

---

I am writing to express my objections to elements of the proposed Enfield Draft Local Plan in particular the proposal to build on parts of the green belt.

The green belt is a precious resource for local people and I strongly object to the Council's intention to allow building on these sites and at such high density.

Specifically I 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; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose the change of use of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

These sites are a valuable natural asset to local people. This has become even more apparent during the lockdowns over the past year. It has been essential for me and my neighbours who live in flats to be able to seek refuge in these spaces. Having spent much time in the site proposed under policy SP PL10 in particular I can see how this would also lead to irretrievable loss of important habitat impacting on the wider ecosystem due to the loss of corridors and food chain. Access to nature is an important part of improving mental health and given the government guidance on this I am amazed Enfield Council would choose to reduce the access for local people.

The proposed land for development is also at the rare and historic Enfield Chase, which is a unique site and played an important role in the development of Enfield. Its loss would cause permanent harm not only to local ecosystems but also to the character of the borough.

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.

I object 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. Combined with the removal of green built these policies will totally transform the character of the area, one of the reasons I wanted to live here in the first place.

The increased pressure on local amenities and transport links which are already highly congested has not been adequately considered. Many roads are already stationary with traffic at peak times, the reliability and capacity of the bus system will reduce and the underground cannot take the likely volume of passengers. I suspect those who have proposed this are not regular commuters into the centre of London themselves.

Removal of green belt also sets a precedent for future development- I am surprised this Council would want to be the one known as the group of Councillors and leaders who choose to do this, particularly a Labour Council who I have voted to support in the past but will never do so again now.

I attempted to input my views via the online platform and website but it is so complex to find the right information and use I am also surprised this mechanism would meet the accessibility requirements for different communities as required by government communications guidance. I trust this letter will be considered as input to the process.

