
I am totally against use of Green Belt Land when there are brownfield sites across the borough that could provide the number of 2 and 3 bed homes to meet the needs of Enfield residents, especially those in housing need who require affordable, close to public transport and amenities, homes.

In particular:
Spatial strategy

Open Green belt:
Chase Park (Vicarage Farm next to Trent Park between Oakwood and Enfield Town
Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87 and Figure 3.11

Crews Hill with potential for longer term expansion - I do not agree this is required. Agriculture and Locally grown food production must take precedent due to shortages and climate change issues. Local jobs in Nurseries must be sustained
Policy SP PL 9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10

160 Homes in Green Belt at Hadley Wood. I do not agree with this proposed development. It is an amenity for wildlife and residents.
SA45: Land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood Page 364

11 hectares of new industrial storage and distribution use. Agricultural land east of junction 24 of M2 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase
SA54 page 374
Productive farm land must not be lost, locally grown produce and food must take precedent due to climate change emergency.

Upper Edmonton green belt must be kept for use of Edmonton residents well being.

Expansion of Spurs football training ground in North Whitewebbs Lane up to M25 for recreational sport community sport/leisure. Pages 277-279. I am against this as it is Green Belt and far away from public transport. Again climate change and Use of vehicles to travel there must be limited.

Tall Buildings:
Policy DM DE 6 Fig 7.3
The Enfield draft Local Plan definition of tall buildings is not in line with that of the London Plan which defines a tall building as any over 21 metres, and 3 metres per floor, ie 7 storeys. Therefore buildings with heights over 12 storeys are excessive and