

Dear Sir

### **Response to Enfield Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 20**

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 SA62 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. 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.

The Green Belt provides many benefits to health and well-being as well as environmental protection for example controlling flooding, maintaining biodiversity and, in particular, helping to fight climate change, and providing local food and local jobs.

#### ***Policy DM DE6: Tall buildings***

While there is a need to provide more housing I do not see that there are any exceptional circumstances present to allow for the protections of Green Belt land to be removed because there are clear alternatives on brownfield sites that have yet to be sufficiently explored or taken into account. The CPRE pointed out to LBE (email Alice Roberts to Cllr Caliskan 21 July 2021) that there is sufficient brownfield land in Enfield to build enough homes at “an appropriate density” to both avoid the need to have tower blocks or use the green belt.

#### ***Strategic Policy PL9: Crews Hill.***

Crews Hill is semi-rural and the current class houses and nurseries reflect that. Already there is weak enforcement leading to activities that are not in keeping with the green belt. Developing housing as a suburban extension to the congested urban area will add to the congestion. There is no evidence that the infrastructure needed to support such development is being put in place or that it will be possible to put it in place. For example, the road network could not take increased traffic and would demand significant change to allow capacity. The water and sewerage infrastructure. Crews Hill rail station would see increased use and indeed it is proposed that it will become an important transport hub, but where is the plan to upgrade both the Hertford rail line and indeed the station to cater for this increased rail traffic? It cannot be right to propose development of a significantly large area with housing in isolation of key infrastructure over which LBE has no control.

#### ***Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because***

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.

Enfield’s own policy at 12.4.1 t states: “Enfield offers unrivalled access to sporting attractions, including: golf courses (e.g. Whitewebbs Park)...”. Closing this golf course and turning the land over to a football academy hardly supports this policy. The plans as set out on Tottenham Hotspur’s website makes no guarantee of public access to the any of the land such as the parkland which is to be included in the lease. It seems bizarre and contradictory to close the very amenities quoted in the policy as a positive reason for developing this part of Enfield. The Crews Hill Golf Club is another similar amenity.

#### ***Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre***

I am also 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 and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy. As noted above the CPRE has already noted that there is enough brownfield land to build the homes necessary without resorting to towers.

The Plan will not achieve the Council's purported aims and only lead to the destruction of important amenities.