

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've just completed the online form too.

I am writing to object to a variety of draft policies.

Firstly, DM BG10 in the Draft Enfield Local Plan. This allocates Firs Farm Wetlands (Site ID SA59) as a site for burial and/or crematorium use. I oppose this policy because:

- Firs Farm wetlands is a vitally important community resource, essential to the health and The draft Policy directly contradicts Strategic Policy SP CL4 in the draft Local Plan. This identifies Firs Farm as facilitating and contributing towards developing sport and leisure facilities in Enfield.
- The proposal will significantly affect the local Site of Interest for Nature Conservation, and reduce the biodiversity and nature conservation interest of Firs Farm wetlands, contrary to several other policies in the draft Local Plan.
- The proposal will reduce the effectiveness of the flood alleviation provided by Firs Farm wetlands, which Enfield Council has spent more than £1 million to provide.
- The proposal will adversely affect the environment and local traffic, and this has not been properly considered in the Integrated Impact Assessment of the draft Local Plan.
- The policy introduces uncertainty into the future use of Firs Farm wetlands that jeopardises funding for projects secured by local community groups (e.g. from Thames Water) that have been endorsed and supported by Enfield Council.

I call on the Council to remove all reference to Firs Farm wetlands from Policy DM BG10.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. I am also objecting to the proposed redevelopment of Sainsbury's Green Lanes.

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

