

---

Dear Enfield Council

I am writing to object to several parts of the Enfield Plan that is currently out for consultation.

The use of green spaces should not be used removed or re designated to build housing. The plan should concentrate on brownfield sites within the borough. I don't believe these are being used to their full potential and believe there are other options without using or building on green spaces or green belt land. I also think in conjunction with reevaluating Briwnfield sites, Enfield Council should spend more time and investment targeting the number of vacant properties within the borough before deciding to build additional housing on green spaces and green belt land. I do not believe there are enough exceptional circumstances to warrant the building of housing on any green space or any green belt land as there are plenty of viable alternative options.

Green land and space is important for mental health which has become increasingly important in the last few years due to many more people working from home in the borough due to covid. Fractals in nature are proven to reduce stress levels and by removing green spaces you are not providing people the opportunity to be spending quality time outdoors in green areas for their health and welfare.

By removing or redesignating these spaces you are also reducing biodiversity and natural habitats.

In terms of water you are reducing the natural process of water draining and filtering, increasing the amount of water that enters drains and needs expensive treatment and filtering. The reduction of green spaces also has a detrimental affect on our very important chalk streams.

I also don't believe the Enfield plan assists the government in achieving net zero by 2050.

I specifically 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 resignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique and plays an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a valuable landscape asset for all the reasons mentioned above and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the character of the borough. Enfield is a wonderful place to live and visit because of its green spaces and the green belt spaces which provide such natural beauty. These areas are the lungs of London.

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 reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money as it is valuable asset for the local community and provides a place where people can meet. I would like this facility for leisure, sport and relaxation to be reinstated.

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

I also object to Policy DM BG10 on p380, the loss of public space and amenity from the conversion of the recreation fields at Firs Farm and to the east of the A10 (south of Church Street) for crematorium use.

I also object to SA42 the development of Ford's grove car park as this was allocated as free parking to make up for the loss of parking spaces when the cycles lanes were introduced on Green Lanes and will negatively impact business and shoppers, especially the disabled, elderly and those with children who will have to walk further.

I also object to SA32, Sainsburys Green Lanes N21 3RS. Page 351 of Enfield Local Plan - redevelopment of supermarket and car park to mixed-use homes and non-residential floor space.

All together these policies put at risk the character of the area, the places where people go to relax and unwind.

You are considering removing fundamentally important places for leisure, health and community and this plan would also have a detrimental effect on the environment. I fail to see where the positive aspects of the plan may lie.

I totally see that there is a need for housing in Enfield but I do not believe the Enfield Plan meets this objective in a constructive and positive way. The need for housing can be met in other ways and there is no exceptional need for building on green belt land. The Enfield Plan does not seem to add any benefits to either the residents or the local community.

Thank you for your consideration.