

---

I am writing to object to the following policies contained in the proposed Local Plan. As a local resident for decades I am extremely disturbed at the suggestions you have made in this consultation document, especially those relating to the Green Belt. The developments you are suggesting are in direct opposition to the needs of our country and borough with regard to the problems of global warming and climate change and I do not feel that these particular suggestions are in any way of benefit to the borough.

The council has already a potential 10,000 housing development in Meridian Water, which is would benefit from being expedited and this is a site that already has good transport links. This development has been ongoing for at least a decade and would considerably ease the need for housing in the borough.

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. 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 suggestions of building in these areas will destroy swathes of farmland and the properties built will probably be larger expensive houses that provide more profit for developers.

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. The bridleways and woods are protected and well used by riders and walkers alike.

3. I feel the proposed development at Crews Hill which is currently home to a few hundred people, will not benefit Enfield as a whole. The transport links are few and the suggestions made to improve these links will destroy much of the character of the area. Crews Hill is an extremely popular place to visit for people from miles away as the concentration of garden centres provides a considerable interest and draw for residents from other boroughs. The designation of Crews Hill as a "transport hub" when trains run approximately twice an hour seems inaccurate. For transport links to be improved it

would require destruction of much of the existing infrastructure, and as it is, the existing roads become extremely congested at certain times of day and year. I do not feel the suggestions in any way offer an improvement for the residents of the borough.

4. 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.

5. 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.

To summarise I feel that there should be no building on the Green Belt until and after all opportunities to build on brownfield sites have been implemented and completed - the tardiness of the Meridian Water development is something that the council should immediately deal with - taking over ten years to not have built any housing does not give residents confidence in their ability to take care of the character of our borough.

