

To: Local Plan team

I wish to object to a number of elements in the Local Plan which will have huge ramifications for Enfield and its residents.

**Spatial strategy (section 2.4)**

The conflict between the spatial strategy and its impact on climate is striking. To place dense housing developments on swathes of countryside at Chase Park and Crews Hill would be hugely damaging to the environment, to local ecology and to the wellbeing of Enfield residents. Alternative brownfield sites are available and should be utilised first together with the upgrade and use of existing housing stock.

**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**

These parts of the Local Plan recommend the de-designation of Green Belt land for housing and other purposes. As 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 and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough

This area is part of the historic Enfield Chase and should be preserved as such. Much of the land in this area has public rights of way which are well used and have been a lifeline to many during the pandemic and the periods of lockdown. Of course, these rights of way would remain but Enfield residents would find themselves walking along paved roads between houses with no access to the fields that were once there. Whilst Enfield is blessed with many beautiful parks, this is one of the few places where residents can access natural countryside. Its loss would cause permanent harm to the Green Belt which plays an important part in the character of Enfield which was once known as the Green London Borough. Once this land has gone it is lost forever. There will be no going back.

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

Whitewebbs park is a much loved area used extensively by Enfield residents and many other groups. The transfer of part of this park into private management will restrict access and sets a precedent for other parks in the borough. The reinstatement of the golf course should be given priority.

**Policy SA52 page 372**

This would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt and should be rejected to ensure this area continues to flourish as a wildlife habitat.

**SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321**

The proposal for the redevelopment of Palace Gardens is unacceptable. Enfield Town has a historic town centre dating back many centuries and is a conservation area. To build high rise

flats at its centre would be ruinous to the area. In the shadow of Grenfell, consideration really needs to be given to the acceptability of high rise living and the cost of ensuring that high rise buildings meet ever more stringent regulation and can be maintained over the long term to a high standard. Such problems have resulted in many high rise buildings of the 1960s being demolished in recent years giving only a 50-60 year life span for such buildings.

During the pandemic, having access to gardens has proved very important to many and high-rise living does not provide such access. Shopping habits have also been impacted with a move to online shopping and any decision on changes to Palace Gardens should be delayed until wider research is available on long term impacts.

Whatever is built should be sustainable for many years into the future not just a quick fix for today's housing shortage which could mostly be addressed by brownfield sites, renovation of existing buildings and low-rise development.

In summary, the loss of our Green Belt heritage will be forever. Do you want this Labour administration's legacy to be remembered for this when alternative approaches are available?