

I am writing to object to the following 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 – all of which 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 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.

Strategic Policy PL10: Chase Park.

As an individual who daily walks the Merryhills Way with friends and family the views of rolling topography, hedgerows, trees, copses and long-distance vistas that are unique within the Enfield boundaries and have significantly contributed to my mental health being. The character and identity of western Enfield derive in very large part from the openness and countryside character of this land.

In contrast the Council states in *Character Responsive to Context 4* that the existing townscape should only be ‘acknowledged’ and densities increased on the Chase Park development. *The design of new development should acknowledge the townscape of the 1930’s residential context but make more efficient use of land with a higher density, sustainable urban form which reflects its suburban location.*

Are these increased densities proposed appropriate in a countryside environment?

I question whether the ‘Place-Making’ for Chase Park is really place-making at all as it appears to have no reference to the special qualities of the area at all.

The Green Belt sites designated for Chase Park are strategically important. The Green Belt assessment commissioned by LBE states that release of much of this land would cause major harm to adjacent Green Belt. Green Belt purpose 3 – **To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment** – is of particular importance here. The Green Belt study is unable to indicate any ways in which the harm could be mitigated in terms of design and layout. Far from being an ‘urban fringe’ development, the proposed development would be in actual countryside i.e. it would be in sharp contrast with the built-up areas. Green Belt purpose 4 – **To preserve the setting and character of historic towns** – is also very relevant. Local residents moving through the corridor on the bus, walking, cycling or driving find that experiencing the presence of the countryside on both sides is key to their identity and sense of place. This would be lost if the separation between Oakwood and Enfield Town disappears.

We also note that the Chase Park area has been assessed in different sections that appear to have been artificially created, given that the land is under single ownership and that the entirety of the area is important for the integrity and coherence of historic Enfield Chase.

This land also makes an important contribution to the setting of Trent Country Park Registered Historic Park, which would be lost.

The Merryhills Way (a popular Public Right of Way from the Ridgeway to Trent Park) would be transformed from a unique countryside experience to a walk along an urban path between buildings. The Merryhills Way currently provides an outdoor opportunity for residents, such as myself, living in an area of deficiency in access to nature, Highlands Ward being one of only two with no park.

This will mean the only way to walk my dog in a countryside environment will be to drive to a park. This doesn't seem a very good "green" policy.

Far from being 'deeply green' and a 'sustainable urban extension' as described in the plan, the proposed development would see infrastructure including roads, foul sewage, surface water run-off, footways etc. replacing countryside farmland that sustains a wide range of resident and migrating birds and insects, in addition to other fauna and flora.

I personally am deeply concerned about the potential impact on the following reptiles and amphibians which are seen regularly in the gardens, woodland and grassy areas around the Fairview Road end of the Merryhills way:

- Great Crested Newts
- Slowworms
- Grass snakes

The proposed development would cause a large increase in traffic and related congestion, especially at Oakwood and at the Slades Hill/Windmill Hill junction with resultant pollution.

I agree with local suggestions that a better use for this land in all ways would be for it to be farmed and for it to be incorporated into Trent Country Park allowing for increased public access and the sustainable growing of local food.

Strategic Policy SSI: The Spatial Strategy.

This policy protects Strategic Industrial Land at the cost of Enfield's Green Belt and historic landscapes such as Enfield Chase which are integral to the history and character of the borough.

I believe Medium Growth Option 2 better serves the needs and future of the borough and that the pros and cons have been manipulated to produce the result favoured by the Council. The Council's assessment of the options is technically flawed but a political decision has been made to proceed with the Green Belt option, which fails to take into account or even address the level of local objection in the previous Issues and Options responses and in the pre-2018 consultation, where 82% of respondents did not want to build on the Green Belt.

Insufficient effort has been made to drive better use of brownfield land (of which Enfield has huge areas). The case for exceptional circumstances and using Green Belt as the preferred option is technically flawed.

I have concerns about part 2 of this policy and object to parts 7, 8, 9, and 11 relating respectively to Chase Park, Crews Hill, warehousing in the Green Belt east of Junction 24 of the M25 of the Ridgeway, and housing in the Green Belt at Hadley Wood.

Strategic Policy BG3: Biodiversity Net Gain, rewilding and offsetting.

I am concerned that this policy is being used to justify development that would be highly

damaging to the environment. There are irreplaceable priority habitats within Enfield Chase lying within a non-recreatable historic setting. Development would destroy or fragment these important assets. No amount of developer contributions to 'rewilding' or offsetting can compensate for damage to these aspects of the countryside. Also Vicarage Farm is located on the Buglife B-line (part 3c of the policy) and should be protected, rather than destroyed by development in an area great for wildlife, insects and birds.

Policy DM RE1: Character of the Green Belt and Countryside. Paragraph 11.1.2 suggests that this policy is about 'compensation' for harmful developments such as Chase Park. It is not possible to compensate for the irreplaceable wildlife and heritage benefits of Enfield Chase at Vicarage Farm. The justification is hollow and I object to this policy and the way in which it is presented.

Policy DM RE2: Improving access to the countryside and green corridors. Part 1d refers to 'important viewing points'. Many of the most important 'viewing points' in the Green Belt are visible from the Merryhills Way at Vicarage Farm. The Merryhills Way is close to local people and is highly valued for the physical and mental health benefits it provides, principally because of the openness of the landscape. This policy, like the proposal for destruction of the countryside at Chase Park (PL10) fails to recognise that. I note that Enfield Golf Course is shown as a green corridor on the Proposals Map and suspect that the Council intends that this route would somehow compensate for harm to the Merryhills Way caused by development at Vicarage Farm, given the poor access to open space for residents in the area. I do not believe as a private citizen I have access to the golf course land and I couldn't afford to join.

I look forward to a clear response to my objections.