these disappear you will be destroying yet another amenity for the residents of Enfield who support these local businesses along Cattlegate Road. There is no infrastructure to sustain this development as a whole as the existing transport links will not cope with the additional footfall. No mention of how the Council in the plans intend to blend in possible up to 10,000 new people who will need to use the local amenities. How does the Council intend to address this problem when our hospitals, schools and doctors surgeries are full to capacity. There is only one road in and out of Crews Hill so the traffic is going to be horrendous with more pollution and the Council are living in cloud cuckoo land if they think people are going to walk and cycle everywhere. The Council are going to destroy yet another of the greenest areas of the borough by also having the option to build a further 4,500 homes with no infrastructure in place on Green Belt which is home to so many species of wildlife. Green Belt is sacrosanct and should be preserved for future generations not to be used for the Council as a quick fix. Once it's gone it's gone and it's not fair on the younger generation to take away the countryside which everyone should be able to enjoy, not just the people who will be moving into very expensive housing, again the vast majority of the indigenous population will not be in a financial position to buy these properties so all the Council will be doing is encouraging people from outside the borough so this doesn't help residents who "are finding it difficult to find decent and affordable homes in Enfield" does it?

Sainsbury's Green Lanes N21 SA32 Page 351

I object to the redevelopment of this site. To build 299+ homes on a site means that the Council will have to allow a tall building which according to the Council's own website "Developing a Local Plan that will stop Skyscrapers in inappropriate locations" so how can you plonk a massive development right in the middle of a residential area which is mainly houses. It will be such an eyesore and block out much of the light and is totally not in keeping with the surrounding area. The development will have to enter and exit on to Green Lanes as the surrounding Roads Fernleigh, Haslemere, Arundel Gardens, Arlow and Orpington are congested as it is at the moment. Also is this not going to affect the Council's beloved cycle route which is right outside Sainsbury's in Green Lanes. Again extra pollution with more cars on the road. Where are the local community going to shop for food. You can hardly walk or cycle to the A10 so more pollution as a car will be necessary to do the weekly shop. Are the Council going to acknowledge that there are Covenants on this site or just brush them aside like Sainsbury's and Haringey Council have.

In conclusion on reading the Plan I feel the Council have taken the easy option. I cannot understand how the Council can be proud to say they are a green borough and want to be carbon neutral when they want to build on what has to be the most beautiful countryside in the borough. Under no circumstances should the Green Belt be built on. The Green Belt is sacrosanct and should be protected for future generations like it has been in the past, what right does this Council have to take this away from future generations.

None of the supermarket sites that serve the communities of Enfield should be redeveloped. Where is everyone supposed to shop for food? If Enfield Council is serious about being the greenest borough and carbon neutral then it needs to rethink this plan as it is contradicting itself. More homes being built in affluent areas is not going to ease the "housing crisis" all it will do is bring more people into Enfield as the majority of the local population can't afford these homes. More importantly Enfield Council is relying on the existing infrastructure and amenities to be able to cope with the influx of all these new people who will put yet another strain on an already overburdened system. Enfield Council needs to look at building affordable housing in the more deprived areas in the borough to bring about regeneration.

