

Thank you for the opportunity to reply to this important consultation for Enfield.

I am replying to this consultation by email as the formal online consultation is designed in such a way it is too confusing to know where to insert my comments. I do not believe that this consultation has been effectively communicated to the residents of Enfield. The sheer size and complexity of the document and the required consultation process is likely to limit the level of response. It is difficult to find out specific proposals for individual localities. The Future Enfield leaflet sent to households further does not communicate that what Enfield Council is proposing is counter to the Mayor of London's strategic objectives of protecting the green belt and focusing housing development on smaller BrownField sites.

While I support the need for housing to meet Enfield's current and future housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to allow development of the Green Belt for housing or other purposes. I believe that there are alternatives available to meet housing targets and that the Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations. It is too valuable to lose for all the many environmental, ecological, economic, public health and other reasons that have been identified, especially during the recent pandemic. The Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan. The loss of these sites would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough.

I disagree with the option (Medium Growth 1) selected by Enfield Council. The Green Belt should not be given up as it will never be regained. Once it's gone it's gone. This option fails to protect what residents value and what makes the Borough attractive both to residents and those outside the Borough. The Green Belt is vital and needs protecting at all costs and fought for rather than being offered up immediately. The damage this will do to the landscape is irreparable.

My preferred option would be Medium Growth 2 which provides the same number of homes, considers itself future proof and releases no Green Belt. The Green Belt is and should continue to be protected.

**Please apply these objections to ALL the relevant sections of the Local Plan.**

Whilst I agree with the policy of development of smaller brownfield sites within the borough, I am concerned about the inclusion of the following sites as potential areas for development:

- Policy SP PL 10 – pages 80 to 87. Giving up farmland which could be used to grow local crops goes against modern thinking of producing locally. While the rest of the country is moving forwards, Enfield Council is proposing to take Enfield backwards. Self sufficiency is a strength never more so than now during these times of a pandemic and the supposed impact of Brexit on supplies and delivery.

- Blue and Green Strategy. How can the same plan build on 7% of the Green Belt, whilst at the same time aiming to make Enfield London's greenest borough with its ten-year Blue and Green Strategy. This Strategy will only eat up funds that the Council doesn't have and will need to borrow to implement. We need to keep and protect what Green Belt we have already. Not destroy and borrow to bring us back to further back than where we started. Remember mature trees and landscape and the benefits they provide cannot easily be replaced, if ever.
- Policy SP PL 9 – pages 77 – Giving up Crews Hill, a major asset to Enfield, will have a devastating effect on Enfield as a whole. Crews Hill has its own identity, it is an area of garden centres, visited by residents from the Borough and from outside the Borough from far and wide. Keen and not so keen gardeners visit as it has something for everyone. It is a very positive place and is a tourist attraction not just a retail venue. I am categorically against the plans to build 7,500 homes in place of the garden centres and Crews Hill golf course.
- SA Palace Gardens Shopping Centre. The local plan identifies that Enfield Town has a unique character, the plans for Enfield Town only erode the character and do nothing to enhance it. Enfield Town has an historic market aspect, to alter the skyline with high rise residences and re-routing traffic to alter the current ringway will be damaging to the identity of the area and the historic value. Better use should be made of the Civic Centre, a high rise which is an eyesore. However, since it is already built, why can this not be repurposed for residential, before damaging Enfield Palace Gardens. The plans for Enfield Town have not been thought through.
- SA20 ASDA Southgate. This is a major supermarket which supplies Southgate and Winchmore Hill. I do not agree with the plan to give up the existing space, including car parking to residential and commercial areas. Car parking needs to be protected as it is a necessity to be able to transport heavy shopping home. Active travel, either by bike, cargo bike or on foot does not replace a motorised vehicle. It surely cannot be expected for shoppers to take their shopping home by bike? Even for healthy, active people it would be impossible in these days where people do one big shop for the week or even less, owing to time constraints and wanting to limit travel. Just think about the shoppers with small children, the shoppers buying a lot of heavy items (bottles, tins), not to mention the elderly or infirm where the problem is magnified. This is absolutely not realistic. Is the council's ultimate intention for shoppers to order their food shopping online for it to be delivered, in which case this cancels out the reason for banning the car. Or could it be that the council want to encourage shoppers to do smaller shops but more often. Again unrealistic for some people.
- SA22 Marks and Spencer's Southgate. This is another supermarket which supplies Southgate and Winchmore Hill. I do not agree with the plan to give up the existing space, including car parking to residential and commercial areas. Car parking needs to be protected as it is a necessity to be able to transport heavy shopping home. Active travel, either by bike, cargo bike or on foot does not replace a motorised vehicle. It surely cannot be expected for shoppers to take their shopping home by bike? This is not realistic for most people.
- SA32 Sainsburys Green Lanes. There is a covenant on this plot to retain 40% of the site as public green space, the plan has no mention of such greenery, why would this be?) I do not agree with the plan to give up the existing space, including car parking to residential and commercial areas. Car parking needs to be protected as it is a necessity to be able to transport heavy shopping home. Active travel, either by bike, cargo bike or on foot does not replace a motorised vehicle. It surely cannot be expected for shoppers to take their shopping home by bike? Even for healthy, active people it would be impossible in these days where people do one big shop for the week or even less, owing to time constraints and wanting to limit travel. Just think about the shoppers with small children, the shoppers buying a lot of heavy items (bottles, tins), not to mention the elderly or infirm where the problem is magnified. This is absolutely not realistic. Is the council's ultimate intention for shoppers to order their food shopping online for it to be delivered, in which case this cancels out the reason for banning the car. Or could it be that the council want to encourage shoppers to do smaller shops but more often. Again unrealistic for some people.
- SA42 Fords Grove car park. Traders have already lost a significant amount of on street parking, through the construction of the A105 cycle lanes. The New River development will generate an additional parking requirement, as will the former Travis Perkins site to be redeveloped shortly. Any

development will result in over-population, no supporting infrastructure and even more congested roads.

- Firs Farm Recreation Ground (p380) has been designated as a site for a crematorium, with no recognition in the Local Plan of its ecological and community significance; especially as there are plans to build a community hub on this location.
- RE1-RE4 – I do not agree with any homes being built on Green Belt designated land or redefining Green Belt designated land.
- And one last point on the consultation that I would like noted, questions 30 to 33, very specific questions on renewable energy, climate change and greenhouse gases. Seriously, how are these ever questions for a local plan consultation, they are better suited for an essay or study group. From these you will get a skewed total response as only those with extreme views will answer but the majority won't – e.g. Q30 'Is % over Part L the right measure for reducing greenhouse gas emissions?' – I don't even know what that means! Just ridiculous.

The plan does not take into consideration the lifestyle changes which Covid has brought for Londoners. Working from home is likely to be a means which significant parts of the workforce will adopt going forward. This is likely to see people want to achieve more with their money, in terms of home buying, by moving out of the more expensive areas like London. London housing may not be so as in demand as previous estimates may suggest.

Enfield Council should focus on providing homes in those properties and spaces already sold or being developed, e.g. the police station on Green Lanes next to Sainsbury's, how long has that been left empty? Or our high streets where many businesses lie empty, these could be converted to residential use. Or Meridian Water, this is not finished, indeed hardly started, so many years after initiation and advertisement, once completed this will provide more homes cancelling out the need to build on sites of historic and social importance. Enfield Council need to think harder not go for quick damaging fixes and blight the Borough!

The comments provided in this response to the consultation are my own views.