

---

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to respond to the development plans.

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; Policy SA62 page 372; 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.

I have lived in Enfield for about 30 years, and have always been impressed by how well the area's environment, especially its green spaces are looked after and developed. However, I am concerned that these new proposals will cause to the destruction of considerable areas of valuable Green Belt, that should be an inheritance for all of us and especially for future generations. Once this land is given to development an area of great importance to the physical and mental health of the residents is taken away, and cannot be replaced or made up for. I appreciate the effort to increase the bio-diversity of the remaining areas, but however you look at it there will be a considerable loss of natural habitat with the knock on effects across the ecological and health arenas, to name but two. The Green Belt needs to be sacrosanct, and I would have thought, given the current green agendas that building on it would be absolutely avoided.

Having two children of my own in their late teens/early twenties I am personally very aware that we need to provide more housing. Clearly, Enfield has an important role to play in this. The Plan suggests 25000 homes over 20 years and appears to conclude that around 6000 must be built on the Green Belt. However, an independent report, "Space to Build" (2019) details considerable Previously Developed Land that could be used. In addition, I am unconvinced that all available brownfield and industrial sites have been considered. Development of such sites could bring many benefits to their surrounding areas without destroying historic, essential and uniquely valuable Green Belt.

I am also concerned about the proposed developments at Whitewebbs (map SA62). If THS are to develop AstroTurf pitches in the North section, why are they to have the surrounding land down to the other side, and the pond area up by the north road? How will the character of all this land be protected given for example, the use of flood lights which will adversely affect the wildlife, increased traffic and the cutting down of the trees and so forth. What guarantees are there that access will remain for the whole area?

I am pleased that the ancient forest is to be protected, but maintain that the open areas should be developed in way that increases, not diminishes, their biodiversity. The provision of sporting facilities is obviously important. However, they need to be near where the people who will use them live, and have good access for all types of people. I believe that the proposed development will only benefit a small section of the populace.

Over the pandemic this area provided a vital place for many people's physical and emotional health and the businesses that run in that space are very popular. I understand that the golf course, especially in its current state, may not the best use of the land yet I wonder to what extent other options have been considered? This area has huge potential to really put Enfield's environmental care and development on the map.

Lastly, I want to say that I have found this very difficult to write. I understand that such planning is necessary, and very complex. However, the documents are not easy to read, and harder to interpret for non-specialists. I may well be wrong, but are being pushed forward too quickly? Has enough care been taken to present the information in plain and easy to understand way?