

Dear Enfield Council,

I am writing to strongly object to the following Policies of the Draft Local Plan that impact on the Green Belt in Enfield: **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 – all of which propose the de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

I have lived in Enfield Chase for over 39 years and have enjoyed living in a part of London that I always tell people is like living in a rural village on the edge of London. I moved here because it enabled my family and I to walk into the countryside, through farmland and into the Green Belt from home. These latest proposals put forward by the council in the Draft Local Plan to allow the building of homes on beautiful country side within the Green belt are simply outrageous. These are lovely countryside areas with stunning views in most cases and not “a disgrace” as some ill informed councillor has voiced! 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 and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough

I am well aware of the need to build more housing and have witnessed huge development and infilling of land around Enfield Chase over the recent past including the Chase Farm development and proposals to convert the Data Connection offices in Windmill Hill and Church Street, as well as countless other developments within a stones throw from my house in Waverley Road. Waverley Road is only 200 metres long but since I have been living here 101 new dwellings have been created which has virtually doubled the number of dwellings on the road. All of this development has undoubtedly impacted on the quality of life in living here but none of this is as devastating as these latest proposals to rip away the green belt countryside that still allows sanctuary to escape the increased cars, noise and pollution. Previous councils have managed to build housing and hit housing targets without the need to encroach onto the sanctity of the Green Belt so why does this council feel the need to do so? Is it simply to give an easy way out at the expense of current residents, or perhaps arrogance that they feel they can ride roughshod over the people of Enfield and the Mayor of London and his London Plan? I am also perplexed as to why this council can declare a “climate emergency” and then implement a policy which exacerbates climate crisis by getting rid of countryside and building all over it – what sort of hypocrisy and lack of joined up thinking is that?

There are huge areas of brown field sites all over the Borough of Enfield that could be redeveloped as housing together with retail space being released from the change in people’s buying habits. It is these that need to be developed before stealing the Green Belt.

I am also objecting 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 mar the landscape, ruin the conservation area in Enfield town and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms

could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.