

---

Dear Enfield Council

I wanted express my severe concerns and register my response regarding the recently released local plan for Enfield.

I am shocked at the proposed level of increased housing being proposed for the borough in general, and specifically how huge swathes of green belt countryside are being targeted for development to meet these housing needs.

Firstly, I question whether the housing requirement is as high as is suggested in the local plan. My understanding is that the London Plan 2021 projects figures towards the lower end of those mentioned in the Enfield Local plan (circa 18,000) and certainly comes nowhere near “high growth” figure of 55,000 mentioned in the plan. It makes me wonder whether the 55,000 figure was only included to make the planned for 25,000 seem reasonable in comparison. I also question whether these projected housing figures have been flexed downwards for the potential impact of Brexit and consequent reduction in immigration and therefore housing needs for the borough.

Secondly, and more importantly, the plan to meet the housing requirements involves massive development of green space, particularly around Enfield Chase either side of the A110 and around the Crews Hill area. These areas are protected green belt land, they provide welcome open spaces that are used for a variety of recreational and agricultural purposes, and are of course a haven for all types of wildlife. There are stunning views across these fields and woods from many vantage points in the borough that will of course be destroyed if 1000's of houses are built there. Also, in this era of global warming and promises by central government to tackle climate change, it seems ludicrous to meet housing requirements by bulldozing huge areas of fields and forests. Of course, the disruption to the local residential areas would be enormous while works are ongoing also. Even something as small as temporary lights near the Jolly Farmers pub has recently caused massive traffic jams from Oakwood Station to Enfield Chase station. I can only imagine what disruption would be caused in the local area by such major works going on for years and the noise and traffic pollution that would ensue.

Furthermore, as far as I can see, there is no mention of how additional schooling and healthcare requirements would be met in the vicinity of the large proposed developments in Enfield Chase and Crews Hill. With 1000s of houses in one specific area comes the need for 1000s of school places, doctors surgeries, leisure facilities, etc, etc. The existing infrastructure clearly could not handle the additional numbers of residents, so does that mean that further development of greenbelt will then be required to add more schools for example?

I know that there are numerous brownfield sites throughout the borough that are currently

sitting empty and unutilised. I cycle regularly past vast tracts of empty concreted over land towards the east of the borough towards the River Lea. There are also many opportunities to develop smaller brownfield plots throughout the borough. With this in mind, why the plan put forward recommends a “solution” to the housing requirements that involves destruction of green belt land is beyond me. Perhaps it is just easier/cheaper/more profitable to develop on large green belt areas rather than redevelop on existing brownfield sites?

Thank you for your time