

---

I am a long-time resident of Enfield and welcome the opportunity to contribute my views on the draft plan to encroach on the Green Belt.

Before dealing with the details of my concerns, I would like to express my horror that the principle of preserving the Green Belt has been so easily set aside by a Labour Council. The Party has been selling itself as the party of values at least on the national stage and yet locally it is hard to discern which if any principles remain intact. I urge you to consider the damage to your reputation such short term money driven policies will cause. Your objections to other policies that contravene your remaining principles will be undermined possibly fatally. Please consider the following carefully;

I 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. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough. It is inconceivable that in the wake of a deadly pandemic with restrictions on movement and contacts, that a council should consider the reduction of green spaces that allowed safe exercise to extremely vulnerable people such as myself. It smacks of the kind of opportunism that has seen the increasing loss of public spaces to private development and control.

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.

As we have seen across the world, our environment is under extreme threat with the combination of drought, wildfires, melting polar icecaps, freak weather flooding, mudslides and hurricane damage. The headlines scream the need for major and immediate reconsideration of policies that will further stress our climate. It is hard to see how your proposals to cover green land can be reconciled with avoiding further escalation of climate damage. I trust you have considered the reputational damage to Enfield, and are prepared to accept the opprobrium of being the 'dirty borough' of London, if you press ahead with these plans.