

---

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 dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of 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.

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 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.

I am also objecting to the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321 which propose areas for and the acceptable height of tall buildings which, in many cases would mar the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

I object to the proposal to build 3000 new homes at Crews Hill as it will destroy the horticulture businesses there. Horticulture is part of Enfield's history and heritage and could be encouraged to grow as an important part of Enfield borough's contribution to improving food security and mitigating the negative effects of climate change. ([Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#)); instead the proposed housing development would destroy a viable and popular group of local businesses.

I object to the proposal to build 3000 new homes on the land at Vicarage Farm on the open Green Belt countryside. There is nothing 'deeply green' in my opinion as the council claims to call it, about building thousands of homes on Green Belt land. Having already renamed the area Chase Park and the land already in the ownership of developers Comer Brothers it feels very much like this consultation is a foregone conclusion and that the financial interests of housing developers are given the top priority. The council plan claims this is about providing housing but the housing will not be affordable for most people in need. The price commanded by homes build on what was Green Belt, will be built for maximum profit for the developers. This is not a decision for the good of Enfield residents who will be losing access to the Green Belt in our home borough. It's more likely that if this plan approves development on Green Belt land, the winners will be housing developers cashing in, and the people who buy the resulting highly priced properties as an investment. ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#));

I don't think this development is the best way to solve our housing shortage. To do this the council should cap rental prices by offering council owned and maintained housing and/or capping privately rented accommodation prices. This would make housing affordable.

I also wish to register my objection to the survey platform that residents were encouraged to use to give their feedback. I find the use of the closed yes/no questions very limiting in allowing residents to express themselves.