
Subject: Draft Local Plan - Regulation 18 Consultation 2021 - SAVE THE GREEN BELT

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation. I write as an extremely concerned resident and former Residents Association Chair of Crews Hill.

I object strongly to the following policies, all of which propose the de-designation of green belt land for housing and other purposes:

- SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10;
- SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11;
- SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crewscent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364;
- SA52, page 372;
- SA54, page 374;
- SA62, page 383; and
- SP CL4 pages 277-279;

I am copying for their information the Mayor of London, particularly as it has been stated that he is "*seeking to protect and enhance the green belt, which provides vital environmental and recreational benefits, prevents urban sprawl, and drives the use of previously developed land*"; Joanne McCartney, as a member of the London Assembly for Enfield and Haringey with a particular interest (amongst others) in a greener and environmentally friendly London; and Sir Christopher Chope, as this may be of interest in relation to, and in support of, his proposed Green Belt (Protection) Bill.

The Enfield Council's draft local plan is ill-considered in the extreme, misleading and potentially permanently damaging to the borough and to London as a whole, and the Council is urged to look at developing the many brownfield sites in the borough that would more beneficially fulfil Enfield's housing needs, rather than destroying our green belt land, which is, amongst other health and mental wellbeing benefits, an essential contributor to the fight against climate change, and aptly named "the lungs of London" .

I ask the Council to carefully consider the following:

- Most of the sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which played an important role in the development of Enfield. and the remaining parts of which are unique in the southeast and rare and valuable landscape assets. The loss of such sites would cause permanent harm

not only to the green belt but to the very character of the borough.

- Vicarage Farm is crossed by the Merryhills Way footpath, much-used by Enfield residents and others for exercise and relaxation, and the physical and mental health attributes of the footpath would be destroyed by the proposed development. The farmland could rather be put back into productive use growing local food for local people.
- Crews Hill is equally important to the borough. Its garden centres and other businesses are an inherent part of the community and local landscape, and provide employment and resource for people from Enfield and beyond. Rather than developing Crews Hill for housing, its horticultural activities should instead be encouraged and enhanced, and maintained for the enjoyment of future generations.
- Crews Hill is currently protected under the Green Belt (London & Home Counties) Act 1938. It is poorly connected, with existing roads struggling to cope with the current traffic load (including many lorries which support local businesses), particularly during the spring and summer months when the garden centres are visited by many, both from within and outside the borough. There is insufficient infrastructure to support the Council's proposal of 3,500 new homes. As its name suggests, the area is hilly, and the Council's sustainability objectives such as encouraging walking and cycling would be severely challenging, if not impossible, as houses will almost certainly need cars, which will of course add to pollution and congestion.
- Furthermore, the proposals are highly unlikely to deliver affordable houses (the Chase Farm development delivered only 5% of the proposed 25% for social housing) and will have little or no effect on the housing waiting list for Enfield residents when market forces inevitably take over.
- The Council states that there are not enough brownfield sites to meet the housing needs in Enfield. This is strongly disputed. Research by the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England ("CPRE") indicates that Enfield has space for at least 37,000 homes on a wide range of types of brownfield land. Existing sites, such as supermarkets and car parks, could also be converted to provide homes whilst maintaining their existing use.

While I fully support housing development to meet Enfield's housing needs, I object most strongly to the proposal to release green belt land for housing or other purposes. The government's policy position is that the green belt should be protected. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has stated that *"protecting the green belt is a priority and our national planning policy reinforces regenerating brownfield sites and prioritising urban areas"*. Although the Council states in its summary leaflet that the *"Draft Local Plan prioritises developing on urban brownfield sites"*, there is very little evidence to support this statement. The Council should be looking to all the available brownfield alternatives before developing green belt land as it is a precious resource which, once lost, will never be recovered and should be protected for future generations.

The Council has a duty of care in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and is respectfully requested to uphold and respect that duty of care by removing from the local plan any intention to build housing developments on green belt land.

