

Although there are many issues within the local plan (jargon filled and almost incomprehensible to ordinary mortals) that I would take issue with, there are 2 major ones that stick out like a sore thumb.

#### Building on the green belt policies

Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87 - 3000 new homes on Vicarage farm (referred to as Chase Park) on the open green belt adjoining Trent Park either side of the A110. This is a very large site amounting to 140 Hectares. Comer Homes have already published a glossy brochure with proposals for 5000 homes on this site.

Policy SP PL 9, pages 77-80, figure 3.10 - 3000 new houses at Crews hill with longer term expansion.

SA 45, page 364, SA 52, Page 372, SA54, page 374, SA62, page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279.

I strongly oppose the above policies on the following grounds.

They are contrary to the Mayor of London's London Plan which states that local government deliver homes in London whilst keeping green belt boundaries that are currently in place. The statement (chapter 3 para 3.12) that 'the place-making policies have been prepared in the context of the NPPF and the London Plan' is therefore not at all accurate.

Crews Hill, which is cited as being a viable transport hub is refuted by Transport for London. TFL, in an earlier draft of the plan, stated that Crews Hill has a PTAL of from 1a to 1b (where 6b is the highest and 1a is the lowest). TFL does not believe Crews Hill is suitable for development and calls in to question the plan for building on the green belt surrounding Crews Hill station. It has not changed its position on this issue.

The green belt is a valuable asset for the good mental health and well being of Enfield residents who find it an invaluable resource, particularly in times of stress. The pandemic has only served to reinforce the necessity of available open space.

Building on the green belt is a negation of our responsibility to protect the environment and maintain and benefit the quality of life for future generations.

#### High rise buildings policies

The draft plan seems to suggest that building on the green belt will mean fewer tall buildings within the rest of the borough. However, as well as tall buildings already being approved and built, there are proposals in the draft plan to allow for their development on an even greater scale (Policy DE6, pages 156-160 and SA2 Palace shopping centre).

I strongly oppose these policies.

The proposed maximum building heights do not take into account the surrounding areas and will have a detrimental impact on the local environment. They ignore any existing conservation areas and ride roughshod over the historic relevance of many areas of Enfield, particularly Enfield Town and its environs, the majority of which is made up of low rise residential buildings.

Enfield needs family homes not one and two bedroom high rise flats, with minimal amenities and no significant outside space, aimed at a transient population.

I refer you to Boff A. Housing Typologies investigation findings (letter sent to all London councillors 2 Sep 2021). 'Our key finding is that the committee does not believe that tall buildings are the answer to London's housing needs and should not be encouraged outside of a few designated and carefully managed areas'.

Andrew Boff is the Chair of the London Assemblies Planning and Regeneration Committee.

Finally, many people's reason for living in Enfield is its enviable mix of town and country which this plan seems destined to destroy.