

---

Hello Enfield council,

I am a resident in Enfield (N21), and have been for over 20 years.

I object in strong terms to the proposals in the draft local plan which involve building on areas of natural environment, whether for housing or otherwise. The proposals are listed at the end of this email, I am not sure if it is all the proposals, so I want to make clear that I am opposing any destruction of the natural environment in Enfield in the draft local plan. The main reasons are:

1. We should stop damaging our natural environment, and instead take action to restore it.

This is a time of unprecedented environmental damage worldwide. Since 1990 we have lost over 10% of the world's forests, and they continue to be destroyed at a rate of about 5 million hectares annually. This global destruction of our natural environment is accelerating the climate crisis, and causing huge loss of wildlife and plantlife. In the UK it is said we are losing around 21 square miles of countryside to development annually, and that more than half of our wildlife species are in decline. The natural world is unique and unimaginably wonderful. Once destroyed, it cannot be recovered. We are part of the natural world and should care for it, not destroy it. It is an important part of our quality of life and well-being. This is especially true of green belt areas. They are close to densely populated towns and cities so as to be easily accessible to residents as an antidote to the challenges of living in densely populated places.

2. The Green Belt sites in Enfield are part of the history and character of the borough, which we should conserve.

The sites for development are part of historic Enfield Chase, which played an important role in the development of Enfield. Parts are unique in the south east, and rare and valuable parts of our natural world. The loss of these sites would damage the character of Enfield, which we should conserve. We are keen to conserve buildings of historic or cultural importance. The concern for our natural environment should be all the greater..

3. There is no need to build on the green belt.

Yesterday it was reported that the Government is abandoning important aspects of its proposed new planning laws. In particular, the setting of targets for the numbers of new houses to be built, and the zonal system which would allow for building on green belt areas. The need for these reforms was questioned due to the high level of house building currently achieved, with record numbers of homes built in 2019, and in the first quarter of this year. In addition, there are 1.1 million homes with planning permission waiting to be built. I agree that there should be more decent, affordable homes in Enfield. But the developments on the green belt sites are for luxury homes, which are the most profitable for developers. Social housing should be built on brownfield sites, and needs to be subsidised or otherwise incentivised to avoid poor quality construction.

3,000 homes at Vicarage Farm on Green Belt countryside on both sides of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town (Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11)

3,000 homes at Crews Hill with potential increase to 7,500 new homes (Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10)

160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood (SA45 page 364)

Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammey Marsh (SA52 page 372)

11 ha industrial and storage and distribution hub on Enfield Chase agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 - New Cottages and Holly Hill Farm (SA54, page 374)

Transfer of 42.5 hectares of land of Whitewebbs park to private management by Tottenham Hotspurs football club (SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277-279)

Tower blocks in Enfield Town Centre (pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321)

Crematorium at Firs Farm.