

Dear Enfield Council

Response to Draft Local Plan Consultation

I am writing in response to the draft local plan.

The plan includes a significant amount of content and is supported by a large number of additional documents that are described as an 'evidence base' (many of which have been updated in 2021). The length, depth and complexity of this compendium of materials, which runs to well over a thousand pages, makes it extremely difficult for members of the public to read, process and respond. I am sure that this not a deliberate approach by the Council, but I am concerned that many members of the public, who would have ordinarily responded to such an important consultation, have been deterred in responding.

Specifically, I am writing to 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 de-designation 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.

I also object to the following policies:

- SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement.
- Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.
- To the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321 which propose areas for and the acceptable height of tall buildings which, in many cases would mar the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

I wish to make a specific point in relation to the potential development of Crews Hill. The placemaking plans for Crews Hill suggest that the golf course could be at risk of development. This is a historic golf course, designed by one of the great golf course architects of this country, Harry Colt. In addition, Enfield Council's Mark Bradbury (Director of Property & Economy) report on the future of Whitewebbs Golf Course from March 2021 cited the following:

'There are several other courses in the borough, including three owned by the Council, and more in the surrounding area that offer opportunities for golfers and prospective golfers to enjoy or take up the sport.'

The development of Crews Hill Golf Course (one of the three cited in Bradbury's report) following the closure of Whitewebbs Golf Course would clearly significantly restrict continued opportunities for local residents to participate in golf, a healthy recreational activity and partially undermine the original justification for the closure of Whitewebbs.

Lastly, the current plan fails to acknowledge important strategic proposals in the south-east of England such as the development of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. Schemes such as the 'Arc' envisage significant place-making and have important implications for London Boroughs, including Enfield. The implications of these proposals on the population projections used within the Local Plan should be understood and various scenario-based models should be constructed to model their impact on current population projections and housing need.