

I am writing to object to the following Policies in the Enfield Draft Local Plan.

Firstly, I would remind all Councillors that at the last General Election all the parties promised to protect the Green Belt. As far as I am concerned this is a very important promise. Labour Manifesto 2019: "Green Belts protect one tenth of our land and offer conservation of some of our natural environment. Introduced by Labour in 1947 to provide access to the countryside, they are threatened by developments. A Labour government will maintain agricultural and rural structural funds but repurpose them to support environmental land management and sustainable methods of food production". Conservative Manifesto 2019: "The Green Belt. We will protect and enhance the Green Belt.In order to safeguard our green spaces, we will continue to prioritise brownfield development, particularly for the regeneration of our cities and towns". Green Party Manifesto 2019: "strengthen Green Belt".

I object to the creation on Green Belt land of 3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green' 'sustainable urban extension' referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#)). No "deeply green sustainable urban extension" can be as green as the Green Belt no matter what is artificially put in place. The Enfield Road and Hadley Road are both single lane roads and added traffic would be horrendous. Enfield Chase is historically important and should not be eroded further.

I object to the loss of Green Belt land for 3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7,500 new homes right up to the M25. ([Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#)). The excuse for this development is the twice an hour train service. No thought seems to have been given to the dozens of small businesses that are on this site that will be closed. Worst of all is the loss of the fantastic amenity Enfield residents have of the whole raft of nurseries and this site must be unique in London.

Again I object to 160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood ([SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364](#)). This area has a wider setting of numerous heritage assets including Grade II listed buildings and the Battle of Barnet Registered Battlefield and should be properly preserved for posterity.

I object to the loss of more Green Belt by Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammey Marsh ([SA52 page 372](#));

I object to 11 hectares of new industrial and storage and distribution use at what is

currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase ([SA54, page 374](#)).

I object to a big expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25, comprising of 42.5 hectares of land, for “professional sport, recreation and community sports/leisure uses” ([SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279](#)). The Whitewebbs golf course is a fantastic local amenity which should not be removed.

I absolutely abhor 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](#)). A [higher quality version of figure 7.4](#) is also available, showing proposed maximum building heights across the Borough. There are many other proposed tall buildings with which we disagree, namely on the B&Q site, Palace Gardens, Cockfosters Tube, Enfield Chase. The loss of the amenity of both Dunelm and B&Q is grievous and means travelling further afield by car to their next nearest branch which is counter to all current thinking. After all a bag of concrete can't be carried on a bike. Apart from the fact that these tower blocks, to quote Prince Charles, are a carbunkle on the landscape and are visually unattractive, these schemes are seriously altering the whole ambiance of what it means to live in leafy and historic Enfield. Most importantly, of course, is that these homes in tower blocks are not a new idea; after the war many were built and it was soon found that they were not conducive to a happy life for their occupants and many were torn down because of this.

My additional reasons for objecting to the Local Plan as shown are as follows:

Impact on climate change, Global Mean Surface Temperature (GMST) and air quality

The existing site on the Green Belt at Vicarage Farm is a 95% two dimensional site consisting of thousands of square metres of green vegetation which is absorbing short wave irradiance from the sun (watts per square metre). This energy is put into the growth of plants and because of the colour green it is also reflected back as short wave radiation which is not absorbed by the atmospheric gases and CO₂ in particular. In this process of photosynthesis CO₂ is removed from the atmosphere while oxygen is emitted to the atmosphere, the life support system of all life on this planet. The planned development would turn this into a three dimensional site of darker than green building material ie bricks, tarmac and concrete of many tens of thousands of square metres more. A vast increase in area than before. This will absorb a vast increase in short wave radiation solar energy. These building materials absorb this solar radiation as internal energy and it is re-radiated as long wave radiation (heat). This transmission is resisted by the atmospheric gases and this slows down the long wave radiation leaving the planet and increasing the GMST. What is known as the greenhouse effect.

These developments on Green Belt therefore contribute to and exacerbate the increasing of the Global Mean Surface Temperature of the planet. As all our politicians are taking the country to Net Zero and reducing CO₂ emissions to reduce the GMST and air quality, this Local Plan is intent on producing the opposite effect and taking us in the wrong direction of travel.

To use the greenhouse analogy on a smaller scale, if this development was inside a greenhouse in a back garden the proposed Local Plan is equivalent of removing 95% of its plants and replacing them with building materials and then adding a heater (representing the heat emissions from the planned new homes) and this would further raise the

temperature within the greenhouse from what it was with just the plants.

Heat gain to the planet = heat loss to the planet

The Climate Change Act deals with the heat OUTPUT of the planet (heat loss) by reducing the CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere to increase the heat loss from the planet into space thus attempting to lower the GMST.

The other side of the equation deals with the heat INPUT (heat gain) to the planet. This is the sun's solar radiation plus all the energy and power we use.

This proposed Local Plan therefore sits on the heat gain side of the equation by increasing the conversion of the sun's short wave solar radiation to long wave heat radiation thus increasing the GMST which is the opposite of the intention of the Climate Change Act. Within the Enfield Local Plan there are no mitigating circumstances where these developments can prevent this occurring

In conclusion

The Council will be making a very poor choice if the development is allowed to go ahead on Green Belt land rather than previously developed BROWNFIELD sites. By building on the Green Belt the Enfield Local Plan is increasing the GMST of the planet and creating poor air quality for the surrounding area. Enfield Council will be increasing the GMST of the planet rather than reducing it as required by the IPCC. Enfield's Green Belt is a large part of the lungs of London and therefore should not be reduced. The rationale for the introduction of the Green Belt in 1947 is still as strong for Londoners today and must be protected at all costs. Finally, before any more erosion of the Green Belt is undertaken ALL BROWNFIELD sites should be utilised instead. The rationale for the introduction of the Green Belt in 1947 is still as strong for Londoners today and it must be protected at all costs. To just snip away 10% here and 10% there is unacceptable. In recent years there has been a gradual erosion of the Green Belt and this direction of travel must be stopped.