

# NATIONAL PARK CITY FOUNDATION\*

Councillor Nesil Caliskan  
 Leader  
 London Borough of Enfield  
 Civic Centre  
 Silver Street  
 London EN1 3XA

By email

14 July 2021

Dear Councillor Caliskan,

## London Borough of Enfield and London National Park City

We write on behalf of the National Park City Foundation, the charity behind London National Park City to point out recent remarks which we consider misappropriate and misrepresent London National Park City and its status, and to ask that you and Council colleagues rectify so that future references to London National Park City and its aims and status are accurate.

We should be pleased to meet you and colleagues to explain the points in this letter. Equally, should there be any questions arise we should be pleased to discuss and clarify those to overcome any misunderstandings and reach a position where we can work together productively.

Our concerns centre on the London Borough of Enfield's preferred option to de-designate considerable areas of London Green Belt for housing and its use of London National Park City in justifying and making the case for that policy.

As we understand the proposal, the London Borough of Enfield has justified its proposed loss to development of Green Belt in the borough on the basis that remaining Green Belt would be improved as part of London National Park City.

That is a misreading of London National Park City, which is about the entire urban realm and fabric, not just parks, green spaces. We appeared at the Examination in Public (EiP) into the new London Plan in defence of London's Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Space, attending the same session as Enfield Council representatives. It should therefore be clear to anyone at Enfield Council that London National Park City does not support the loss of green space not least Green Belt. It is therefore misleading for the London Borough of Enfield to refer to London National Park City in writing or verbally as part of justifying its proposals for the loss of Green Belt.

We note numerous references in Enfield Council's Local Plan to London National Park City including the dedicated policy 3.7 on page 70, which we would normally be pleased to see. While the Council's proposals for the restoration of Enfield Chase appear laudable and the planned enhancements for public access seem ambitious, they are not a justification for the loss of Green Belt, which we do not support, and which both government planning policy and the new London Plan aim to avoid.

Paragraph 3.8.8 on page 71 of the Enfield Local Plan states that "The designation is not strictly a national park...". To be both clear and correct, London National Park City has no formal planning or legal status and neither has nor seeks the kind of planning role of the established National Parks.

Any comparison with England's 10 National parks established in law is only valid in terms of applying the kind of thinking at the heart of National Parks to start reversing London's declining environmental conditions which have a bearing on learning, health, fitness, recreation and community. Planning policies must start improving life in London, including protecting and restoring nature and ecosystems, not finding new ways to justify deliberate choices to allow their further erosion.

A place you can enjoy. A vision you can share. A movement you can join.