

I provide comments on the Draft Local Plan approved by full Council on 8 June. My comments refer to the Chapter heading (for example, 3. Place) and to the specific page and section numbers within a Chapter

### **Chapter 3, Place, p37**

**Of the ten placemaking areas, I refer, specifically to two, SP PL9, Crews Hill, p76, and to SP PL10, Chase Park, p82.**

These areas both encompass current green belt land which must be protected according to the London Plan. While I understand the concern of Enfield to create sufficient homes of appropriate size and nature to satisfy the need for new housing in the borough, these proposals should be rejected while large areas of open green space within the borough that are not part of green belt land remain ignored for new housing.

I refer, in particular, to golf courses that provide access and recreation to a very small minority of the borough's population and exclude everyone else. If golf courses were parks, they could provide access and recreation to fifty to one hundred times more people than they do at present.

Both Bush Hill Park Golf Club and Enfield Golf Club are within urban Enfield. Each have only a few hundred members and there is little doubt that a single golf course could accommodate all the golfers who want to play.

It is totally out of order that Enfield considers building on green belt land while ignoring the potential of at least one local golf course to be repurposed for housing. The locations of both these courses are close to Enfield Town and would make sustainable travel an obvious option for new residents of houses built upon them. It should be easily possible to maintain parts of a course to provide an attractive 'green' setting for any housing development.

**SP PL9 and SP PL10 must be rejected until Enfield seriously considers the potential for new housing on one or more of the golf courses within its boundaries.**

### **Chapter 10, Town centres and high streets, p243**

#### **10.1 Strategic Policy SP TC1: Promoting town centres, p244**

Para 10.1.2 states:

*There is a need to ensure that town centres remain adaptable in the face of challenges to UK high streets. Whilst retail will be needed in town centres, it is also crucial that we seek to ensure that centres are able to evolve and adapt over time, so that they continue to support the communities in which they are situated. Town centre locations provide opportunities for the re-use of buildings, including for other commercial, cultural, leisure and community activities which help to attract visitors....*

It is vital that this perspective is kept in focus as areas such as Palace Gardens are redeveloped. The changes that are likely to be necessary within town centres in the next few decades will be as transformative as those that occurred fifty or so years ago as car-

based shopping centres and out-of-town shopping took over from town centre shopping in high streets. It is essential that multiple uses are permitted and that 'shopping' is seen as just one option for the future rather than the prime purpose of redevelopment. Creating the necessary vision will entail extensive consultation with residents and awareness of progressive changes happening elsewhere in this country and elsewhere.

### **Chapter 13, Movement and connectivity, p281**

Para 13.2, p281 states:

*Enfield is committed to meeting the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy objectives to deliver a transport network that improves the health and wellbeing of all Londoners and to achieve an 80% mode share for active and sustainable travel by 2041. To achieve this target, a significant shift towards walking, cycling and public transport use is needed over the next 20 years. Development will be expected to contribute to these aims by enhancing local active and public transport networks, and minimising need to travel through good design and location.*

We congratulate Enfield for the necessary ambition. Likewise in **Sub-Section 13.2, p284: Making active travel the natural choice**, we must support the ambition articulated in Draft Policy DM T2, p284:

*1. Development will be expected to support the healthy streets approach. Priorities will be given to measures that encourage a shift to active transport modes and an increase in cycling and walking particularly journeys under 2 kilometres, along with public transport and high-quality public realm....*

However **item b**, following is totally lacking in the necessary ambition to deliver said strategy. **There must be an articulated and specific ambition to create a network of interconnected and segregated cycle lanes across the borough so that cycling is a first option for anyone who wishes to cycle.** At present, the changes that must be made to enable the desired 80% mode share for active and sustainable travel are not present in the Plan. Without a network of interconnected and segregated cycle lanes across the borough the ambition for active travel is just wishful thinking. The "*where appropriate*" in item e (p284) is just weasel words which make this resident think that Enfield has no real ambition actually to enable sustainable travel.

I hope my concerns are not valid. The proof will lie in the actions Enfield takes to counter the baseless propaganda exercise conducted by the car lobby that aims to nullify any attempt to reduce car use or to limit where cars might be permitted. The creation of low traffic neighbourhoods as in the Fox Lane area has been an excellent start that I hope to see extended across the borough in the coming (not too many) years. As Members and Officers will be aware, private car and van use presently account for around twenty per cent of the country's greenhouse gas emissions and for a large proportion of urban pollution causing many thousands of premature deaths across London alone each year. Only via forthright action to enable active and sustainable travel can both global environmental challenges (climate change) and local environmental challenges (pollution from motor traffic) be tackled while at the same time helping residents to lead more active and healthy lives. Enfield can and should lead the way.

