

Dear Enfield Council,

Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

I am pleased to have the opportunity to respond to this important consultation which has so many far-reaching ramifications for Enfield now and in the future. Whilst I understand there is a great need of housing presently, with 4500 on your housing list currently, and a projection in the London Plan of a need to build new homes at a rate of 1246 per year to 2039 for a population increase, I take issue with the plans you have proposed to make this possible and your current building programme which does not include nearly enough affordable and social rent family accommodation and far too many one and two bed flats and proposes building on the Green Belt when there are enough existing Brownfield sites that could be utilised (eg **Brimsdown, S of Millmarsh Lane 7500 homes by Areli Developments SA49**) in addition to over 3000 uninhabited houses in Enfield.

It is easy to be accused of Nimbyism if you are privileged to live in accommodation with a garden near to the Green Belt, but surely this is the ideal for everyone? It is not a matter of building on the Green Belt in the West of the Borough to even up the Urban nature of the East side. We should be protecting the Green belt for everyone's use and making far more green spaces in the east of the Borough as well, for example the **Banbury Reservoir Park** for western residents to enjoy too. This would also require much needed better East - West public transport.

I object to the following policies:

Policy SP PL9 SA 27 pp77-80 and concept Plan Fig.3.10

Policy SP PL10 SA 28 pp80-87 and fig.3.11

Policy SA 45 p 364 land between Camlet Way & Crescent Way Hadley Wood

Policy SA 52 p 372

Policy SA 54 p374

Policy SA 62 p 383

Policy SP CL4 pp 277-279.

On the grounds that all these propose the de-designation of the Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

Many of these sites have huge historical significance and contribute to Enfield's unique character. As one of the last remaining examples of a Chase in the South East, " Enfield is the only surviving example of a Chase, within which rights to game and over vegetation varied slightly from those in forests. Thus, Enfield possesses an extremely rare and very valuable landscape asset". (Dr John Langton, Emeritus Professor, St John's College, Oxford) **PL10**

In addition as the Council itself states of Crews Hill ,(p12 Appendix C Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation November 2020) " This site supports unique relict grassland habitat which has previously been considered to be one of the best examples in the Borough and is of distinct value in London. The habitat is particularly rare in London and is considered to be irreplaceable" **PL 9**

Whitewebbs **SA 62 p 383 and SP CL4 app 277-279** should not be leased off to Spurs. It was bought for the use of the people of Enfield on a 999 year lease in 1931 so the Council have no legal right to lease it and in addition the ancient woodland there is unlikely to be

properly protected by Spurs who have already not honoured their commitment to provide a conservation area in their original development. It is used intensively by hundreds of people for recreation, physical exercise and mental wellbeing and its loss for the use of a few would be totally morally wrong as well as elitist.

As we observe empty shelves in supermarkets caused by the Pandemic, Labour shortages, Brexit etc and realise the effects of the Climate Emergency on our food security it makes no sense to be considering building on an area of existing horticulture and farming and its attendant skills and employment. The vision for both the Crews Hill and Chase Park proposed sites should be one of revitalising farming, plant and food production utilising the training facilities that our own Capel Manor could provide and providing sustainable jobs and locally produced sustainable food for Enfield.

In the Rural Enfield Policy **PL 8**

RE 1 states that “ development adjoining or within close proximity to the Green Belt (see the policies map) will only be permitted if 1a-1f are not infringed”. **PL 9 and PL 10** both infringe these conditions.

RE2 : “ New developments will be expected to protect, maintain and improve Enfield’s network of walking routes with 2a-2f as a priority.” The Merryhills Way, **PL 10** and public footpath over Crews Hill Golf course **PL 9** will not be protected, maintained or improved by developments around them.

RE3 “ supporting rural economies” **Crews Hill PL 9** the rural economy will be destroyed by the proposed development.

ENV 1 Policy - **PL 9&10** will violate this by the increases in air, noise and light pollution that will accompany any new developments.

The affordable and social rent family homes that Enfield requires will not be met by developments at either Crews Hill or Chase Park, where there is no infrastructure in place and transport provision is severely limited meaning any homes built there will only be bought by the wealthy, car-owning, middle class.