

---

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to object to the following Policies in the local plan, relating to the green belt surrounding Enfield, and forming part of Enfield Chase.

- SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11;
- Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10
- Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364;
- Policy SA54, page 374;
- Policy SA62 page 372
- Policy SA62 page 383
- SP CL4 pages 277-279

I also object to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. I must also object to the misrepresentation of the National Park City Foundation within the document which the council seem to be attempting to use as leverage or an excuse to justify this development on the green belt.

All these policies propose the de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. The green belt land around Enfield is an important part of the area's character, and, although I live in Barnet these days, regularly visit, travel through, walk and bike ride in the area.

We should be doing all we can to protect these areas, and I see it as a dereliction of the council's duty to do so. Given recent events with respect to climate change, we need these green areas more than ever and cannot afford to lose any greenspace.

Indeed, it seems perverse that while at the same time as developing Enfield Greenways (very positive compared to the inaction of my local council, Barnet) and supporting the Enfield Chase Restoration project (funded by the Mayor of London) – that the council considers desecrating the same area in this way. Clearly, my feelings around this are shared by the Mayor of London as he has reiterated his opposition to these proposals. (See <https://www.enfieldindependent.co.uk/news/19406962.sadiq-khan-unhappy-enfield-councils-green-belt-plans/>)

Please do not mistake this my above objections for NIMBYism: I think other elements of the local plan include positive suggestions.

Although I am not keen on the height of the developments proposed for Enfield Town, or at Southgate, they are much better uses of space and brownfield to provide housing over an already-developed area. Likewise, I can see the positives of building housing on tube station car parks, though I believe the existing proposals for Cockfosters/Arnos Grove and, locally to myself in Barnet are ill-thought through, both in terms of quality of design and density of development – and a lack of creative thinking around creating a joined up transport network in the area. It is sad to me that the default seems to be for developers to opt for ugly, square 'pack them in and pile them high' units – whereas I note that in your policy DM DE6, 7.6.4 you admit that tall

buildings are not the only option.

I do not agree with the implication that we somehow have no option but to build on the green belt to solve the housing problem. As someone with a young family, and many friends that are struggling to buy – or indeed, have moved out of London/Enfield/Barnet for cheaper areas – I am acutely aware of these issues. However, I fail to see how building inaccessible expensive homes on the green belt, likely only accessible to those with cars and large deposits will go anyway to mitigating these problems.