
Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

First let me protest at the quality of the supposed consultation provided at Palmers Green library which I attended. There was no presentation of such a complicated document and it was impossible to study this and the map in the cramped situation with few copies available of an excessively complex document. It was not a proper consultation at all in my opinion.

I am grateful to the numerous local bodies who have studied the Draft Local Plan and been able to bring some clarity to us residents who have numerous concerns over these 'revolutionary' (or retrogressive) ideas. I think that it is very important that the council seriously reconsider their Draft Plan (fortunately it is a draft plan) in the light of the in depth evidence provided by these bodies.

London's Green Belt was put in place primarily to stop London sprawling into the surrounding countryside and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment without its continuous development around London would likely now extend from Brighton to Cambridge as one continuous ribbon development and infill.

The proposed development on Enfield's Green Belt would not be 'deeply green' or a 'gateway settlement' as claimed. It would be infill and sprawl. Urban sprawl comes with multiple economic costs, including increased travel costs; decreased economic vitality of urban centres; increased tax burdens due to more expensive road and utility construction and maintenance; increased car use leading to higher air pollution and increased health care costs for diseases like asthma, and loss of productive farmland and natural lands that support tourism and the boroughs well-being.

The Draft Local Plan is clearly out of alignment with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework with respect to delivering housing on the Green Belt. In fact, the London Plan places the utmost importance on the protection of the Green Belt and the Mayor also has a strong commitment to protect the Green Belt.

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; 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 the designated sites in Enfield's Local 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 I support housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. **I 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. There **are** alternative sites for increasing the housing stock where there is better transport potential and which will meet the need for low cost housing – not on posh estates in the Green Belt whose prices will be unaffordable for the average person and so will not answer Enfield's need for new homes!

I think that you will find that many people have been put off commenting by the complexity of this plan and we have had to rely on resident bodies to help us to understand it. However be assured that there is huge opposition to the loss of the Green Belt in a borough that has always been proud of its 'green roof'.

PLEASE THINK AGAIN ABOUT YOUR PRIORITIES

Yours sincerely,