

---

Dear Enfield Council

I am writing with concern over Enfield Council's Draft Local Plan.

I am writing to 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 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 Belt, but also to the very character of the borough. The Green Belt is designed to prevent urban sprawl and to preserve special characteristics of an area. We should be protecting and enhancing our precious Green Belt which provides vital environmental and recreational benefits.

The proposed plans would simply not deliver the type of homes needed by the people of Enfield, especially young families and key workers. We have, for example, seen a total absence of social housing on the recent development at Trent Park. These proposed homes would not be affordable but would, undoubtedly, make a fine profit for the construction companies, from the 'lungs' of the Green Belt of London. This plan is effectively giving away our future to developers.

The proposed development of housing at Crews Hill, is a concern. The garden centres are an important 'character' in the borough. They provide employment and resources for the people of Enfield and beyond. This asset should be encouraged and developed to benefit the economy of the borough.

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. For many years, maybe forever, a large part of the beautiful local amenity of Whitewebbs would not be accessible to the very people of Enfield. This is unacceptable. I have lived in Enfield most of my life and have highly valued this asset and had expected it would be there for generations to come. Whitewebbs, Forty Hall and Hilly Fields are all part of the best of Enfield. During the pandemic, these and the golf course provided much needed recreation. It seems the Council's analysis is that, the asset of, Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money. Surely ways should have been found to increase the use of it. I should like to see it reinstated for public use.

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. This is another area of Enfield that makes it a special place to live, a rare habitat.

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. There are so many reasons that this tall building policy is bad for Enfield and its residents. The 'homes' provided in these tower blocks would, once again, not be suitable for the housing needs of the families in Enfield. During the pandemic, we have learnt the value of having an easily accessible outside space to our homes. The height of these proposed buildings are completely out of character to the low rise, established buildings in and around Enfield Town.

While I understand the need of the Borough of Enfield to provide housing, I do not see that this is 'an exceptional circumstance' to propose to build on the Green Belt. I consider that your housing target could be achieved, within a sound local plan, by building on brownfield sites within the borough, not on the Green Belt which should be preserved for future generations.

The council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Policy

Framework (NPPF), and any intentions to release parts of it should be removed from the Local Plan.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.