

---

I grew up in Enfield and decided to move back here when I retired after more than 30 years living overseas. I was drawn back by the borough's green spaces and heritage and its good public transport connections. I am therefore shocked by the proposals in the draft local plan to build thousands of homes and some industrial facilities on Green Belt sites, removing beautiful and important historic countryside and destroying Crews Hill, which supports many businesses and draws people from near and far. Both areas should in fact be producing local food for local people but agriculture and horticulture receive only nominal attention.

It seems that the plan was drawn up by people who haven't visited these sites in person – and maybe don't even live in the borough. The plan looks like a desktop exercise that has gone horribly wrong. Anyone really familiar with the borough will know that its green spaces are valued by residents from all over Enfield. You shouldn't need to be told in these days of climate crisis why our green spaces are important – or that Green Belt is protected for very good reasons. You might try to claim exceptional circumstances but you have not proved your case. A trip to other parts of the borough will take you to brownfield areas that are crying out for regeneration, that would bring necessary greening, improved public services and provide homes and more employment. There are no exceptional circumstances, just what appears to be lazy, uninformed, uncreative planning.

I object specifically 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. Also Vicarage Farm is crossed by the Merryhills Way, a popular footpath that would be destroyed by development and the fields are rich in biodiversity, providing habitat for many bird species and resting grounds for migrants.

I also object to *Policy DM BG10 Burial and Crematorium Spaces* which allocates three Metropolitan Open Land [MOL] sites for potential new crematoria, specifically SA58 Alma Road Open Space, SA59 Firs Farm Recreation Ground (part) and SA61 Church Street recreation ground. These sites are very important for the health and welfare of residents.

I also object to *Policy DEG: Tall Buildings*. Tall buildings are being played off unnecessarily against the Green Belt in the plan documents. The Council admits that alternative building forms, such as mid-rise mansion blocks, can achieve a similar number of homes as tower blocks. *7.6.4 For instance, mansion blocks, terraces or stacked maisonettes can achieve the same number of homes or floor space without excess height. These buildings can offer advantages in terms of better amenity and less costly maintenance.* Tall buildings are out of character for the borough and should be allowed only in a few specific locations and only at moderate height. Our historic town centres are not appropriate places for skyscrapers.

I would also like to make the following comments on the consultation process:

- The consultation has not been properly publicized and relies too much on internet access. The leaflet from the council did little to explain the plan properly or make it easy for people to respond.
- Expecting average residents to read and understand even the consultation document, let alone all the evidence base documents is unrealistic and undemocratic.

- The LetsTalk survey is equally hard to navigate with different questions in some areas from the consultation document itself, a varying number of questions for different policies which don't seem to relate to the overall importance of the policy and a variable number of characters permitted for different answers. It takes hours to complete the survey in a responsible way.

I have always been proud to come from Enfield, with its extensive Green Belt, rich history and innovative thinking. This plan represents an Enfield I no longer recognize and would be ashamed to call home. If this consultation is truly a 'listening exercise' then listen to me and all the other people who are responding to tell you that you are on totally the wrong track.