

---

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

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; Policy SA52 page 372; 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.

Most of these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, a rare and valuable landscape asset. The loss of these sites would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough. The Vicarage Farm site is home to a variety of wildlife and, with the Merryhills Way footpath, has for some considerable time been an invaluable asset for walkers, dog-walkers and runners, more so recently with lockdown. The physical and mental health benefits of our green spaces should not be underestimated and this development would destroy this important local asset. Moreover the site is simply not suitable for such a large development which would increase pollution and put undue strain on the local infrastructure. The road between Enfield and Cockfosters is already regularly congested and the lack of support services would, in my mind, make such a development untenable. Instead, the farmland could be put back into productive use growing local food for local people as had been the case in the recent past. I further note that Highlands is one of only 2 wards with no park and these developments would destroy the remaining green sites in the ward.

Crews Hill is equally important to the borough and should not be destroyed. Its garden centres and other businesses provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond. 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.

I also object to Policy DEG: Tall Buildings. Tall buildings would be highly inappropriate in most parts of Enfield. Certain of the proposals would directly impinge on conservation areas and many would be incongruous in an otherwise low-rise suburban setting. Moreover the Council even admits in 7.6.4 that alternative building forms, such as lower-rise mansion blocks, can achieve a similar number of homes as tower blocks.

While I support necessary housing development and the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. I believe that there are alternatives available to meet housing targets (and would question the basis on which the Council reached these targets) and that the Green Belt is a valuable asset for everyone in the borough and we should be striving to preserve it for future generations, especially given the immediate need for greater environmental protection. It is too valuable to lose for all the many environmental, ecological, economic, public health and other reasons that have been identified, especially during the recent pandemic. The Council should be better utilising the more than adequate brownfield sites across the borough rather than destroying our green legacy for our children and grandchildren. Developers clearly prefer Green Belt sites over brownfield ones as it is easier and cheaper for them. The Council, however, has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan

