

---

Dear Enfield Council,

As a resident of the borough I feel compelled to object to many of the policies in the Draft Local Plan relating to building on the Green Belt, high rises, and crematoria.

The proposals for a crematorium at either Firs Farm (where there is a new Wetlands and new tennis courts) and Church Street Rec ground both seem unsuitable. They are both in the middle of residential areas and would have a marked impact on traffic, but also they are valued open spaces. Particularly in the Church Street area of Edmonton, there is little other green space and the rec ground is well used by local people. Firs Farm seems much too residential an area, and Firs Lane too quiet a road to accommodate this. Why is there a need for an additional crematorium? The Plan states that people are choosing burial more often and thus taking up more room; maybe they have to stop having a choice and space that is taken up by cemeteries should go to a crematorium. Prioritising the dead over the living seems utterly nonsensical.

Regarding the Green Belt, we cannot simply continue to trample all over nature and open spaces in the interest of 'affordable' housing. I believe that there are enough brown field sites in the borough to be used for new homes, and also since the Covid pandemic 'business as usual', ie building new housing estates in outer London, cannot continue as previously; the country is becoming less London-centric, people are moving away and able to work from home. There will quite likely be less pressure on housing in Enfield than has previously been forecast.

I was also deeply concerned to note in the Council's leaflet that 50% of the new homes would be affordable- this is ludicrous! Surely if it's so imperative that these homes are built for local residents, they should ALL be affordable! We don't want to give up our Green Belt at all, let alone for some developers' profit.

The specific policies affecting the Green Belt that I object to are: 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 de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. This is a rare and valuable landscape, part of Enfield's charm as a green outer London borough, and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough.

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.

3. I am also particularly objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. With the Council's focus on wetlands in every park (seemingly) in the borough, it makes no sense to decimate a natural

marsh area.

Apart from my concerns around the Green Belt, I would also like to object 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 will categorically change the feel of Enfield, making it much more urban. I do not believe that Enfield Town is the right place for high rises given the number of historical buildings. Again, referencing the Covid pandemic, no one wants to live in flats or high rises, these will no doubt be bought by landlords and rented to people who cannot afford a house, thus creating a poverty trap and damaging the community.

Finally, I would like to specifically object to the proposed housing on the site of Sainsbury's on Green Lanes in Winchmore Hill. This supermarket is an extremely important local amenity which can be reached on foot for the majority of Winchmore Hill residents (reducing car journeys, which is supposedly an aim of the council). If this supermarket were to go, residents would be forced to drive elsewhere. This will further increase traffic on Green Lanes and will particularly impact the elderly. There is simply not the space or infrastructure to accommodate houses and flats at this site.