
We are writing to object to Enfield Council's Draft Local Plan as approved on 8th June 2021.

In summary, we are objecting to the part of the Green Belt proposed for development, the encouragement of tall buildings within sensitive locations and the plan to build another 30,000 homes by 2039.

1. Green Belt Development (Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80, Concept Plan Figure 3.10), (Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, Figure 3.11), (SA45, page 364), (SA54, page 374)

London became the world's first National Park City in 2019. It has a number of aims, including

- a city which protects the core network of parks and green spaces and where buildings and public spaces aren't defined only by stone, brick, concrete, glass and steel,
- a city which is greener in the long-term than it is today and where people and nature are better connected.

We understand that the London National Park City Foundation has already written to the Council Leader, and we agree with their comments, *"As London National Park City is also about the entirety of London, not just the parks, green spaces and Green Belt, the London Borough of Enfield and all Local Planning Authorities in London should be examining the entire urban fabric and should avoid using National Park City as a bargaining chip to justify loss of Green Belt and green space"*.

Our objection is that the Green Belt is gradually being eroded yet was specifically introduced to prevent the lands being developed so that the residents and public could enjoy the countryside. The draft local plan is suggesting extensive development of the Green Belt lands yet it is part of the positive heritage environment of the borough. Much of the history of Enfield is linked to the Enfield Chase area.

With regard to the specific proposal for 3,000 or more new houses in Crews Hill, the roads in and around that area are already regularly congested, consequently adding further housing will only increase the traffic and pollution and we would argue the proposal is simply not feasible.

Please also see our further comments below on traffic congestion and housing targets.

2. Tall Buildings (Policy DE6 (pages 156-160) & SA2 Palace

Gardens Shopping Centre page 321).

We have previously lodged with the Council our objections to more tall buildings in the Borough, particularly in Enfield Town.

In summary, our objections are that tall buildings as planned would bring further traffic congestion to the area and spoil the appearance of the central shopping area in Enfield. Furthermore, we understood that the Council was moving away from adding tall buildings, due largely to the social and maintenance problems associated with such a dense concentration of people, and tower blocks in Edmonton have already been demolished as a result, having been proved to be unsuccessful.

The plan to build more tower blocks therefore seems at odds with previous Council decisions and actions taken.

3. Housing Targets (Policy SP H1 (pages 183-185 section 8.1))

We are concerned at the plans for over 30,000 new homes in the area by 2039. Whilst this may be a target which is imposed by Central Government, we feel adequate support services must be in place to cope with the increase in local residents.

For example, it is essential that arrangements must be made for the re-opening of the A&E at Chase Farm Hospital (Barnet & North Mid Hospitals are already struggling to cope with existing numbers). Also, adequate schooling and nursery places must be available and resources at emergency services (police, fire, ambulance) and GP surgeries need to be increased as these are all finding it difficult to maintain their services even now.

All the issues arising from the previous paragraph need to be addressed and agreed as part of the local plan and put into place as part of the work to meet any large-scale planned housing in Enfield.

At the time of writing, we are not aware that any of the foregoing concerns are being addressed or even considered, and hence we strongly object to the plans for the 30,000 new homes.