

---

Dear Enfield Council

I am writing to object to the following Policies:

SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11;

SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10;

SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364;

SA54, page 374;

SA52 page 372; and

SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose the de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

Most of these sites are part of the 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, including myself, and others for exercise, relaxation, watching wildlife etc. The effect on physical and mental health by the closure of the footpath would be detrimental if destroyed by development. The farmland could be put back into productive use growing local food for local people and reduce carbon footprint. Crews Hill is equally important to the borough and should not be destroyed. Its garden centres and other businesses provide employment and a leisure 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. Again reduce carbon footprint.

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. It's original intention of being the lungs of London is even now more important in this time of health, well being and climate change. 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.

In addition I would object to the tall buildings policies on pages 156-160, fig.7.3, 7.4 and Policy DE6 and SA2 re Palace Gardens shopping centre page 321. High rise buildings at this site would mar the landscape and detract from the borough being seen as a green and pleasant place to live, work and visit. Enfield Town was always referred as a 'market town'.

Services in Enfield are over stretched as it is so added road congestion, fuel emissions (also from new homes), sewage, water, NHS, schools, Police, over density, loss of habitat etc etc will not make Enfield a nice place to live.

The Green Belt is protected and should remain so for future generations. The London Mayor is against developing it and all these plans go against him which are a threat to the suburban nature of this borough.

The comments provided in this response to the consultation are my own views.

Regards,