



## Enfield RoadWatch

**We are fighting to save Enfield's Green Belt and to promote affordable homes on brownfield sites, where people need them most.**

**The Local Plan examination process is still under way. Read on for an update and to learn what else you can do to help save Enfield's Green Belt.**

Dear Supporters

During the past few weeks, we and The Enfield Society have been working with the Local Plan team and the government Planning Inspector's Programme Officer to include as many of the missing representations as we can. It seems that 2,659 were missing from those submitted up to 10am on May 20 alone. These were all backed up by hard copies, which were delivered to the Civic Centre at 3pm on May 20. We are reasonably confident that these will all be included in the next version of the index and consultation statement when they come out. More than 650 representations were submitted after 10am on May 20 and we won't know until the next index release how many of those are included. We will do our best to rectify any omissions from that set but it may be harder without proof of submission. If you submitted your representation after 10am on May 20 and find that yours is not included in the next index and, crucially, if you have an email proving that it was sent before the deadline, please let us know and we'll let you know what to do. [We'll let you know once the new index has been released and provide further information on how you can check your submission has been received]

In the meantime, there are a number of other issues which need your input, please. You'll find more information on all the following later in the newsletter:

1. The council is consulting on locations for Traveller sites in the borough. The Traveller Local Plan [Regulation 18] consultation runs until **5pm on November 4**. We have concerns about the proposed locations and suggestions for more appropriate locations. More information below.
2. Fairview New Homes, which manages the fields south of Enfield Road for the Diocese of London and which has an option to develop the land, has submitted a planning application for work to the trees, which have Tree Preservation Orders, and other vegetation. While this sounds benign, the proposed work will reduce the biodiversity in the fields and should be objected to, **as soon as possible**. More information below.
3. Not related to the Green Belt but a similar assault on the communities of Enfield we know and love is the council's proposal to close 8 of the borough's libraries. There is a consultation and two petitions under way about this. The consultation deadline is **5pm on November 14**. More information below.

We'll be back in touch when we have any updates.

Thanks for your continued support. Together we are stronger!

Ian D'Souza  
Chair

---

**Traveller Local Plan consultation  
Deadline 5pm November 4**

This survey can be completed by emailing a response to [travellerlocalplan@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:travellerlocalplan@enfield.gov.uk) or by completing the survey at <https://letstalk.enfield.gov.uk/traveller-local-plan/surveys/traveller-local-plan-questionnaire>. You will need to be registered to use the survey [And, yes, there is a typo in the link!]

Here is the background. Enfield will require 30 permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches, as well as a transit pitch to accommodate at least 15 caravans simultaneously, during the plan-period i.e. up to 2041. The Council originally considered 11 sites from which they have chosen 5. Those 5 will deliver in excess of 52 pitches, so far more than is required.

Two of the sites are the proposed new residential developments at Vicarage Farm [Chase Park - TLP-10] and Crews Hill [TLP-11]. No specific locations have been proposed so the suitability cannot be assessed. However, the landowner of Chase Park has not agreed to include Traveller pitches so Chase Park should be excluded. With regard to Crews Hill, the Council owns some land that might be suitable but, without knowing if that's the site they are proposing for a Traveller Site, it is impossible to assess the location at this stage.

Part of Edmonton Skate Park on the A10 is also proposed [TLP-09]. This site seems inappropriate because of traffic concerns, including large caravans entering and exiting the site, the small size of the site, and the noise and pollution from the A10.

There is also a site on The Ridgeway near to St John's School [TLP-03]. This site is problematic for the following reasons: the speed of the traffic in that location, which is known for accidents; the site's remoteness from public transport and amenities; the configuration of the site and the fact that it is Green Belt.

The former tree nursery at Bulls Cross [TLP-01] is the final site under consideration. The main objection to this site is the impact on the surrounding conservation area and the narrow road system.

Suitable sites must be found for the required number of pitches but we do not believe that the Council has proposed the most appropriate. Meridian Water is close to road and public transport networks and amenities and could provide space for a permanent or transit site. For the same reasons, land in the Southbury placemaking area could be set aside. Or land in the Brimsdown area. Additional sites around the borough that are close to road networks, public transport and amenities are also being proposed by our partner organisations.

Please have your say on this one!

---

### **Fairview planning application** **Please respond as soon as possible**

Fairview New Homes recently submitted a planning application for work on trees in the Enfield Road fields that they have managed for the London Diocese for over 10 years. We use the word 'managed' loosely as the fields have largely been allowed to re-wild, except for the grazing of a few horses. It therefore seems suspicious that this application comes just after we submitted the fields as a potential site for the GLA's Local Nature Recovery Strategy and included the habitat survey that was completed last year, which suggested sufficient biodiversity for the fields to be considered as a Local Wildlife Site [SINC].

There are issues with the application as follows:

- The trees are allegedly dead and in danger of collapse. Their removal is allegedly to “enable the retained trees and hedgerows, as well as grazing land, to develop” (see Statement of Reasons). However the map provided (see Sketch Plan) shows four of the five trees in the middle of open space, posing no impediment to retained trees or hedgerows.
- According to the application form, where work is to be carried out on a protected tree, the applicant is “required to provide written arboricultural advice or other diagnostic information from an appropriate expert”. This is not supplied.

Our ecologist believes the work is effectively land clearance to reduce the likelihood of any significant biodiversity being retained or encouraged. It will simply make the area a little

easier to build on.

Scrub is a valuable asset for birds and invertebrates. Unfortunately it is the wrong time of year to insist on breeding bird surveys being carried out. It might increase the amount of land available for horses to graze but it will significantly decrease the biodiversity value. It has nothing to do with safety.

How rigorous were the tree surveys? The brevity and lack of detail regarding structural and physiological conditions of the trees mentioned in the documents imply that they were not. All tree work recommended should be carried out to the industry standard of BS 3998:2010 by competent and fully qualified tree surgeons.

There is no mention of tree sizes or categorisation of condition - this is particularly important when it comes to larger trees as bat roosts may be present. (If they have not carried out bat surveys, any voids, loose bark, dense coverings of ivy should be subject to a close up visual inspection by an ecologist with a Natural England Class 2 licence before any work is done. This is likely involve use of climbing equipment, high powered torches and endoscopes.)

As it is the lack of care for the larger oak trees by the land owners/ managers that has led to their demise, ask that for every tree removed it is replaced with two heavy standard oaks of native provenance (probably wont happen but it is worth a try). Remind them that where possible, pollarding is better than monolithing and that all deadwood should remain on site. It could be used to construct loggeries for stag beetles and other invertebrates.

The application is 24/03061/TPO and can be found at <https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=SJN97KJN1WQ00>

Once you have registered, you can comment on the application. If you would like to see what Enfield RoadWatch submitted click [here](#).

Please take the time to make your opinions known. Thank you.

---

### Save our Libraries Consultation deadline 5pm November 14

This isn't directly related to our Green Belt campaign, but it's another assault on our civic life. You may have heard that the council is proposing to close 8 libraries as a cost-saving measure - mostly in the west of the borough. All of the targeted libraries have advocates who want to save them. As an example, the library near Oakwood Station is actually the sixth most used in the system with visitors growing year on year so it makes no sense to close it. Two of the local MPs have expressed concerns about the Council's plans so we hope it is not a done deal. There is a council consultation going on at the moment.

**Deadline November 14, 2024.** You can answer the questions in a way that makes all these local libraries important and irreplaceable, so please do that. <https://www.enfield.gov.uk/consultat.../library-consultation> There is also an online petition which is gathering steam. Please sign that too. <https://www.change.org/p/save-enfield-s-libraries> And the Over 50s Forum, for whose members the libraries are especially important as social and warm places to spend time, also have a petition they'd like you to sign. That's at <https://governance.enfield.gov.uk/mgEPetitionDisplay.aspx?ID=281&RPID=149707505&HPID=149707505> Thanks for supporting our libraries!

---

### Whitewebbs update

Sadly the court has refused an appeal in The Friends of Whitewebbs case against the Council [and Spurs]. However, there are other avenues to pursue, which are currently being explored. In the meantime we understand that Spurs planning application will go to the Planning Committee in November. Although the deadline for making an objection has passed, you can still send in comments until the committee meeting. You'll find instructions, a synopsis of the arguments and much more information, including maps and illustrations of what is proposed and an example of the comment form, at [the Whitewebbs website](#)

---

**Links to some of our partner organisations:**

[The Enfield Society](#)

[CPRE-London](#)

[Enfield Climate Action Forum](#)

[London Green Belt Council](#)

[Better Homes Enfield](#)

Please stay in touch via our social media [buttons below] and keep up to date via our website. [www.enfieldroadwatch.co.uk](http://www.enfieldroadwatch.co.uk). If you haven't already signed, please join the thousands of people who have signed our [Change.org](#) petition. Go to: [Change.org](#) [then search for Protect Enfield]

Thanks for your continued support.



Enfield RoadWatch  
[info@enfieldroadwatch.co.uk](mailto:info@enfieldroadwatch.co.uk)



This email was sent to {{ contact.EMAIL }} You received this email because you are registered with Enfield RoadWatch

[Unsubscribe here](#)



© 2020 Enfield RoadWatch