
Additionally, I also object to the 'conversion' of the recreation fields at Firs Farm and to the east of the A10 (south of Church Street) for crematorium use.

So many people have worked so very hard to make this an amazing community and wildlife space. How can the Council possibly be thinking of selling this off?

On Sun, 29 Aug 2021 at 18:20, Cathy Archer <catherinearcher1@gmail.com> wrote:

IMPORTANT - OBJECTION TO THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

I reject the loss of the Green Belt in favour of building affordable homes where they will bring regeneration to deprived areas. The Council should be aiming to **Preserve the Green. Regenerate the Grey!**

The Local Plan includes twenty eight Green Belt sites with the potential for up to 30,000 homes, to be built between now and 2039 when the plan ends. I oppose the building on the Green Belt and would direct you to a report issued by The Campaign for Rural England (CPRE), the Enfield Society and Enfield RoadWatch, **Space to Build** - showing how existing brown-field and under-used sites in the Borough could be used for substantial housing volumes (up to 37,000 homes).

One of the key findings of the report is that Enfield should not, and does not need to, seek to release Green Belt as part of the Local Plan development process.

Apart from a station, there are no other amenities to support the 3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7,500 new homes right up to the M25. ([Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#));

Where are the amenities to support 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](#)).

The loss of areas of Whitewebbs for the expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25, means less green space

for residents and the closure of the affordable golf course deprives those less able to afford golf club fees. ([SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279](#)).

Proposed tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area, should not be allowed as it will ruin the look and feel of Enfield Town, Southgate and other areas. ([see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#)).

Once again, I repeat my objection to the draft Local Plan to building on the Green Belt, to the loss of Whitewebbs, and to the overdevelopment of Enfield Town and surrounding localities.