

---

I am writing to object to certain aspects of your proposals to build housing on areas of Green Belt land in Enfield. Many of the areas highlighted in the plan are part of historic Enfield Chase, a unique area that over the years has played an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a rare and valuable asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough. Enfield is known, and respected by many, for the many green areas within its boundaries, including some beautiful parks, some of which, like Whitewebbs, appear in the plan.

- In particular I object to the following Policy: [Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#) which proposes the dedesignation of Green Belt land at Crews Hill for housing and other purposes.
- Crews Hill is a unique area not just within the borough but within the whole of London. It provides both employment for local residents and also leisure facilities for the many people in the borough, and outside the borough, who have an interest in gardening. I myself visit one or other of the Nurseries once or twice a month to buy plants and meet friends for coffee. I cannot think of an alternative local venue where I could do this.
- As well as the effect it would have on local businesses and employment opportunities, and also leisure and social activities, this area and the surrounding farmland provides valuable spaces within which wildlife can flourish. There would be no need for the suggested re-wilding of areas with any housing development if the natural wildlife areas were retained. The only reason for re-wilding is because natural wild areas are being destroyed by proposals like these.
- I note that the plan says that the riding school must be retained but pays no regard to the many more people whose leisure activity is gardening and not horse riding.
- I would also question what will happen to riders' access to bridle paths if the redevelopment takes place.
- I am also very concerned about the effect that this density of housing would have on the railway line that takes commuters into London. The trains would fill up at Crews Hill and make it virtually impossible to get onto the already busy trains as they pass through Enfield, Grange Park, Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green.

So, to sum up, I object to the plan because:

- of the effect it would have on local businesses,
- the loss of employment opportunities in Crews Hill,
- the loss of facilities to support the leisure pursuits of hundreds, if not thousands, of Enfield's keen gardeners, and
- the destruction of natural habitats within our Green Belt areas.

I would like to propose that an alternative way to increase housing within Enfield would be to look at the many empty office blocks within the borough. The re-purposing of the office block next to the multi-storey car park in Enfield (formerly the

offices of a gas company) demonstrates how such empty and redundant buildings can be converted into very attractive living spaces. I would suggest this would be a more economical and environmentally sympathetic solution to the housing problem and it would also have the added advantage of adding footfall to Enfield Town Centre and this in turn would support the many businesses that are struggling within the area.

I also think that brownfield sites and empty houses within Enfield should be tackled before any of our Green Belt is destroyed.