

---

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to register my objections, in the strongest possible terms, to various proposals contained within Enfield's draft local plan.

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 redesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

One of the main features that makes Enfield such an appealing place to live, is the amount of green space that we have available and it is vital that this should be preserved for generations to come. The recent pandemic made us all aware of the importance of such green spaces and they were a lifeline for many residents in the borough.

Most of these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which played an important role in the development of Enfield. 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, which is well 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 London Plan states at paragraph 8.2.2 that the Mayor may support development on 'derelict and unsightly' parts of the green belt, but the draft Enfield Local Plan proposes development on high-quality countryside.

Crews Hill is equally important to the borough and should not be destroyed. The garden centres enjoy a well deserved reputation that goes far beyond Enfield and people travel from outside the borough to visit them. They provide a hub of horticultural excellence and employment opportunities for many local residents. 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.

The proposal to build approximately 6,000 new homes on various green sites will put even more pressure on the local infrastructure, such as increasing demand for school places and access to health services. It will also contribute to an increase in traffic volumes on already congested roads. Information about infrastructure provision is lacking in the draft plan.

I feel strongly that the Council has failed to fully consider all the alternative options available to address the housing shortage, such as utilising the existing brownfield sites effectively. The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government directed the Mayor 'to provide boroughs in the difficult position of

facing the release of Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land with a greater freedom to consider the use of Industrial Land in order to meet housing needs.' According to the draft local plan, approximately one third of Enfield is designated Green Belt, which must mean that the Minister's statement applies to the borough, and this is another option for the Council to consider.

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.

I wish to make it clear that I am not just objecting to the proposed development because it would be in my local area. I fundamentally disagree with building on the Green Belt anywhere in the UK, thereby denying local residents access to vital open spaces, which have been a lifeline for many people during the recent pandemic. The Green Belt is an important part of Enfield's, and indeed, London's environmental infrastructure.

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