

Dear Enfield Council

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

### **Green Belt**

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.

While I support housing development and support 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 that 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.

I would also like to object to the justification of the loss to development of Green Belt in the borough on the basis that remaining Green Belt would be improved as part of London National Park City and feel this is very misleading. London National Park City concerns the entire urban realm and fabric, not just green spaces, etc. Both government planning policy and the new London Plan aim to avoid the loss of Green Belt. Paragraph 3.8.8 on page 71 of the Enfield Local Plan states that "The designation is not strictly a national park...". London National Park City has no formal planning or legal status and neither has nor seeks the kind of planning role of the established National Parks.

### **Tall Buildings**

I would also like to object to the encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area (see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321), and the proposals to increase building heights across the borough (DE6: Tall Buildings pages 156-159, figure 7.4). According to paragraph 7.6.2 of the draft Local Plan, "this is based on a rigorous assessment of townscape, character, and the sustainability of the location for higher density development." However, I feel in each of these locations, buildings of the heights suggested (e.g. 13 storeys/39m at Southgate Circus) would have a detrimental effect on the townscape and character of these areas.

Having already protested the Southgate Office Village development, I am dismayed to see that the borough is considering making this sort of development the norm. I also feel the council is failing to take into account the ongoing fallout from Grenfell Tower disaster and other fires in tall residential buildings mean that these are not necessarily the best type of accommodation to be planning.

### **Accommodation**

I also think the council has not fully considered the long-term implications of Brexit and the Covid-19 pandemic on population figures for London and more specifically the outer boroughs. The council has mismanaged the opportunities afforded at Meridian Water to provide many more affordable homes (not in tall buildings) by opting for commercial opportunities which are unlikely to provide long-term employment for people living within the borough.

This response to the consultation contains my own views.