

---

## GREEN BELT

I am writing to object to your proposals for building on Green Belt and areas of scientific interest.

The following policy sections apply:

- 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 Rammey 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](#));

My reasons for objection are as follows:

- Once the Green Belt is built on it is lost forever. "Only 7%" is the thin end of the wedge.
- Your Population Growth Forecast is based on 2019 figures. Since Brexit and the Covid Pandemic, the population has decreased by over 1 million people. You need to revise your figures for the number of homes to be built.
- You should use Brownfield sites, and push to finish the Meridian Water development.
- Farmland must be retained and used to help the country be self-sufficient in food production. We are currently experiencing food supply problems because of Brexit.
- Your plan will ruin the nature of the Borough for all the residents of Enfield, and

those who work in and visit the Borough.

- We have and will lose recreational facilities i.e Whitewebbs Golf Course, Trent Park, Hadley Wood and Rammey Marsh.
- We will lose the facilities at Crews Hill. This area is unique in the country and has existed for many years. It attracts many visitors and revenue into the Borough.
- Houses built at Crews Hill will not be affordable for most people. The developers will build large detached properties for Rich City Workers commuting to the City and Canary Wharf. The idea of providing them with green houses to make residents self-sufficient is risible.
- Overall, the Infrastructure of the Borough is under pressure at present; and there appears to be insufficient plans to relieve the situation when more homes are built.

## ENFIELD TOWN

As a resident of Enfield Town I object to the proposed redevelopment of the Palace Gardens precinct.

The following policy applies:

- 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.

My objections are as follows:

- The proposal will ruin the nature and character of the Enfield Town Conservation Area and surrounding environs.
- The erection of a 26-storey tower block will stick up like a sore thumb. It will be visible from many green spaces in the Borough and will detract from the amenity of those areas. At present the Enfield Town Skyline is interesting and historic buildings are not dominated by any tall buildings. The Civic Centre, Pinnacle House and Tower Point are tall enough.
- Residents and visitors will lose shopping facilities for 5-10 years whilst work is undertaken, and they may never return.
- There is nothing wrong with the entrances to Town Park, and its accessibility from the Town. The park is well used on a daily basis.
- Little or no provision of parking spaces for the proposed 600 units will mean occupants will park their cars and work vehicles in local streets. This will make life more unpleasant and difficult for existing residents.