

---

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

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

My objection is due to the following reasons:

1. The Green Belt is an area of recreation for the entirety of the Enfield community, and the proposed building will permanently destroy this space. The green belt is imperative to the physical and mental health of the local population, and the proposed alternatives are limited and unlikely to be sufficient to compensate the loss of such a wonderful open space.
2. There will be a permanent loss of habitat for wildlife. The natural diversity of flora and fauna will be destroyed for brick work and buildings, and many creatures will be unable to live in the area due to the construction.
3. There are not sufficient local amenities to support such a large scale development:
  - a. The Chase Farm Hospital no longer has an A&E unit, so other local hospitals will be even more overrun than they already are,
  - b. The roads are already overcrowded in the area, and added more housing will not help this,
  - c. The area is hilly, so many residents will choose easier modes of transport over cycling. Riding bikes isn't a feasible option for many, such as the elderly, disabled and families with young children, especially with the increased traffic on the roads,
  - d. The local transport links into London are overcrowded and with not many local jobs, the commuting traffic will increase,
  - e. Local schools are oversubscribed, meaning children will have to travel further afield for their education, which in turn increases commuting traffic on both trains and roads.
4. The development does not follow the National planning policy Framework paragraphs 137 to 151 for the following reasons
  - a. I do not believe that "exceptional circumstances" exist that would justify such a development
  - b. 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 before any consideration of using the greenbelt for development
  - c. The development does not fall within the exceptions noted on paragraph 149 of the Framework and is therefore inappropriate development
5. The development is not in line with the London Plan 2021 which states that:
  - a. The Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development
  - b. 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. I do not believe that exceptional circumstances exist in this case

- c. 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.