

---

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 the above propose the de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

My objection is for the following reasons:

- Permanent loss of the Green Belt as an area of recreation to the whole of the Enfield community. The area is open to all and provides a recreational facility which is imperative to the physical and mental health of the local population. The proposed green space alternatives are very limited and do not compensate for the loss of this vital asset.
- Permanent loss of wildlife habitat.
- Permanent loss of the Enfield Chase - an area of natural historic interest which defines the character of the Borough.
- Insufficient local amenities to support the large scale development proposed. There is no longer an A&E unit in Chase Farm Hospital; insufficient healthcare facilities (e.g. GP, NHS dentist, social care) locally; local roads are already overcrowded; the area is hilly and therefore not conducive for residents to use cycles, especially the elderly, disabled and families with children; local transport links into London are good, but are already overcrowded; local jobs are limited meaning there will be an increase in commuting traffic; local schools are oversubscribed with no room to expand, meaning that children will have to travel further to school, increasing road traffic.
- Loss of viable businesses in the Crews Hill area with associated loss of jobs and loss of economic value to the area.
- Housing developments in the proposed area will not generate the low cost, affordable housing as set out in the proposals given the example set by the housing developments in Trent Park
- The development does not follow the National planning Policy Framework paragraphs 137 to 151 for the following reasons:
  - I do not believe that “exceptional circumstances” exist that would make this development justifiable
  - I do not believe that the local authority has examined all other reasonable options for meeting its development needs. All Brownfield sites should be utilised and built on by developers prior to any consideration of usage of the green belt for development
  - The development does not fall within the exceptions noted on paragraph 149 of the Framework and is therefore inappropriate development.

- The development is not in line with the London Plan 2021 which states that:
  - The Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development
  - Exceptional circumstances are required to justify either the extension or de-designation of the Green Belt through the preparation or review of a Local Plan. I do not believe that exceptional circumstances exist in this case
  - See also paragraphs 8.1.2 and 8.2.2 of the London Plan 2021 in which the Mayor “strongly supports the continued protection of London’s Green Belt “ and states that “Openness and permanence are essential characteristics of the Green Belt”.

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.

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.

---