

---

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the following Policies in the draft local plan, all of which propose developing Green Belt land for housing and other purposes:

- 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 SA52 page 372;
- Policy SA54, page 374;
- Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 which would transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management.

I also object to the tall buildings policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321, which propose increases to building heights including in sensitive areas across the borough. These would mar the landscape and are unnecessary because, as stated on page 160 of the policy, other lower rise building forms could provide similar densities without excess height, as well as having advantages in terms of better amenity and less costly maintenance.

The sites above are part of historically important Enfield Chase, the remaining parts of which are unique in the south east and a rare and valuable landscape asset. The loss of these sites, including the valued Merryhills Way footpath, would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the character of the borough. Similar arguments apply to the destruction of productive farmland at a time of food insecurity and climate breakdown

Crews Hill is equally important and should not be destroyed. Its garden centres and other businesses provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond. Instead of losing Crews Hill to housing, its horticultural activities should be encouraged and enhanced so that it can once again be a hub for food and plant production.

While I recognise the need for development to meet Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. The proposals in the draft plan will not solve Enfield's housing problems and ignore the large number of previously developed brownfield sites in need of regeneration. The Green Belt is a precious resource that must be protected and preserved for future generations.

On a separate aspect of the draft plan, I suggest an addition to Policy SP BG3 along the following lines:

Developers should seek opportunities to create other habitats or features such as artificial nest sites that are of particular benefit in an urban context. Relatively small features, such as incorporating swift bricks and bat boxes in developments and providing safe routes for hedgehogs between different areas of habitat, can often achieve important benefits for wildlife. These should follow best practice guidance.

This is in accordance with the London Plan (March 2021), Policy G6 B(4) which states that 'Boroughs, in developing Development Plans, should seek opportunities to create other habitats, or features such as artificial nest sites, that are of particular relevance and benefit in an urban context' (page 325). It is also in line with the guidance in NPPG Natural Environment Paragraph 023.

In my opinion, this consultation has been handled very badly by Enfield Council which has left residents to fight their way through a complicated mass of undifferentiated documents on the website. This is not a reasonable way to approach such an important consultation. Similarly, the leaflet distributed through letterboxes more recently is nothing more than a PR exercise.

Yours faithfully,