

For the attention of the Planning department

First of all I'm confused that I have not been able to log into or complete the New Enfield local plan survey on Enfield Council website - the login feature is disabled, I've tried several different ways.

I logged into my Enfield council account - I am resident in Enfield EN2 and Have an existing account with Enfield council to pay my council tax and refuse fees - and I can't use that login to access the survey or reply properly as instructed.

Please explain how I'm not able to complete the survey despite being resident, and how many days has the survey been closed for? and How many residents will have been excluded from responding to the consultation during that time?

My submission is via email - and includes my partner - John Slattery (email included)

We moved to Enfield because of the large green spaces, paying more to live in an area where we felt we had access to a lot of the countryside with the benefit of being able to commute to our places of work. If the plan to build on the green belt goes ahead we will move away from Enfield.

For this reason we object to 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

3.9.9

we feel all of which proposals for the the dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes describe degradation of the area, without meaningful design or masterplanning to add value - since the plans describe a significant proportion of the country parks, farming areas and golf course will be given over to commercial leisure and commercial housing, with very little affordable housing proportionately. We value the existing farmland, woodlands and golf course where we regularly walk and enjoy with our child and our friends.

It is extremely concerning that not enough is known about the Heritage considerations and archaeological priorities before decisions are being made about this - it is not sufficient information to make decisions about the development prior to completing analysis for the heritage needs - later accommodations could be costly and make the current consultation and planned developments costly and not achieve the same outcomes - to retrofit these masterplanning decisions will be more costly and confusing.

Strategic policy SP SS1 Spatial strategy response

SP SS2 making good places

we are extremely concerned about the lack of clear design for infrastructure, roads, public transport and access that the additional load industrial estates, domestic housing and commercial businesses would create extra load on the existing public infrastructure, services, roads, and the strain added population will create on public amenities.

The current situation today is that public transport is sparse and already creaking the added planned population would create greater loads that have not been addressed in the plan - what will happen to an already sparse bus network and appallingly poorly run train line - Great northern. Not to mention the disruption in the local area during construction - local

roads are already narrow and blocks and jams occur easily - the Whitewebbs and Clay hill roads from A10 to Crews hill regularly has problems and is narrow in many places. What will be the impact on local schools during construction traffic with heavy lorries and machinery? and subsequently how will the the additional needs for school places in the area be met?

2.4.11 - Green infrastructure - " Opportunities to provide green infrastructure should be taken. The aim should be to link proposed new developments with their surroundings, enhance biodiversity and create high quality private and public space."

This is woefully inadequate to describe requirements that green infrastructure should fulfil in our community. Requirements for planning alongside the measures and metrics that green infrastructure should be evaluated against - and there should be specific proportions of the infrastructure set to be green with specific outcome measures that should be met in the designs for the strategic plan across the borough.

Chase Park 3.10.9 - strategic policy SP PL10 Chase park

13. biophilic design - It is deeply concerning that you have introduced such a design concept - used in urban areas for buildings and cities to bring in opportunities to "green" - to replace an area which is already naturally wilded! No mention is made of the upkeep costs of Biophilic design and the fact that it is risky and frequently fails without the proper maintenance.

14. "high quality place spaces" - We don't need these, our children play in nature already and enjoy learning and playing in nature - they don't need more plastic designed play spaces. Enfield has a number of good forest schools, and our child's nursery at crews hill planning to gain forest accreditation. we don't support the destruction of existing green space to have 'designed' "biophilic" experiences reintroduced - it appears to be a gross waste of money - when the masterplanning on housing and support structure could be done more sensitively to leave key parts of the landscape intact, without the need to redesign 'green spaces' back into urban masterplanning.

the "placemaking" proposals don't seem to be adequately described - the 'vision' isn't sufficient to explain how the design decisions will need to balance the problems the hospital will experience in vehicle traffic, or public transport. The aspiration set out seem unachievable. And while plan mentions "Publicly accessible landscape" for Trent park it mentions nothing about accessibility to be designed for people in the disabled community.

We also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. especially to a private group (Tottenham Hotspur) which has shown zero engagement this far with the local community on their existing site. We have no faith that they will deliver on promises to the community.

We don't see why Whitewebbs couldn't have been supported sooner with people working with the community on the activities the community needs and already enjoys - especially in light of changes to working and home lives due to the pandemic, we are now working 50-100% at home when we were previously commuting into London and Hertfordshire. Enfield and our community have totally different meaning to us, it's no longer the local wildlife we are able to enjoy on weekends, we are walking every day and working in the community to contribute to care for local spaces.

We see no detail on the Whitewebbs golf course plan to reassure us that we will still have our outdoor leisure needs met in enfield. And again we don't see why we should be asked to consider the design of these areas that has not incorporated the impact on the Heritage assets and archaeological analysis

Please acknowledge that this email has been received and will be included in the consultation feedback - since we are incredibly concerned that we have been unable to add our voice on the Enfield council Survey website due to the log in not working, or not providing clear instructions about log in requirements (did I need to make a separate new

password - this wasn't specified! very poor User experience.)