

Strategic Planning and Design  
Enfield Council

Dear Sir / Madam

I'm writing as a very concerned citizen of Enfield who has a track record of running community events and contributing to the improvement of the borough and supporting local businesses through the arts.

I vehemently oppose The Draft Plan which contains numerous instances of inappropriate overdevelopment in the borough, in particular on our precious Green Belt. There are plenty of Brownfield sites in the borough such as in the Lee Valley - Harbet Road, Meridian Water East Bank, and Brimsdown which are ripe for considerate development without destroying the natural beauty that is one of the key characteristics of our borough making it special with its own unique identity. The Secretary of State 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*". Enfield Council need to focus development on brownfield sites not Greenbelt unspoilt countryside. The London Plan states at paragraph 8.2.2 that the Mayor may support development on "derelict and unsightly parts" of the Green Belt. However, the Enfield Local Plan proposes development on high-quality countryside.

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

**I also object to the proposed development at Crews Hill (including the Crews Hill Golf Course) Strategic Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10):** 3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7,500 new homes right up to the M25. The Plan would result in development on some high quality Green Belt countryside within Enfield Chase, and would result in traffic pressure on the Conservation Areas and at the rural East Lodge Lane and at the remote hamlet of Botany Bay. Crews Hill is a unique site for gardening suppliers. I know people travel from far and wide to visit the area as there is nowhere else in the country that has such a vast selection of specialist gardening suppliers. Again this is one of the unique features of our borough that attracts visitors, boosting our local economy and local businesses. The rural lanes that traverse the area are another key characteristic of our borough. These are not suitable for the substantial developments proposed and if widened / altered, would destroy the countryside feel that is enjoyed by so many of us living in the area.

**I also 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 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. High rise buildings have proven to be detrimental to mental health of residents. Cramming people into this type of accommodation is a number crunching game, not taking into account the real needs of human beings and the importance of their environment and easy access to green space. Clusters of high-rise buildings on green belt or next to conservation areas such as in

Southgate are wholly inappropriate and would only result in massive over density of population, which is not only not supported by additional infrastructure or services such as additional doctors' surgeries or schools but not eco friendly and not delivering appropriate housing for families who need space with access to green space, not living in high rise blocks.

The recent trend for introducing LTN's in a bid to improve quality of life, reduce pollution and car-use have merely transferred traffic to roads on surrounding areas. This is hard evidence that you cannot stop people using their cars. With increased over development in our borough, you are simply importing more cars, more traffic and more problems. There is no such thing as a car-free development, other than in name only. I have experienced first-hand this type of development which is not policed and not enforced; so people park their cars where they are not allowed to, resulting in daily conflict between existing occupiers and incoming residents. Human beings need space to live and breathe and green spaces are vital for a healthy population. It's a recipe for disaster to wipe out these spaces in favour of filling them with densely populated sites and think traffic and air pollution issues are mitigated by simply labelling developments as "car-free" and putting a few cycle racks in. Not everyone is fit or able to cycle, nor is it practical to carry heavy loads on a bike.

**I also object to Strategic Policy PL10: Chase Park.** The proposed development would cause high or very high harm to open Green Belt countryside; it would cause irreversible harm to the coherence and integrity of Enfield Chase Heritage Area, severing the link between Trent Park and Old Park and adversely affecting the setting of both; it would end the visual separation between Oakwood and Enfield Town provided by the experience of passing through open countryside on the A110; it would spoil the openness of the popular Merryhills and it would worsen an existing deficit in open space provision in postcode areas EN2 7 and EN2 8.

**I object to the Site allocation SA45 Hadley Wood and SA54 Land east of Junction 24.** These two sites are both strongly performing Green Belt countryside and part of Enfield Chase. The proposed industrial and employment site on the Ridgeway at SA54: East of Junction 24 would destroy an attractive green gateway to the borough and make the area another anonymous industrial estate, sacrificing our beautiful countryside and negatively impacting massively on our wildlife.

The Council does not appear to have given any consideration to the **Areas of Special Character** in selecting its preferred development sites. Development on the above sites would cause severe harm to the *Enfield Chase Heritage Area of Special Character (AoSC)*. I believe Enfield Chase is of national significance.

To conclude, there is huge opposition to Enfield's Draft Plan so I sincerely hope that the public's opinion will be listened to when finalising the Plan. If proper consideration is not given to residents' and business owners' views in the borough, the Council will destroy the unique character of the borough, negatively impact on the health of its population and adversely effect the local economy. It's vital that future generations are considered and that Green Belt is preserved. Once it's gone, it's gone.