

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Council's 'Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021'.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important documentation.

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; Policy SA52 page 372; 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.

Most of these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which played an important role in the development of Enfield. The remaining parts of the Chase are unique in the southeast and a rare and valuable landscape asset. The loss of these sites would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough. Vicarage Farm is crossed by the Merryhills Way footpath, much used by Enfield residents and others for exercise and relaxation and the physical and mental health attributes of the footpath would be destroyed by development. The farmland could be put back into productive use growing local food for local people. Crews Hill is equally important to the borough and should not be destroyed. Its garden centres and other businesses provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond. Instead of losing Crews Hill for housing, its horticultural activities should be encouraged and enhanced so that it can once again be a hub for food and plant production.

The Green Belt should remain fully protected and kept for the purpose for which it was first set up. The Green Belt has proved to be a very successful planning tool in its purpose of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Sprawl has a negative impact on both the land and consequently the quality of people's lives by the loss of farmland and wildlife whilst promoting the increased use of the car leading eventually to the neglect of towns and cities and loss of character. Whilst you as the Council argue that the plan '**only**' proposes development of 7% of Enfield's Green Belt I would argue that this sets a precedent and would inevitably lead to further development down the line. (There will never be enough homes). Any homes built on the Green Belt would only serve as a quick fix to reach targets and would in no way serve local residents needs in looking for a decent affordable home and only serve to boost the profits of developers and their shareholders who would much prefer to build larger expensive homes on the Green Belt than less profitable brownfield sites.

In an effort to win approval for the proposed Green Belt development I feel that the Leader of Enfield Council Cllr Nesil Caliskan in her newsletter update on the plan sent out to residents used scaremongering tactics by implying that if the plan isn't passed it will lead to greater development all over the Green Belt. Also I note that the plan's use of the London National Park City in justifying and making the case for the loss to development of Green Belt on the basis that remaining Green Belt would be improved as part of London National Park City has raised concerns from The National Park City Foundation's Founder and Chair who stated the following in a letter to Cllr Caliskan:-

'Our concerns centre on the London Borough of Enfield's preferred option to de-designate considerable areas of London Green Belt for housing and its use of London National Park City in justifying and making the case for that policy. As we understand the proposal, the London Borough of Enfield has justified its proposed loss to development of Green Belt in the borough on the basis that remaining Green Belt would be improved as part of London National Park City. That is a misreading of London National Park City, which is about the entire urban realm and fabric, not just parks, green spaces. We appeared at the Examination in Public (EiP) into the new London Plan in defence of London's Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Space, attending the same session as Enfield Council representatives. It should therefore be clear to anyone at Enfield Council that London National Park City does not support the loss of green space not least Green Belt. It is therefore misleading for the London Borough of Enfield to refer to London National Park City in writing or verbally as part of justifying its proposals for the loss of Green Belt. We note numerous references in Enfield Council's Local Plan to London National Park City including the dedicated policy 3.7 on page 70, which we would normally be pleased to see. While the Council's proposals for the restoration of Enfield Chase appear laudable and the planned enhancements for public access seem ambitious, they are not a justification for the loss of Green Belt, which we do not support, and which both government planning policy and the new London Plan aim to avoid.'

While I support housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs and improve Enfield's environment for all, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. I believe that there are alternatives available to meet housing targets and that the Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations. It is too valuable to lose for all the many environmental, ecological, economic, public health and other reasons that have been identified, especially during the recent pandemic. **The Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.**

The comments provided in this response to the consultation are my own views.

