

---

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 – all of which propose the dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

As well as providing residents (such as myself and family) with beautiful green open space and opportunities to get away from the hustle and bustle of our concrete jungle, the Enfield green belt is an important and essential part of local life.

With historic connections and valuable green landscape which is home to many species of flora and fauna, the green belt in Enfield is part of our history. Growing up in the borough, I've always appreciated this - now the council is proposing to remove this precious amenity.

This can not be allowed to happen and must not happen, even in the name of development. We have enough brownfield land which has not been considered fully for this proposal and this is of concern.

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.

I am also objecting to the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321 which propose areas for and the acceptable height of tall buildings which, in many cases would mar the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

To be clear I'm objecting in no uncertain terms to the following:

- The 'Spatial strategy' ([section 2.4](#)) which identifies how growth will be distributed across the Borough over the plan period and gives rise to the strategies for housing, employment, town centres and countryside green belt;
- 3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green' 'sustainable urban extension' referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#));
- 3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7,500 new homes right up to the M25. ([Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#));
- 160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood ([SA45: Land](#)

[Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364](#));

- Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammev Marsh ([SA52 page 372](#));
- 11 hectares of new industrial and storage and distribution use at what is currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase ([SA54, page 374](#));
- a big expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25, comprising of 42.5 hectares of land, for “professional sport, recreation and community sports/leisure uses” ([SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279](#));
- Encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area ([see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#)). A [higher quality version of figure 7.4](#) is also available, showing proposed maximum building heights across the Borough.