
Dear Sirs/Mesdames

I have been a resident of the London Borough of Enfield since early childhood and have lived in homes in the East and West of the borough, for the last 30+ years in Chase Ward, North Enfield Parliamentary constituency.

I have never wanted to live in any other part of the country as Enfield has such a diverse range of facilities from beautiful parkland and open spaces for fresh air and recreation (often referred to as the 'lungs' of London), as well as having ease of access into London and wider road/rail networks to the rest of the country.

Since lockdown it has been ever more apparent that all residents need and benefit from our open spaces and green belt areas. We take pride in the appearance of our local roads and parks, with thriving (and growing!) groups of litter-picking local residents who cannot stand back and allow a minority to spoil the areas through selfish actions.

Objections to the Draft Local Plan

Please be advised that I am writing to object to the following Policies: 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; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose the dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough.

I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement. To say that a public golf course is elitist is nonsense, it is a way for people of all ages and incomes to enjoy pay and play exercise in the fresh air.

I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

I am also objecting to the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321 which propose areas for and the acceptable height of tall buildings which, in many cases would mar the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

In all cases:

- It will increase car-dependency and traffic congestion
- It will be low-density, high carbon and land-hungry, and housing will be unaffordable

There are much better options: build attractive, 'car-free' development within the urban footprint, serviced by public transport. Inefficiently-used space and run-down sites can be transformed into places people want to live, redeveloped at appropriate density, incorporating affordable housing and enabling people to live within walking distance of local amenities.

Please acknowledge and note my objections.

Thank you
Yours faithfully