Dear Sir/Madam

In accordance with your request for consultation about the proposals in the Enfield Local Plan, I am appending my contribution and views. Whilst much of the comments are those expressed by others, which I fully agree with, I have in addition made my own observations about the plan which will in my view convert Enfield into a borough in which it will be highly unattractive for future generations. I have lived in Enfield for 41 years and I thoroughly disapprove of many parts of the plan.

Alan Copperwaite
71 Gladbeck Way
Enfield
EN2 7EL

I 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 re-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

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.

I also object to PolicyDM BG10: Burial and crematorium spaces, which would take part of Firs Farm and other recreation sites for crematoria.

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.

I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. 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
.