

Draft Enfield Local Plan

I am greatly concerned about the impact of certain policies in the **Draft Enfield Local Plan** on the Green Belt countryside of the borough and some Conservation areas.

The Draft Enfield Local Plan proposes development on **high quality countryside** within the Green Belt. This is contrary to the London Plan, which states at paragraph 8.2.2 that the Mayor may support development on **'derelict and unsightly'** parts of the Green Belt.

I object to the following Policies:

- 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**). This proposal would cause irreparable harm to open Green Belt countryside. It would also cause irreversible damage to the integrity of Enfield Chase Heritage Area. It would end the visual separation between Oakwood and Enfield Town.
- 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**). I object to Strategic Policy PL9: Crews Hill, particularly the development of Crews Hill Golf Course. This would result in development on some high quality Green Belt countryside within Enfield Chase. It would also greatly increase traffic on Whiewebbs Lane, East Lodge Lane and Botany Bay.
- 160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood (**SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364**).
- 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**).
- A large 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**). I object to the transfer of part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. In light of the public's increasing need for public, outdoors recreation space - which has been accentuated by the Covid 19 pandemic - I call for the reinstatement of Whitewebbs Golf Course.

All of the above 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

Draft Enfield Local Plan

and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the character of the borough.

The Spatial Strategy (**Policy SS1**) gives too much weight to protecting Strategic Industrial Locations (**Strategic Policy E3**). The Draft Enfield Local Plan ignores the Secretary of State's direction to the London Mayor to *'provide boroughs in the difficult position of facing the release of Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land with a greater freedom to consider the use of Industrial Land in order to meet housing needs'*. Mixed use development, such as could be provided at Harbet Road, should be given further, full and open-minded consideration in contrast to the Draft Enfield Local Plan to desecrate high quality Green Belt land. Houses built on Green Belt land would not have supporting infrastructure - including lack of transport links - leading to more car use and pollution. The level of infrastructure required to support the very high levels of proposed growth would cause further harm to the character of the borough. Green Belt homes would be marketed for those with higher incomes - not for those in the borough with lower incomes and great need of housing. That is why the Draft Enfield Local Plan should take heed of the Secretary of State's direction (above) to the Mayor.

I also object to the proposed Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammey Marsh (**SA52 page 373**). This would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. Rammey Marsh has ~ 225 plant species including pyramidal and bee orchids. Birds such as reed bunting, skylark, meadow pipit and linnet have been spotted there. There are grass snakes, pipistrelle bats (protected species) and Small River Lea provides an important habitat for the water vole that are a priority species in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. They are fully protected under section 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981(as amended). This land should be cherished and not put under threat of redevelopment or disturbance by nearby development.

I object to the encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area (**pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6 and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321**). These propose areas for, and the acceptable height of, tall buildings which, in many cases would mar the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy. There has been no Heritage Impact Assessment made available to the public.