

To whom it may concern;

I write in overall objection to the proposed draft local plan. I find it unnecessary to draft a plan on protected green belt. This goes against all government advice. The housing secretary has stated that the government will protect the green belt, prioritising building on brown sites and that green belt protection will be kept. I therefore can't fathom how you can ride roughshod over protections put in place designed for the very thing you are you planning to do. Enfield Council have not shown in any detailed way whilst brown sites are not appropriate and instead you want to ruin the landscape of Enfield forever. Furthermore, I feel the plans fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework. The Mayor of London has even openly discussed his opposition to this plan. I'm unaware of any person (except it seem Enfield's Council) who is for the destruction of Enfield Town. I urge you to reconsider these plans and fully explore all options for housing, including the innovative use of existing brownfield sites in Enfield before the Green Belt is even considered as a possibility to destroy.

In particular I strongly disagree with the following:

1. 3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green' 'sustainable urban extension' referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#)). This area does not have the infrastructure to support such numbers of new homes and the council has not mentioned how it will do so. I regularly use this space and it is lovely to see the wildlife that thrives there. Building on this land would be a fundamental error. A popular right of way known as the Merryhills Way passes through Merryhills Brook Vallet and if the council's proposal come pass, this footpath would be surrounded by housing estates on all sides. Enfield council talks about improving the quality of the green spaces yet you are quite happy to develop on them. The hypocrisy is unfathomable. Renowned and respected expert, Dr John Langton on royal forests and chases I note has also objected due to the fact that 'Enfield possesses an extremely rare and very valuable landscape asset. It would be a great pity to lose part of what is left of it to housing development.'
2. a big expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25, comprising of 42.5 hectares of land, for "professional sport, recreation and community sports/leisure uses" ([SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279](#)). This space is enjoyed by so many of Enfield residents. You only had to go during recent times in Covid to see how busy it was, an encouraging FREE space for so many to get out and keep fit.
3. Encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area ([see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#)). I wholeheartedly object to you changing the landscape of our market town. This would fundamentally change the character of Enfield beyond recognition. I'm all for regenerating the town but not with tall buildings, completely out of character in conservation areas.

4. 11 hectares for industrial usage and distribution in open Green Belt countryside at New Cottages and Holly Hill Farm east of Junction 24 of the M25. Again, what is wrong with existing brownfield sites? Why spoil protected greenbelt? ([SA54, page 374](#));

I really hope that objections are taken seriously and you take residents concerns of altering our town seriously. If you approve these plans you will forever be destroying our beautiful green belt and character of Enfield Town which we will never be able to get back. I urge you to abandon these awful plans and reconsider the existing brown field sites.