

Dear Enfield Council,

I am writing to you to object to the following policies relating to Enfield Council's misguided draft Local Plan.

1. GREEN BELT

I object to the following policies relating to the proposed overdevelopment of our precious Green Belt:

SP PL10, pages 80-87 and Figure 3.11

Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80

Concept Plan Figure 3.10

Policy SA45: the Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364

Policy SA54, page 374

Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279

The above proposes the dedesignation or rezoning of Enfield Borough's Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are precious and form an integral part of our historic Enfield Chase. They belong to our intangible cultural heritage and provide residents with a link to our historical past in a fast and frenetic ever changing world. These natural gems are unique in the southeast of England and played an important role in the development of Enfield, and are what makes Enfield attractive. Enfield's rare and valuable wildlife landscape is an asset to the community as it is packed full of biodiversity along with several thousand mature trees that mitigate the worst effects of climate change. The removal of our Green Belt trees would run directly contrary to Enfield Borough's Climate Action Plan 2020 stated Net Zero carbon neutral climate goal of 2030 by significantly reducing the borough's carbon offset efforts by an order of magnitude. In fact the removal of the Green Belt would drastically reverse Enfield's direction towards its Net Zero 2030 goal, possibly making it possibly unachievable by 2030.

Ref: <https://new.enfield.gov.uk/services/environment/enfield-climate-action-plan-2020-environment.pdf>

If the Green Belt is lost to the bulldozers and greedy developers this would also cause irreversible and permanent harm to the quality of life and mental health of the residents of Enfield Borough who have been seeking solace and enjoyment in the borough's green spaces during the coronavirus pandemic of the last eighteen months, and into an uncertain future.

2. WHITEWEBBS PARK

I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279. The transfer of part of

Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management, is unethical and unnecessary. I reject Enfield Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was not financially viable and call for its reinstatement.

3. RAMMEY MARSH

I also object to Policy SA52 page 372, which proposes to remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area full of biodiversity and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

4. TALL BUILDINGS / PALACE GARDENS SHOPPING CENTRE

I object 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 blight the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

5. SAINSBURY'S GREEN LANES

I also object to Draft Local Plan SA32 Sainsbury's Green Lanes p315, p359. The loss of a large supermarket in our area will increase car usage on local roads and force Enfield residents to drive further, thus causing air pollution. This will also be detrimental to Enfield Council's stated carbon neutral goal by 2030. The proposed development would disproportionately affect elderly and disabled residents who will have to bear the extra burden of additional time, cost and inconvenience to reach alternative supermarkets located further away. There will be an increase in the number of road vehicles in the Borough due to new residents of the proposed development who will bring an increase in polluting carbon monoxide levels that will impact existing locals, especially the elderly and school children at nearby Highfields school. Moreover, to my knowledge, there is no additional supporting community infrastructure planned which will inevitably lead to existing overstretched facilities such as schools, doctors' surgeries, dentists being further overstretched to breaking point. With the existing removal of Fords Grove car park and current the recent removal of 14% of car parking on Winchmore Hill Broadway, this development will lead to a further loss of revenue to local shops leading to potential closures. This development will also lead to the destruction of wildlife habitat and woodlands, which runs directly contrary to Enfield Borough's Climate Action Plan 2020 stated Net Zero carbon neutral climate goal of 2030 by significantly reducing the borough's carbon offset efforts. The site is home to at least three different species of woodpecker (greater/lesser spotted and green varieties) as well as trees with tree protection orders (TPOs), such as poplar and oak tree. It should be noted that in 1986, the UK Secretary of State allowed planning permission for Sainsburys to be built with on condition that the green space was retained for community use. This condition should be respected and adhered to. The green space near Sainsbury's is vital to the mental health of residents who live in the surrounding flats and do not have access to gardens. The green space near Sainsbury's is used by the young and the old, thus contributing to the health and wellbeing of all residents of Enfield. The proposed development would necessitate offering housing in keeping with the architectural character of existing housing in Winchmore Hill. However, Enfield residents require larger, affordable family housing which this development will not offer. The choice of site given is grossly inappropriate given its close proximity of existing traditional historical properties. The area around Sainsbury's on Green Lanes is already overdeveloped given the recent and future developments along Green Lanes, such as Travis Perkins and Capitol House, and further development is unwelcome. Years of construction vehicle disruption due to dust and noise from increased building work traffic on Green Lanes, which is already congested especially at peak times,

will be harmful to the health of nearby residents as well as anyone else who visits the area. The skyline of Enfield will be blighted by the proposed development which is not in keeping with the existing character of the area.

6. FIRS FARM WETLANDS

I object to draft policy DM BG10. This allocates Firs Farm Wetlands (Site ID SA59) as a site for burial and/or crematorium use. Based on the points set out below, I call on Enfield Council to remove all reference to Firs Farm wetlands from Policy DM BG16 when the draft Local Plan is finalised and adopted. I oppose this policy because:

- a.) Firs Farm wetlands is an important community resource that is essential to the mental and physical health and well-being of local residents.
- b.) The proposal to situate a crematorium at Firs Farm will undermine work to improve the community, flood alleviation and wildlife and biodiversity value of the area, negating the significant public and private investment that has been made and compromise current plans for further improvement.
- c.) The proposal is inconsistent with and directly undermines Enfield's Climate Action Plan 2020 to achieve net zero carbon dioxide emissions by 2030
- d.) The draft Policy directly contradicts Strategic Policies SP BG1 and SP CL4 in the draft Local Plan.
- e.) The proposal is inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- f.) The proposal is inconsistent with national guidance on the development of crematoria.
- g.) The proposal is inconsistent with the policies of the wider 'London Plan'.
- h.) The evidence base for the draft Local Plan does not set out a clear and compelling case for proposing cremation/burial use at Firs Farm.
- i.) The proposal will negatively affect the local Site of Interest for Nature Conservation and reduce the wildlife biodiversity and nature conservation interest of Firs Farm wetlands, contrary to several other policies in the draft Local Plan.
- j.) The proposal will increase local traffic and congestion, and a consequent additional impact on the local environment. This has not been properly considered in the Integrated Impact Assessment of the draft Local Plan.
- k.) The proposal is inconsistent with its Spatial Vision and Objectives of the draft Local Plan.

I sincerely hope that my views on Enfield's draft Local Plan can be properly considered and acted upon during this public consultation.

