

---

Having recently been alarmed at the release and contents of the Draft Local Plan, I am writing to register my objection, to a number of the proposals, based on the Council's short-term outlook and apparent preference for profit over quality of life for Enfield's existing/future residents and the borough's natural habitat.

I object to the following proposals within the draft plan:

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*

Each of these policies propose the dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. Such dedesignation will ultimately result in the wilful destruction of unique natural properties and attractiveness of Enfield Chase, and the Enfield borough in general. Each of these areas are valuable natural landscapes and their loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough. Moreover, the development of these sites would appear to act contrary to the overall objective of providing further affordable housing within the borough. Rather than achieve this laudable aim which could be achieved through current and future brownfield developments, selling-off of Enfield's natural Green Belt areas will only serve to further exacerbate the growing inequality within the borough. One only needs to look toward the current Trent Park development to understand who such housing developments are aimed at...the wealthy, foreign investors and property development companies: as such the outlined policies for Green Belt dedesignation act in direct contradiction to the draft plans commitment to the provision of "genuinely affordable homes".


2. Similarly, 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. Further destruction of the borough's nature reserves undermines the ability to provide a sustainable environment for children and young people within the borough: this will ultimately impact on their education and wellbeing. This section of Lee Valley has a valuable history including prehistoric settlements, and historic infrastructure. Loss of this area, alongside further destruction of habitat, would further reduce the character of the borough and impact upon local community investment in the

boroughs cultural and historic links.

3. Further, 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*. As clear from the policy document other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation. Hence, the proposal to introduce multiple tall buildings and redefinition of the acceptable height of tall buildings appear unnecessary and redundant. Indeed, not only would the proposed tall buildings policy mar the existing landscape they would by definition impact upon local communities and amenities and therefore fundamentally fail in the draft plan's assertion "to provide high quality private and communal amenity and play space."

In summary, I strongly oppose the Draft Local Plan based on destruction of the boroughs Green Belt areas, potential impact on wildlife, habitat, environmental impacts and detrimental impact to the future health and wellbeing (both physical and mental) of the borough's inhabitants.

I urge all councillors, and our MP (as a Labour voter), to strongly oppose the plan, and implore the council to urgently reassess how the proposed policies will truly impact on the future of the borough, so that all inhabitants can share in the health, wealth, and beauty that Enfield has to offer.



---