
Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

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

We are 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 SA52 page 372; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose the de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

There *are* aspects of the plan which are positive, for example, the place-making areas within existing built-up areas. Also some of the proposed environmental improvements are to be welcomed i.e. those which address climate change and biodiversity.

However within the proposed development, it is alarming to see how damaging to Enfield's individual and unique identity as a borough many of the plans would be, for example, development on **high quality** countryside.

Regeneration opportunities within the Lee Valley are not included in the draft local plan thus wasting a marvellous opportunity.

Surely more attention could be paid to the development of Meridian Water East Bank where simultaneously environmental improvements can bring quality to the neighbourhood whilst also addressing dereliction.

With regard to Policy BG3, could there not be more benefit to the Council's tenant farmers by an approach which favours working with them rather than the possibility of forcing them off the land which may

happen if the council's proposals for rewilding etc. are realised.

As a local residents , we are concerned about how so many proposed tall buildings will impact on Enfield Town, Southgate and Edmonton Green areas.

Most of the sites identified in the draft plan 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. The farmland could be put back into productive use growing local food for local people. 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 for housing, its horticultural activities should be encouraged and enhanced so that it can once again be a hub for food and plant production.

While we support housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, we strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. We believe that there are 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. 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.

The borough of Enfield has **so** much to offer in terms of its terrific historic heritage but attention to this most pertinent fact is not

apparent in the draft proposal.

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