
1. 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 de-designation 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. Those areas are traversed by popular Rights of Way which I regularly walk that would be spoiled by development. Why are Enfield Council looking at developing on Green Belt land when the government and the Mayor of London are committed to protecting and enhancing the Green Belt? The government has clearly stated that a Green Belt boundary may be altered only in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt is “the lungs of London” and once we start encroaching on it then we are in serious trouble. It is more important than ever that the residents of Enfield have green, open spaces near to their home which they can visit to re-charge their batteries, breathe in some country air and get away from the urban sprawl. The M25 effectively creates a barrier at the edge of the Green Belt in Enfield so there is not a lot of land left and it’s essential we keep the Green Belt we have and protect the countryside. You say you need to provide 1,246 dwellings each year but there is no statutory duty to provide any fixed number of homes each year. The London Plan sets out a figure of 1,246 per year for ‘Enfield but the actual number of homes to be provided needs to take account of constraints and opportunities, as well as the implications for the character of local areas. Unless the Council releases Green Belt through its Local Plan there will remain tight controls on any development in the Green Belt. This means that it is you, Enfield Council, who has final responsibility for making the decision to ensure there will be no development on Green Belt land, not the government. The Council has been criticised for misleading references to London National Park City Foundation in their Draft Plan. LNPC Foundation specifically criticises your apparent justification of building on the Green Belt stating . “As London National Park City is also about the entirety of London, not just the parks, green spaces and Green Belt, the London Borough of Enfield and all Local Planning Authorities in London should be examining the entire urban fabric and should avoid using National Park City as a bargaining chip to justify loss of Green Belt and green spaces”. The decisions you make will have a long lasting impact on the borough and it is imperative you do not allow the Green Belt to be used for housing or other development. Already some bad planning decisions have been made e.g. the proposed Colosseum development which got approved by a small minority because some councillors who were against the proposal were unable to vote. Speculators are already buying up plots of land to build on in some of the areas you are proposing in the Draft London Plan in the hope you will be willing to forego the Green Belt which you regard as no longer sacrosanct. You must not allow this to happen.

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. Whitewebbs Golf Course was a well-loved public facility. I was informed by a member of staff there, they had been working

hard to develop the course and make it more profitable and, in their opinion, it was not losing money as you claimed. Enfield Council did not put any investment into Whitewebbs Golf Course to allow it to up-grade its facilities or try to improve it in any way as you had already decided you were going to lease the land. There could have been other options, such as setting up a golf driving range, providing a café etc. There are only a few public golf courses in the borough as the other courses you included in your count of golf courses are privately owned and too expensive for the majority of borough residents to join. If more money and effort had been put into improving the facilities at Whitewebbs many people could have benefited. I do not agree that Tottenham Hotspur should be given a lease to yet another part of our open spaces, effectively enclosing part of it as their football academy which will not be fully accessible to all. What is to prevent Spurs changing their mind about the use of this land they have acquired and applying to the Council in the future for yet another change of use or putting a case for more land to be leased to them? Also developers would be keen to get their hands on land at Whitewebbs via the back door and its original purpose as a green space to be enjoyed by Borough residents would be subverted by stealth over the long term. I call for the reinstatement of Whitewebbs Golf Course.

3. I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Ramney Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. Since the Covid pandemic it has become even more important for us to be able to access green areas and enjoy nature and wildlife near to where we live. It gives us so much pleasure and relaxation and we should not give up these areas lightly. Once it is gone there is no going back. You say the plan will protect and enhance the borough's biodiversity and habitats but this isn't true as areas of the Green Belt that are targeted for development are home to endangered species and rich mosaics of biodiversity, which cannot be replaced.

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. Why are Enfield Council so insistent on building high rise buildings in the borough when it has long been agreed that this type of building is completely inappropriate for family living. They can become high rise ghettos and crime hot spots as there is a lot of discontent in areas where they have been built and often cited in television documentaries for their historical failures. The council have actually pulled down high rise blocks in some parts of the borough and replaced with them lower rise buildings which are much more family and environment friendly. Who would like to be stuck on the 20th floor of a high rise building with young children, with lifts that often break down, with little or no outdoor space provided, with noisy neighbours, with the worry of fires etc like Grenfell occurring? Enfield is a historic market town and to build high rises in the centre of the town especially is completely out of character with the town. With so many people in these buildings, where is the infrastructure going to be to support them e.g. schools, nurseries, surgeries, hospitals? What impact will these large developments have on our already over-crowded roads, sewers, transport etc? The local plan should not include high rise buildings. You say it's a choice between building on the Green Belt or building high rises everywhere and not being able to prevent them but this is not true as the Council decides where tall buildings get built and how high they can be. The Council has admitted that alternative building forms, such as lower-rise mansion blocks, can achieve a similar number of homes as tower blocks

5. Enfield Chase is a unique and beautiful landscape that is now targeted for more than 12,500 homes, while the proposed siting of unnecessary tall buildings will mar protected views and heritage areas. Your plan is not the only way to meet Enfield's housing need. What Enfield needs are affordable homes in areas with existing public services and good transport links, not unaffordable and sprawling executive homes in rural locations that use land inefficiently and increase car-dependency. You have ignored sites with good potential that would bring homes, jobs and investment in public services to urban areas and avoid building on the Green Belt. Other authorities in London are taking a much more creative approach to maximising the opportunities for a mix of uses at derelict industrial land and empty low rise office blocks that are no longer required post covid as many employees workplace is now mostly through Zoom or Microsoft Teams. 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.

6. I believe the Draft Local Plan is not deeply green but deeply flawed. It is not the solution to meeting the borough's housing and employment needs and you need to look at other ways of doing this which does not involve building on Green Belt land or by building numerous, ill sited high rise buildings. When the Council make extremely important decisions on their Plan, I wish my, and others, strong objections to be taken into account and that you will be engaging fully with Enfield residents in a transparent and open manner before any final decisions are made on a Draft Local Plan. I am relying on the council to do the right thing and make the right decisions for future generations and to keep the borough a green and pleasant place for its residents to live.