

'Draft local plan'

I am writing to make the **strongest appeal against** plans currently under discussion to remove 'green belt' status from areas around the borough included in 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; 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. Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. The overlaid 'study areas' of the borough clearly demonstrate the level of intention to 'take large bites from the periphery' of Enfield's green belt, further constricting the conservation areas within.

Governments 'Biodiversity Net Gain' study identified the need for development plans to demonstrate BNG 10% of protected species be included, although even this does not take into consideration the 'corridors essential to wildlife. Has EBC incorporated this in any of their planned projects?, does EBC have a qualified 'ecologist'? There appears to be no documented evidence in the current planning reviews to even suggest Enfield's Green Belt has been taken seriously.

Enfield's history goes back to King Charles and his hunting grounds. Enfield emerged due to 'ribbon development' along with many other towns that sprang up when the railways first linked the country. Sadly in the 1960's under a Labour government, Beeching radically reduced the rail network resulting in goods hauliers having to 'take to the road' producing what is now clearly identified as excessive pollution.

It's interesting to note one of the areas under consideration includes 11 hectares of new industrial, storage and distribution currently a farm, thereby taking the livelihood from a long established family and increasing local 'road use' with heavy vehicles. As with all 'ribbon development' towns and roads constructed then only needed to accommodate very few vehicles; yet there appears to have been absolutely no consideration as to the suitability for current needs, let alone how the additional traffic from 3,000 homes and various industrial sites would bring.

Roads within the Borough are already under pressure; widths causing large and long vehicles to mount pavements and pathways risking injury to pedestrians. Poorly maintained road drainage, with many drains blocked and growing weeds, Listed and Heritage buildings adversely affected with the weight of current road use, who is going to pay for the 'consequential' damage?

The Emergency Services infrastructure within the borough, have they been consulted on how they may perceive they could be impacted? The educational needs and capacity, how have they been addressed. Water, power supplies and sewage would also need to be factored in.

Where are the reports demonstrating clear strategical planning taking into consideration all of the above and NOT just how to build 3,000 new homes plus more without fully utilising **all** the 'brown field sites first??

Whilst nations around the world join to try and stop the manmade decline of our planet, EBC have planned to justify the need to build homes by removing 'green belt' status for some years, yet can they now stand up and make residents proud by utilising EVERY 'brown field site' before even considering the 'green belt'.