

---

I am writing to express concern at the proposed plans for Enfield and I would like to express my objections to the current draft local plan.

There is a lot of information to assimilate and digest so I am not sure if the following issues have been included? so has the local plan included:

- An equality impact assessment undertaken on all the proposals in the local draft plan?
- Has Enfield and the proposed draft local plans addressed any issues that cover its obligation under the Public sector Equality duty contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?
- What percentage of the stock of housing will be public housing? And include provision for key workers and public community services such as libraries, health and social care?
- Could most of the development be on existing brownfield sites?
- Do the plans include provision to minimise any groups, but particularly any resident living with disabilities, and in turn, has it met the many duties of care and provision, as expressed under the current Equality Act

2010?

- Has there been an [environmental impact assessment](#) applied to all of these draft local plans?
- Will all the new housing stock be subject to a carbon impact assessment? Balancing the cost of pollution, use of materials, products, structures and design?
- What environmental impact will there be on Enfield's biodiversity?
- A recent [report found that 3.1 million](#) children were exposed to toxic air in England, where it exceeded WHO limits on particulate pollutant matter (PM) 2.5. What environmental consideration and impact will it have on the air quality of Enfield?

I feel confident that a review of the current plans could include further concentrated development on existing brownfield sites without a need to build on protected green sites.

I would like to note my objection to the proposed local plans and explain it on each point.

1.

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; 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. These sites are part of the 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.

2.

I also 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.

I would also suggest that the plans give consideration and include multiple sports and not just a focus on one sport, so the creation of designated cycling, skateboarding, running and walking paths, a gym, a tennis and squash court, a multipurpose venue to allow and encourage participatory and performance arts, a community cafe with links with local schools and community outreach groups, including charities within Enfield.

3.

I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

