

---

Dear Sir/Madam

Please find my objections to Enfield's Draft Local Plan on the following points:

1. 3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green' 'sustainable urban extension' referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#)); 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.
2. 3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7,500 new homes right up to the M25. ([Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#)); 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.
3. 160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood ([SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364](#));
4. Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammey Marsh ([SA52 page 372](#));
5. 11 hectares of new industrial and storage and distribution use at what is currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase ([SA54, page 374](#));
6. Encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area ([see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#)).
7. The proposal to build a crematorium on Firs Farm Wetlands. This is outrageous as this remarkable wetland area has not been completed and is a community asset.
8. The proposal to knock down Sainsbury's, green Lanes and build houses - SA32 Sainsburys Green Lanes, pages 315 and 359. Another part of the plan I cannot understand. The loss of a major supermarket in the area will force people to have to drive further. This would especially affect elderly and disabled residents and increase car usage on local roads, especially Greens Lanes which is already a busy route. The loss of green space around the supermarket would be detrimental to local residents and nature alike.

It is my understanding that the Government's/Major's plan for housing is still in draft itself so how can Enfield produce a draft plan from a draft plan?

This paragraph was taken from a letter sent to a resident in N21 from the GLA Planning Team – “The Mayor expects Enfield’s Local Plan to align with the policies of the London Plan, and all planning applications to comply with the London Plan in terms of the continued protection of the London’s Green Belt”.

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 our borough.

I urge Enfield council to take a total review of your Draft Local Plan and consult the rate payers of Enfield in the process.

Yours faithfully,