

---

I am writing regarding my concerns and objections to the Enfield Local Plan document published in June 2021.

I object to the following Policies:

SP PL10, Pages 80-87 and figure 3.11 – Chase Park

SP PL9, Pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10 – Crews Hill

SA45, Page 364; Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood

SA54, page 374; Land east of Junction 24

All of the above 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.

The development of Crews Hill and Chase Park would bring traffic pressure on the Conservation Areas and to the rural East Lodge Lane and the hamlet of Botany Bay.

These policies also contradict the London Local Plan 2021. The Mayor strongly supports the continued protection of London's Green Belt which performs a number of functions including combating the urban heat island effect, growing food and providing recreational space. The London Plan Page 314 Policy G2 states 'The Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development' and 'exceptional circumstances are required to justify either the extension or dedesignation of the Green Belt'. The Enfield Plan does not show any 'exceptional circumstances' and does not appear to have explored more suitable areas for development.

I am 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 objecting to:

SA32, Page 351 Sainsburys Green Lanes

SA42, Page 361 Fords Grove Car Park

The plan to build up to 299 homes plus other non residential space on the Sainsburys site on Green Lanes and 24 homes on the Fords Grove car park with no supporting community infrastructure plan will lead to an overstretch of existing facilities including schools and doctors surgeries. The loss of the only large supermarket in the area will force people to have to drive further especially affecting the elderly and the disabled. The

loss of the green space on the Sainsburys site is detrimental to local residents and the environment.

I am objecting to:

Policy DM DE6, Page 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4, Tall Buildings

Policy SA2, Page 321 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre

Both 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. The evidence base lacks detail on the impacts of tall buildings on Conservation Areas.

Overall, I don't believe enough alternative options have been taken into account. There appears to have been too little weight given to the contribution of Green Belt countryside and historic landscapes such as Enfield Chase to the history and character of the borough. There also appears to be little regard for the impact on the local road network and infrastructure such as schools, doctors, etc.

Some of the proposed development would have highly damaging impacts on the special character and identity of the borough. Enfield is a green borough with high calibre green belt countryside on our doorstep and much green space within it. To lose this would be a severe detriment to the Enfield of the future.