

---

I wish to record my wife's and my objections to the draft Local Plan because most, if not all, the proposed developments contravene the very principle and legal status of the Green Belt which, I believe, the Government and the Mayor of London have said would be protected. All the proposals pay scant attention to the environment and traffic pollution.

Specifically:

Policy SP PL 10 and Figure 3.11: proposes a large number of new homes (and already a developer is suggesting a greater number than mentioned in the Plan) on Green Belt land. The loss of this farmland is short-sighted when the UK will certainly need more food production now and in the future. Where would all these extra residents work, go to school, get medical help, etc.? Such additional housing would put a huge burden on essential local amenities such as schools, hospitals, power sources, transport, e.g. trains and buses, and roads. The local roads are already inadequate at certain times of day (i.e. The Ridgeway, Botany Bay, Windmill Hill), and Enfield Town will seize up fairly soon!

Policy SP PL 9 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10: another large number of houses and future expansion. The same objections as in the previous paragraph. What does "sustainable" mean in this context and in Policy SP PL 10 above? Is this just intended as a warm comforting word?

SA 62 and SP CL 4: expansion of the Spurs training ground. The first Spurs facility was not going to lead to expansion but this has happened and now this would be another erosion of the Green Belt and erosion of any trust in planning procedures and enforcement. Apart from Green Belt issues, there would be detrimental effects on local residents and additional traffic on the roads, particularly as these are country lanes.

Policy DE 6 and SA 2 Palace Gardens: tall buildings would not be in keeping with the surrounding areas, environment and particularly in the Palace Gardens Shopping Centre.