

---

Hello,

I am contacting you in relation to the Draft Enfield Local Plan 2019-2039 and the proposed development on Green Belt land.

I am really disappointed that this is even being considered by Enfield council. It goes without saying, how essential the green belt is to the environment and therefore to the health of all the residents. Once gone, it will never come back and the health impact of this can never be reversed.

There are also other concerns, such as the capacity of our hospitals (we have already lost Chase Farm A&E and North Mid and Barnet cannot cope with demand, as I have personally experienced), transport (the traffic in the area is already terrible), schools. The list could go on, however, none of this is as important as the environmental and health issues I raised.

There are many brown field sites that can be regenerated and these should be used first. Even if there were no other sites available, building on green belt land should never be considered.

It is also abundantly clear that the majority of these homes will not be 'affordable'.

I wish to make the following specific points of objection to the draft local plan:

1. I wish 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.
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. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement.
3. 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. 4. 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.

Thank you for taking time to read my email and I do sincerely hope that the opinion of residents will be taken into consideration.

