

---

I have read Enfield Council's proposals for the local plan and wish to comment as follows:

- Firstly, as a general comment, the draft plan has been issued as a 400+ page document written in technical planning terms which the layman may not fully understand, nor have the time to digest. A resident-friendly version of the document should be produced with such items as an executive summary at the front. Failure to properly engage the local community will be high on the list of legal challenges when the time arises.

- Section 2.4.2 Strategic Policy SP SS1: Spatial Strategy.

I object to the proposal to target Green Belt land at Chase Park (a name which you appear to have invented AKA Vicarage Farm) and Crews Hill for housing and industrial development.. There is no compelling reason to release land on the Green Belt, as brownfield sites in the borough more than adequately cover the need for future housing. The Green Belt was designated in these areas for reasons (e.g. urban sprawl, lungs of London) which have not changed over time, and thus Enfield Council has no right to "chip away" at these areas to the detriment of the local community.

Destruction of sections of Enfield's Green Belt will lead to the irreversible loss of open countryside along with a significant negative impact on the local environment and ecology. There may also be harmful impacts to the health and wellbeing of the local population.

As we engage with climate change we must also protect pervious surfaces to support natural drainage and protect against flooding - the destruction of hundreds of acres of Green Belt countryside is clearly taking an opposite path.

Point 7. "Crews Hill will be regenerated ... to form a sustainable rural gateway settlement providing access to countryside activities and the surrounding mosaic of green and blue spaces and networks". What does this mean in plain English? Enfield residents already have access to the countryside at Crews Hill and thus there is no requirement to invent a rural gateway. In fact, the existing gateway will be destroyed by the Enfield Council proposals. What are "blue spaces and networks?". I object to this statement and its aims.

Point 8. "Chase Park will provide a deeply green extension to the urban area.....". What does this mean? The removal of Green Belt designation to provide housing does not constitute delivering something "deeply green". These are fantasy words deliberately inserted by Enfield Planners in an attempt to mislead the reader. I object to this statement and its aims.

Point 9. What are the Borough employment needs? I can see no reference to evidence? I object to this statement and its aims.

Point 12. Plans for recreation and sporting excellence are noted here. There is no detail. Enfield Council are currently converting a public park and pay-to-play golf course (Whitewebbs) to a private leasing model, restricting public access. The golf course has already been permanently closed, thus decreasing any "plans for sporting excellence". There are clear contradictions in Enfield Council's approach which lead to extreme doubt about the delivery of such items in the draft plan.

Point 13. "The Green Belt will be protected.....". Irony at its very best. I object to this statement.

- Section PL9 3.9 Crews Hill

Figure 3.10 Crews Hill Concept Plan. There is no key/legend to this diagram and as such it is meaningless. I object to the current format of this diagram.

Strategic Policy SP PL9 Point 9 - This indicates that additional stopping trains at Crews Hill station would be required, thus the assumption must be that more people (hundreds in rush hours) would board at this station. It is a fact that trains to London on this line are already full in the rush hour by the time they reach Winchmore Hill and thus it cannot be assumed that there is any additional available capacity. What analysis has taken place with Great Northern Rail? If none, I object to this section.

Strategic Policy SP PL9 Point 11 - "Retention of existing rural uses is considered important .... including horticulture". This draft plan seeks to allow all existing garden centres and greenhouse facilities to be demolished in favour of housing. The statement is disingenuous and should be removed. I object to this section.

I can see no reference in this section to the plan to release Crews Hill Golf Course for development. Why is this not mentioned? I object to the omission of this topic.

As an overall comment, I object to the release of Green Belt land within Crews Hill for housing or industrial development. The Green Belt was designated in these areas for reasons (e.g. urban sprawl, lungs of London) which have not changed over time, and thus Enfield Council has no right to "chip away" at these areas to the detriment of the local community.

Destruction of sections of Enfield's Green Belt will lead to the irreversible loss of open countryside along with a significant negative impact on the local environment and ecology. There may also be harmful impacts to the health and wellbeing of the local population.

As we engage with climate change we must also protect pervious surfaces to support natural drainage and protect against flooding - the destruction of hundreds of acres of Green Belt countryside is clearly taking an opposite path.

- Section 3.10 Chase Park

Figure 3.11 Chase Park Concept Plan. There is no key/legend to this diagram and as such it is meaningless. I object to the current format of this diagram.

Section 3.10.8 - Vicarage Farm and its surroundings are already a gateway to the local countryside. Housing developments in Chase Park will not enhance this gateway and will destroy hundreds of acres of Green Belt land. Thus an "opportunity" to develop a gateway is not needed, it is already there. This statement is disingenuous and should be removed.

As an overall comment, I object to the release of Green Belt land within "Chase Park" for housing or industrial development. The Green Belt was designated in these areas for reasons (e.g. urban sprawl, lungs of London) which have not changed over time, and thus Enfield Council has no right to "chip away" at these areas to the detriment of the local community. Destruction of sections of Enfield's Green Belt will lead to the irreversible loss of open countryside along with a significant negative impact on the local environment and ecology. There may also be harmful impacts to the health and wellbeing of the local population.

As we engage with climate change we must also protect pervious surfaces to support natural drainage and protect against flooding - the destruction of

hundreds of acres of Green Belt countryside is clearly taking an opposite path.

- Section 12.4 Strategic Policy SP CL4: Promoting Sporting Excellence

This section makes many referrals to the expansion of the Tottenham Hotspur FC training ground. Since building their existing training ground, THFC have contributed very little to the Borough. Local employment is negligible. The land that they have developed is sealed off from the public. It is also the case that THFC are in violation of their last planning permission from 2017 (17/01178/FUL) in that they have failed to deliver their Section 106 legal obligations. Why would any right-thinking Council enter into further agreements with such an organisation? I object to the expansion of the Tottenham Hotspur training ground.

12.4.1 - This refers to Enfield offering “unrivalled access to sporting attractions including .... golf courses (e.g. Whitewebbs Park)”. This is, of course, palpable nonsense given that Enfield Council have recently permanently closed Whitewebbs Golf Course, and have designated Crews Hill Golf Course as a target for housing development within this very plan. The statement in this section appears to confirm that, in terms of strategies for sport in the Borough, there is no coherent approach. I object to the content of this section.

12.4.4 - What is a “sport village”. There is no evidence of any villages at Enfield Playing Fields or Firs Farm. Indeed, the changing facilities at the latter were condemned three years ago circa 2018 and Enfield Council have manifestly failed to deliver new facilities, indicating a zero level of commitment. The changing facilities and pitches at Enfield Playing Fields are extremely sub-standard, indicating a lack of investment priority from Enfield Council.

In addition, the THFC training facility has little or no public access and cannot possibly be itemised as “improving the health and well-being of residents”. All in all, a nonsensical set of statements in this part of the plans in an attempt to impress the casual reader. I object to this section in the strongest terms.

12.4.5 - Expansion of the THFC training facility does not “preserve the openness of the Green Belt” and as such is not appropriate development. I object to this section.

Aside from the specific points mentioned above, independent surveys of Enfield performed by Enfield Roadwatch, The Enfield Society, and The Campaign to Protect Rural England strongly suggest that brown field sites are available to meet future housing demands for the foreseeable future, and no release of Green Belt land is needed. Enfield Council must engage fully with the aforementioned organisations and local residents to examine these areas in greater detail than has been done thus far.