

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

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 de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

Most of these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which played an important role in the development of Enfield. The remaining parts of the Chase are unique in the southeast and 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. Vicarage Farm is crossed by the Merryhills Way footpath, much used by Enfield residents and others for exercise and relaxation and the physical and mental health attributes of the footpath would be destroyed by development. The farmland could be put back into productive use growing local food for local people. 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 strongly object to the proposal to release the Green Belt for housing or other purposes. The Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations. 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 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.

In my opinion the wanton and deliberate destruction of any part of the Green Belt or potentially productive arable land is a crime against future generations and is probably even more morally evil than the destruction of the Amazon rain forests due to the greater population density of the UK (UK 717 per sq mile vs Brazil 64 per sq mile).

The University of Sheffield's Grantham Centre for Sustainable Futures reported in 2015 that the world had lost on third of its arable land in the preceding 40 years, while in 2019 the United Nations stated that the loss of arable land is a threat to 'everything we eat, drink, breathe'.

Anyone advocating the destruction and loss of the Green Belt and arable land in the UK must do so from an uneducated position of ignorance and stupidity, or from intentional malice driven from conscious jealousy and envy, or lastly from simple greed in that they have personal and potential gain to be made.

The destruction of the Green Belt, arable land, or any land that helps Enfield stay green is

an act of moral evil and the pursuit of the morally bankrupt.

The comments provided in this response to the consultation are my own views.