

---

I wish to register my objections to the local plan, in particular to the loss of large areas of "Green Belt" in what the council proudly claims as "London's greenest borough".

I am a resident of the London Borough of Enfield.

Firstly, as a general comment, the draft plan has been issued with over 400 pages the terms of which the layman may not fully understand, nor have the time to digest. Why not issue a resident-friendly version of the document with an executive summary at the front. Failure to properly engage the local community will be high on the list of why many residents hope the whole plan fails.

Secondly the quality of the staff at Enfield Council is not the best. They regularly have to admit they get things wrong and the turnover of staff is worrying given the amount of work that the draft plan is going to create.

**I wish to formally object to the plan for the following reasons :-**

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; Policy SA52 page 372; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose allowing Green Belt land to be used for housing and other purposes this is totally wrong. There are plenty of "brown field " sites to be used in the borough.

**SP PL 9 Pp77-80 Concept Plan Fig. 3.10**

The garden nurseries provide a valuable resource much used by people for miles around and bringing trade to the area. The loss of yet another golf course (Whitewebbs having already been lost) will mean that a large chunk of public open space in the north of the borough will have gone - and that which is built on gone for ever. Once built on there will be no return to the views from the public footpath through Crews Hill golf course to the Ridgeway. Clay Hill from Beggars Hollow up to the bend outside St Johns church, then Theobalds Park Road to the sharp bend at Jollyes where it becomes Cattlegate Road, and on up the slow incline under the railway bridge to the ridge at the golf course entrance, and on down to the junction with East Lodge Lane is a wonderful country road. It could not cope with the extra traffic from a 3,000-home estate without massive widening works. The

railway bridge span currently in use is insufficient, so one of the other spans would need to be opened up. The junction with East Lodge Lane, already the scene of constant accidents, would need to have either traffic lights or a large roundabout, and the extra traffic generated would mean a massive change to the junction at the other end of East Lodge Lane where it meets the Ridgeway at Botany Bay. Should the owner of the estate opposite the golf course get planning permission (hard to refuse if the council goes ahead with its planned development) even more traffic would be generated. A question that has not been covered is what would happen to the hundreds of trees, many of them mature oaks, that the council has carefully logged in the past few years?

### **SP PL 10 pp 80-87 Concept Plan Fig 3.11**

To enclose the road by building 3,000 plus houses (in addition to thousands more planned by private developers/landowners) would destroy this uniqueness and add masses more traffic to an already very busy road - again, one that would need to be considerably widened to cope.

### **SA52 Page 372**

Why do we need to build industrial offices on the Green belt land beside Ramme Marsh. I remember the Council halting plans for the then new north/south road through this area on the grounds that it was of special scientific interest, so what has changed?

### **SA 54 Page374**

11 hectares of new industrial storage east of Junction 24 of the M25 on New College and Holly Hill farms. Visible from Crews Hill I believe, so instead of haystacks and fields, the view will be industrial units and even more (heavy) traffic clogging The Ridgeway. Junction 24 will be more of a nightmare junction for travellers from Enfield, Potters Bar, and Barnet than it already is.

### **SA 62 P383 and SP CL4 Pages 277-279**

*I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Park Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement.*

Tottenham Hotspur want another 42.5 hectares of north Enfield in order to extend their training ground. That is 105 acres, or probably about the same area as Whitewebbs golf course. I know that golf courses are a developer's dream, and sports fields in general, including school playing fields, much sought after. How long before Tottenham Hotspur decide they have too much land and then develop it into even more housing? I am as tired of writing it as you probably are of hearing it from me, but Whitewebbs Lane/Road is narrow and twisting and entirely unsuitable for a lot of traffic. How long before the Club wishes to have permission for buildings on the site? How long before the number of people using the site increases until the road cannot really cope? The junctions with both Forty Hill/Bullsmoor Lane and Theobalds Park Road are poor so would need radical alteration (even more traffic lights or maybe roundabouts?). Plus remember that THFC have not fully complied with previous planning agreements, so what will make them adhere to the rules now.

**SA2 & policy DE6 Figure &.3 & 7.4 Pages 156-160 & 321**

I am also objecting to the tall building policies which would be a blight for Enfield and encourage the creation of “no go zones” for residents.

