
Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

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 re-designation 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.

While I support housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes.

I am a resident living close to Crews Hill and I particularly object to the loss of Green Belt in this area. I realise Enfield does need houses but development in Crews Hill would inevitably be low-density, non-affordable and car-dependent – in other words, it wouldn't help much to meet the housing targets and would add to pollution. As an alternative, there are plenty of sites to meet the need, closer to public transport and where development would also improve deprived areas.

NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.

Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.

The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area. Creative master planning of these sites plus more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades, would all not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas.

The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is unnecessary.

THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!

The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality, accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:

- Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
- Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
- Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
- Improving mental health;
- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. I would also like to reinforce my view that another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because the 2013 review is still valid.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for de-designation.

The comments provided in my response to this consultation are my own views.