

---

I am writing to you to object to the following elements of the Draft Local Plan which will determine land zoning for the London Borough of Enfield:

1. 3,000 homes at Vicarage Farm on Green Belt countryside on both sides of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town (Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11)
2. 3,000 homes at Crews Hill with potential increase to 7,500 new homes (Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10)
3. 160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood (SA45 page 364)
4. Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammey Marsh (SA52 page 372)
5. 11 ha industrial and storage and distribution hub on Enfield Chase agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 - New Cottages and Holly Hill Farm (SA54, page 374)
6. Transfer of 42.5 hectares of land of Whitewebbs park to private management by Tottenham Hotspurs football club (SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279)
7. Tower blocks in Enfield Town Centre (pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321)

I utterly reject these proposals to remove protection from Green Belt countryside areas and re-zone them for development. The Green Belt provides Enfield residents with much-needed fresh air and green spaces, biodiversity and a carbon sink to counteract increasing urbanisation, climate warming and air pollution in our borough.

Given that the Council has declared a Climate Emergency and has a target of carbon neutrality in its own Climate Action Plan, it makes no sense for the Council to remove protection for Green Belt land and allow it to be built on. The Government is committed to protecting and enhancing the Green Belt and wants to present the UK at COP26 this year in Glasgow as a world leader in working for carbon neutrality. The Mayor of London in the London Plan 2020 states that the Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development – it is the lungs of this major city. Enfield Borough should be a guardian of the Green belt as a significant part of it lies within our boundaries. The Council's own Green and Blue Plan aims to invest in Enfield's green spaces, making them accessible to all residents for their physical and mental health, for biodiversity, flood prevention and to support progress to carbon neutrality. The aim of the Local Plan should be consistent with these other plans – it should preserve and enhance our borough's green spaces, not allow carbon-intensive construction to tip the balance towards increased carbon emissions. Enfield Borough already has an unacceptable level of greenhouse gases and toxic pollutants from the major roads surrounding us and from the Edmonton incinerator. We need the Green Belt to balance this pollution with clean, green space.

I recognise we are currently in a housing crisis, but it's a crisis of housing affordability, not of numbers of homes. The real need is for affordable homes in Enfield, and to regenerate the

deprived areas of the borough. It is clear that throughout the UK we're simply not building enough social housing for rent so key workers are often priced out of their area. The Local Government Association has stated that over 1.1 million plots of land in the UK have been granted planning consent but developers are holding onto the land until it goes up in value, instead of progressing the approved works. Social housebuilding has dropped to the lowest level in 40 years and there are around a million households in the UK on social housing waiting lists. Building thousands of houses on the Green Belt won't meet this need; the impact will be a tidy profit for the developers and homes for wealthier people who can afford to live at some distance from main transport routes and to drive their cars to work, schools and shops, increasing traffic and air pollution.

A new approach to housing is required that focuses on needs, not numbers. The Local Plan should invest in delivering genuinely affordable homes, especially homes for social rent, to meet the real housing need. There are enough brownfield sites to provide the new homes needed, without building tower blocks or paving over our precious green fields. Better Homes for Enfield has discovered discrepancies in the calculations used. The count of homes already built excludes those on small sites. The count of brownfield sites available excludes a number of sites that could be redeveloped. It excludes some of the 10,000 homes being built at Meridian Water. I would like to see Enfield Council taking a lead from other London boroughs with a more creative approach to affordable social housing for Enfield families, ensuring our former industrial land and brownfield sites are regenerated into family homes without wrecking our precious countryside.

I recognise that the Council does have a statutory duty to provide homes according to the identified need. The recent leaflet to residents from the Council Leader states that "Enfield Council has a statutory duty to provide 1,246 dwellings each year, but the Government would actually like us to deliver 4,397 per year." This is incorrect – there is no statutory duty to provide any fixed number of homes each year. The London Plan sets out a figure of 1,246 new homes per year for Enfield but states that the actual number of homes to be provided needs to take account of constraints (e.g. Green Belt) and opportunities, as well as the implications for the character of local areas.

The Council Leader also claims in the leaflet that, "We also need a sound Local Plan to protect the majority of our Green Belt from the proposed national planning changes and the risk of uncontrolled development." Therefore it follows logically that the Local Plan should retain tight control on any Green Belt development and ensure these areas remain designated as protected zones not for development.

These elements of the Local Plan go against the wishes of the majority of Enfield residents, who do not want to lose the Green Belt forever, when there are better alternatives for meeting the real housing need. We don't want Enfield Town Centre, with its historic market town character, overshadowed by modern tower blocks. Development should be low to medium rise in the centre. My friends and I enjoy walking the popular paths on the rural farmland of Vicarage Farm and frequently visit the Crews Hill garden centres. We don't want to see this green space paved and built over, lost forever to the public. In the light of the climate crisis which is already upon us, these areas of open land must not be lost forever.

We residents expect better of our Council. As a Labour council, LBE should steer clear of

pressure from developers, sports clubs and wealthy investors to privatise open space that should be available to the public. We want the Council to prioritise the needs of working families for suitable housing and a healthy environment in this Borough.