

---

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am contacting you to register my strong opposition to the proposals to build on Enfield's precious Green Belt land which are put forward in the draft local plan.

I accept and understand that there is a need to address the housing crisis and provide affordable homes. However, to do this by using the green belt is a devastating, clumsy attempt at a solution.

I believe the draft Local Plan is a unimaginative, rushed, lazy and greedy attempt at a solution. Just because there is land, does not mean it is suitable or appropriate to build on.

In particular the locations of the 6000 homes proposed to be built on green space are totally inappropriate for such density of housing. The nurseries at Crews Hill are a huge draw for both residents and visitors to the borough, bringing much needed economic growth. Housing on this site brings homes, but what else? Huge profits for the developers? Nice earner for the Council to boost Council Tax revenue?

The area between Enfield Road and Hadley Road allows the area to breathe. There is new housing in and around Chase Farm already. There will be homes built on the Royal Chace Hotel site. The implications for traffic and pollution in an already gridlocked borough are terrifying.

Your approach is A DISGRACE. The way this Council administration rides roughshod over their own hardworking Councillors, ignore the views of residents (for example the laughable outcome of the waste collection consultation) is absolutely outrageous.

I have lived in Enfield my whole life. I worked for Enfield Council for over 20 years, so know *exactly* how these things work. I have seen administrations come and go - of all political persuasions - yet this is the first time I am ashamed to be a resident. I cannot believe the shameful behaviour being demonstrated by this administration - the draft Local Plan is indicative of the greed, ignorance of Enfield's history, hypocrisy

and total contempt being shown to longstanding residents by the “Leader” and her appalling administration.

I am not cc’ing the Labour administration into this email as I am sadly certain that it would be ignored. Consultation in Enfield is currently a tick box exercise only. This administration will do what it pleases, regardless of informed, intelligent opposition.

The Mayor of London opposes these proposals. How does this sit with Labour policy? Seemingly, this administration ignores any and all constructive discussion with anyone who dislikes their plans.

However, I demand that my comments are included in this consultation, along with those of thousands of other local people who have expressed their disgust through individual opposition, group petitions and so on.

We must STOP the already obscenely wealthy property developers building more luxury homes. A percentage will be “affordable” - seriously??

We should use the plentiful empty brownfield sites and empty offices to build more affordable homes instead, rather than ripping apart the beautiful and historic countryside that surrounds Enfield.

More specifically, I am writing to object to the following Policies:

1. 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 de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. Government policy states that use of Green Belt for housing should only be considered in “exceptional circumstances”. I do not believe this proposal of enormous density in the “lungs” of London is acceptable in any way.

These sites are part of the historic Enfield Chase, and played an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a rare, precious and valuable landscape asset and its destruction would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of our borough.

2. I am objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammev Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

3. I am 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 ruin the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

Like everywhere in London and the south-east of England, housing affordability is a serious issue. But other authorities in London are taking a much more creative approach to maximising the opportunities for a mix of uses at industrial land. If Enfield Council were to take the lead from other authorities it would be possible to accommodate more high-quality development without wrecking the beautiful countryside that residents cherish.

Enfield is being discussed on the news for all the wrong reasons.

The ambitions/plans do not need to be so aggressive to hit short term targets, which you have not been open and transparent about. It could be much more creative with ways to improve the housing needs of Enfield. There are other requirements that have not been factored such as the infrastructure to support eg schools, healthcare, shops, leisure spaces?

There is a laughable proposal to create a garden area at Little Park Gardens - this impacts traffic and residents negatively. How are we supposed to easily access our homes? There is no doubt that this area will become a waiting area for the hundreds of motorcycle couriers that already clog our town and cause huge danger to drivers and pedestrians. Deal with this rather than building a ridiculous garden yards from the Town Park and Library Green.

There are proposals to build on multiple supermarket sites - Sainsbury's and Morrison's on the A10 and Tesco at Ponder's End. Where on earth are people going to shop??

Chase Farm hospital has lost it's A&E - can you guarantee Barnet and North Middlesex hospitals will cope?

Where is the expansion to Police and Fire Services?

Where is the transport infrastructure? People living in “affordable homes” in areas so far from shops and services would need cars to move around. How does this impact the “green” agenda? Surely there will be even higher levels of pollution?

Having open space and green countryside on our doorstep is one of the most appealing and treasured aspects of living in Enfield.

PLEASE DO NOT TAKE IT AWAY

We need to protect small remaining natural environment and green/open spaces that we are lucky to have in Enfield, for our future generation. It is what makes Enfield unique.

Yours sincerely