

---

I am writing in response to the Local Draft Plan and in particular 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 redesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

These sites are part of the historic Enfield Chase, a rare historical landscape which has been an integral part of the development of Enfield. It is a valuable environment and to lose it would permanently damage the Green Belt and alter the very character of the borough. This Green Belt has provided a lifeline to residents, not only during the Covid restrictions but both before and after, facilitating that link with nature which has been scientifically proven to bolster and strengthen mental health and how much we have needed that in these difficult times.

Having lived in the borough for more than 47 years, I cannot envisage being without these important green spaces. Indeed, I moved to my current house in 1991 because it was close to the Green Belt and gave my young family and myself the chance to experience a more rural landscape, to walk, run and cycle there. It was an active choice. Now that I am a pensioner, this landscape is just as important. Week after week, for the last eighteen months, I have walked the paths that criss-cross the land you wish to build on, getting exercise and maintaining stability of mind. Friends in other parts of London frequently express their love of Enfield's open spaces and are envious of its proximity to housing stock. Must we build over it and lose it forever? What further encroachment will ensue? Will future generations forgive us for destroying these vital green spaces? What kind of legacy are we creating?

Furthermore, Crews Hill has a very distinctive character, attracting people from far and wide as customers to the various garden centres lining Cattlegate Road. It brings in a lot of money, provides jobs and offers an alternative shopping experience to that of Enfield Town. We should be proud of what it has to offer, not seek to destroy it.

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

Where is the infrastructure for the large number of homes you envisage in this area? Roads, transport, schools, doctors' surgeries and food shops will all be needed but there is little attention given to those in your plan. Do you really think that Crews Hill Station will be able to cope with the numbers of people who could potentially live nearby? Homes

without the additional infrastructure do not make a community.

The Green Belt maintains the natural environment, so important in this era of climate challenge. We should not be thinking of building on it but maintaining and developing it for the benefit of all. I note that Hampstead Heath was similarly once under threat of urbanisation and saved for the nation by those farsighted people who recognised its value to humanity.

Undoubtedly we need homes but every bit as important is looking after the Green Belt land that makes Enfield the unique place it is to live in. I urge you to be creative and find brownfield sites on which to build and not destroy this precious commodity.

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. The plans for Palace Gardens totally ignore the character of Enfield as a market town and would dwarf the surrounding buildings, paying little attention to the scale of the historic architecture. They are out of character and have no place in an area that contains many fine listed buildings on a much smaller scale. A tall building of this nature would dominate the whole area.

For the above reasons, I strongly object to your draft local plan.