

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.<BR><BR><BR>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.<BR><BR><BR>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. 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.<BR><BR><BR>I also object to PolicyDM BG10: Burial and crematorium spaces, which would take part of Firs Farm and other recreation sites for crematoria.<BR><BR><BR>I also object to Policy DEG: Tall Buildings. Tall buildings are inappropriate in most parts of Enfield and the Council even admits in 7.6.4 that alternative building forms, such as lower-rise mansion blocks, can achieve a similar number of homes as tower blocks.<BR><BR><BR>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.

On a personal level, I consider Enfield council as OUR council. Elected by us to serve our needs. I do not believe that we are at a stage where the only options for providing the homes we need is to build on green belt. Even if we do reach that point in the future it is my belief that as OUR representative Enfield council should be fighting on our behalf against any government directives to build on green belt. Government has implied that they will look kindly on projects which involve building on otherwise ring fenced industrial areas in those areas where the only alternative is to release green belt. That reassurance indicates that they would like you to continue to protect our much valued and irreplaceable countryside. I therefore do not believe that the council would be forced to allow such development.

I also feel that the figures on which this “need” is based are flawed. Historically such figures have not been proved to be accurate and especially now with COVID and Brexit, there is even more reason to doubt their veracity.

The “need” for vast numbers of new homes is therefore dubious. The kind of homes which would be built on green belt land would not be the small affordable homes which the council needs. During my lifetime, most of my peer group, and indeed that of my parents, were not able to afford homes in the west of Enfield. Most of us bought our first homes elsewhere and then returned home to these parts of Enfield as we became better off financially. This is something that the council should not attempt to change. It is this aspiration that encourages self improvement and self sufficiency in many aspects of life. If you flood any area with low income families who require high levels of support, you then have to provide that support, a further burden on any overstretched council budget.

There are plenty of brownfield site around the borough where small family homes can sit comfortably within areas which already have the schools, medical facilities etc. that are needed. Expanding a number of existing facilities is a better economic route than trying to find places for totally new ones, as has been proved in the past with the selling of space around educational facilities which had “appeared to be surplus to requirements” and then proved not to be so!

In the far west of Enfield and in the Oakwood areas we have wonderful access to beautiful expanses of open countryside, but if you remove those then we will be very poorly served in terms of any large recreational spaces which could replace what they provide. These places always have been important for physical and mental well-being and one can only imagine their requirement will increase with the further passage of time. No

council has the right to “sell the family silver” in the manner that this plan for dedesignation proposes.

I very much hope that you will not approve any plan or part of a plan which involves building on our green belt land.

I would further ask that you petition the government for lasting action to preserve the green belt in such a way as we do not have to continually have these kind of discussions. If the green belt could be protected absolutely from the attention of developers, then their attentions would have to turn elsewhere to find serious and viable alternatives. History suggests that most problems can be overcome with the correct and adequate application of effort and will.

Best regards