

---

I am writing to register my objection 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 SA52 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.

Most of these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which played an important role in the development of Enfield. The remaining parts of the Chase are unique in the southeast and a rare and valuable landscape asset.

The loss of these sites would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also 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 development.

Crews Hill is equally important to the borough and should not be destroyed. Its garden centres and other businesses provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond. Instead of losing Crews Hill to housing, its horticultural activities should be encouraged and enhanced so that it can once again be a hub for food and plant production.

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.

There are clear and viable alternatives available to meet housing targets and that the Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations. It is too valuable to lose for all the many environmental, ecological, economic, public health and other reasons that have been identified, especially during the recent pandemic.

Furthermore, the Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan. We are in the midst of a climate emergency, and need to do all we can to protect our greenbelt not decimate it. The planting of a few trees and a bit of landscaping is not a substitute.

Importantly, the selected areas of Enfield do not have the infrastructure to support thousands of additional people in the Crews Hill and Vicarage Farm area. Pre-pandemic, the trainline to Moorgate was already at full capacity. At rush hour, it is standing room only from Winchmore Hill onwards.

With thousands more people at Crews Hill/Vicarage Farm, how do you propose people travel in to work? There are no A&E or maternity services at Chase Farm. Barnet and North Middlesex hospitals are already at capacity. The Ridgeway, and Enfield Road are already at capacity. Each time there is an accident on the M25 which seems to be every couple of weeks, Enfield comes to a standstill. For all your best intentions that people do not travel by car this will not be the reality. It's all very well suggesting that children go to local/ new proposed schools but again the reality will be that those schools will have entry requirements that mean children will not automatically stay local. 50% of Wren Academy's intake is prioritised according to religion and not distance door to door for example

I also object to the proposal to build a crematorium within Firs Farm Wetlands SA59: Firs Farm

Recreation Ground p380. It is unacceptable that after all the work and money that has been spent to create a real community hub and vibrant wetlands, Enfield Council propose to build a crematorium within the wetlands. This is not in keeping with the space! This is an award winning and loved community green space, and is NOT suitable for development due to its liability to flood. There are clearly alternative better suited sites. Why destroy this wonderful natural habitat. It is ironic that Enfield Council is part of a community planning application to build a cafe on that exact same location!

I am astounded at Policy SP H1: Housing development sites p187 Table 8.1 proposal to build over SA11 Southbury Leisure Park. If this pandemic has taught us anything, it is the importance of exercise for our wellbeing. Enfield needs affordable accessible leisure facilities. The alternatives at Southgate and Edmonton are too far away for children to cycle or walk to safely. The people of central Enfield need these facilities. Children need to learn to swim. Do not take this away from them this will create an even greater divide between higher and lower earning demographics within Enfield.

I also strongly 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. Enfield Council should maintain the whole park as a fully accessible nature reserve and community hub.

Finally I object to policy DE6: Tall Buildings (pages 156-159). The whole character of Enfield will be irreparably damaged if we allow such tall building to profligate across the borough, particularly in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area. People want to live in affordable housing not high rise boxes. Conservation areas exist to be protected and not built over when a perceived need arises!

I hope that you take my objections into consideration and change the plan accordingly. The comments provided in this response to the consultation are my own views.

Finally, I feel that you have made it as complicated as possible to register an objection to these proposals. It would certainly appear that you are "loading the dice" to favour the large land developers and make it challenging for your residents to meaningfully input.