
Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for providing the draft local plan and this consultation period.

I am writing to you to express my strong views on some of the development suggestions contained in the document.

Whereas I understand there is a need to improve and resolve the housing crisis of affordable homes, using the green belt to solve this problem is absolutely shocking and devastating.

STOP letting wealthy property developers build luxury homes and insist part are used for affordable homes. Use the ever increasing empty brownfield sites and empty offices to build more affordable homes instead, rather than ripping apart the small yet beautiful and historic countryside that we have remaining surrounding Enfield.

More specifically, I am writing to object to the following Policies:

1. 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; 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, 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 our borough.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

Like everywhere in London and the south-east of England, housing affordability is a serious issue. But other authorities in London are taking a much more creative approach to maximising the opportunities for a mix of uses at industrial land. If Enfield Council were to take the lead from other authorities it would be possible to

accommodate more high-quality development without wrecking the beautiful countryside that residents cherish.

The ambitions/plans do not need to be so aggressive to hit short term targets, which you have not been open and transparent about. It could be much more creative with how we improve the housing needs. There are other requirements that have not been factored such as the infrastructure to support eg schools, healthcare, shops, leisure spaces?

Having open space and green countryside on our doorstep is one of the most appealing and treasured aspects of living in Enfield.

PLEASE DO NOT TAKE IT AWAY

We need to protect small remaining natural environment and green/open spaces that we are lucky to have in Enfield, for our future generation. It is what makes Enfield unique.