
To whom it may concern

I wish to raise objections to aspects of the of the draft Enfield Local Plan, June 2021, which is currently out for consultation.

The sections which I wish to object to are noted below.

1. **SP PL10, pages 81-87**, 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, which is unique in the southeast 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 but also to the very 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.

- a. **SP PL10 Chase Park** contains popular spaces used by local people for leisure and exercise and is a large piece of greenbelt land, playing a part in making the borough a greener place to live. The past year has shown how popular access to green space is for well being and how much it is valued. Retaining this land in its natural setting would surely be more beneficial than a landscaped area, amongst a housing development. The proposed development is large and although the local plan says that the development must maximise opportunities for sustainable and active travel, much of the proposed development area would be quite a distance from any of the local stations, potentially encouraging people to drive to them or increasing bus traffic on the A110, which is already a busy road.

The parcel of land also included in this policy, which is situated on the Ridgeway, next to Chase Farm Hospital, is part of a popular route, used for walking and riding. I have seen a greater use of this area over the past year, by local residents, suggesting its loss would have a large impact. Although the plans suggest the footpath might be retained, it would not have the same wellbeing and health benefits to residents as a green space with wildlife.

- b. **SP PL9 Crews Hill** The existing garden centres and shops at Crews Hill are well used and create local employment. Removing these would seem to go against the wishes of the local plan to create employment in the borough. Although the plan does mention encouraging horticulture and employment in the area, there is not enough detail to understand if this would be at the same level as the existing. Additionally, Crews Hill and the roads leading up to it are often congested, with people coming to the local businesses. Even with the removal of the business, this would seem unlikely to improve should 3000 homes be built on the site. Although the local plan expresses that the site should promote walking and cycling, these

will not be viable for every journey and it seems likely additional roads will need to be built. The existing train and bus services would need to be upgraded to deal with the extra users.

- c. **Policy SA52 Rammey Marsh** This area is described on the visit lee valley website as an important wildlife haven. It is also a green space in a part of the borough, which the local plan details as already having less access to green spaces.

In general the plans to build on the greenbelt would seem to be contradictory to the council's earlier Climate Action Plan 2020 which states " The Greenbelt will play an enhanced role in biodiversity, carbon offsetting". While there are good plans to increase tree planting and woodland cover in the borough, removing established trees and grassland, with a settled wildlife population, to replace it with housing will surely release carbon and decrease biodiversity. It will be many years before the new woodland woodland will be able to compensate.

The Blue and Green Strategy (2021-2031) states as Aim 2 "Ensuring our residents can access blue and green spaces within 15 minutes walking distance of their homes and businesses". Building on a large section of the green belt would seem to make this harder to achieve.

I also note that Enfield Council have declared a climate emergency.

Lastly the Local Plan goes against The London Plan of March 2021, as issued by the Mayor of London. This states in Policy G2 that the Green Belt should only be de-designated in exceptional circumstances.

While I understand the need to build more homes in the borough, the large amount of Green Belt is one of the things which makes Enfield special and enjoyable to live in. Once this land is lost it can never be returned. Although the local plan contains proposals for the management of the rest of the Green Belt, once some areas are de-designated, this may set a precedent for others in future years.

- 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.

Overall I found the Local Plan to be comprehensive, with many good aspects, however, it is a very challenging document for residents to comment on due to its size and complexity. I understand the need to set out the council's vision in one place, but the volume of information provided, together with the language, which uses many terms familiar to the Town Planning profession, may have put many off commenting. It would also have been very helpful to have had some key road names on detailed maps, such as Figure 3.2, to help with understanding. The same applies to the overall borough map, which was difficult to zoom in to and identify the extent of the areas where development on the Green Belt is proposed.

