

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Draft Local Plan

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; 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.

These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough. I believe the farmland could be put into productive use growing organic vegan produce for the local community.

Merryhills Way footpath is a much loved and much used footpath, which has been critical in the wellbeing of me and my family as we regularly use the area for walks.

Crews hill is also an important part of the borough and is used extensively by my friends and family for the wide array of garden centres and other shops on the sites. The garden centres have also provided a fantastic opportunity for my daughter and her friends to get part-time employment and learn to serve the community and be introduced to a working life. There is an opportunity to develop the garden centres as they are iconic and widely known with a very good reputation for all types of gardeners across London and wider area. My friend comes there from Shepherds Bush and uses several shops while less reluctant gardeners in his family browse the non-garden shops or wait in the Plough, where they can be served a delicious lunch.

2. I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement.

My family including teenage children have walked through the Golf course almost every day since March 2019. It is a beautiful and much loved part of Enfield.

3. I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Ramney Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

Ramney Marsh, wildlife area is a vital resource not only for residents of Enfield but also for the many local schools as it offers opportunities to engage with Nature with the support of the Enfield Council Highways department. Oasis Academy Hadley, the school where I am a site manager, have proposed students visiting this area at the Sustainability Working group meetings in order to encourage and develop young peoples life long love of nature.

4. I am also objecting to the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321 which propose areas for and the acceptable height of tall buildings which, in many cases would mar the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

While I support housing development and the ambition to meet Enfields 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 the Green Belt is a precious resource that should

be protected and preserved for future generations. It is too valuable to lose as it offers enormous environmental, ecological, economic, public health and spiritual benefits, as detailed in my letter, to the local and wider community.

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