

---

I am writing in response to the draft local plan for Enfield. First of all I would like to say that I am very concerned that the Enfield Council has already stated its preferred option to the public before the consultation has been approved by the Council and I wonder if this is an attempt to influence public opinion in favour of its preferred option.

The policies put forward in the plan are not easy to understand and important information not easy to read, such as that in the maps showing heights etc. I find it hard to understand how this information is good enough to be approved by Councillors and also how can the public in general be expected to respond to this, considering the scope and significance of it, this is of serious concern. There are so many, many pages of information to consider that does not make this at all easy. The presentation of the documents should have been accompanied by a summary in laymen's terms that would have led to a more meaningful consultation exercise. I also consider the timescale for such a huge amount of information and with changes that could lead to such a drastic effect on the community, unfair, especially as it has been over the Summer holiday period. I am also disgusted that the Council has not given enough consideration to the elderly and more deprived people who may not have access to the internet and therefore unable to see or comment on any of the plans. It is not until you access the information on the Council's website that you see that there is the option to write in! The leaflet that was eventually circulated to the community did not mention that people could give their views in writing. Again, I wonder how meaningful is this consultation that is not reaching the whole of the community.

1. 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 am not against development and recognise the need for new homes but strongly believe there may be other ways and that these should be exhausted before the Green belt is considered. Indeed the Government has said it is committed to protecting and enhancing the Green Belt in line with their manifesto. The framework outlines strong protections for Green Belt land and states that a Green belt boundary may be altered only in exceptional circumstances, through the Local Plan process. A local authority should consider releasing land from Green Belt only if it can show that it has examined all other reasonable options for meeting its development needs. This means that the authority should have been using as much Brownfield land as possible to do so.

I also believe Green Belt is too important to lose because of health and well being and environmental purposes such as controlling flooding.

Enfield needs Social rent housing and I cannot see that building on areas of Green Belt will deliver this. With regard Policy SP PL9 : Crews Hill and the mention of a 'transport hub' as there is a railway station, Crews Hill station. This station has two trains an hour and many cancellations of these trains as well. There is no link from this station to the rest of Enfield as there is only one bus that goes to this area turns around before reaching the station. I think it is stretching the imagination to describe this as a transport hub. This does appear to be a policy that would also increase the amount of traffic.

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.

This appears to be a massive expansion of the Spurs facilities within the Green Belt as far as the M25, which is buried in the information on page 375.

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

4. I am also totally 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 especially in a conservation area, and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

I would also like to refer you to the key findings of investigation into housing typologies as sent out to Councils from Andrew Boff Chair of the London Assembly's Planning and Regeneration Committee - Boff, A, Housing typologies investigation findings, letter sent to all London councillors, 2 September 2021.