

Dear Enfield Council,

This is my response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation. I am very concerned about the numerous examples of projects which will affect the Green Belt land in Enfield. This space is invaluable and once it's gone it won't be coming back. There has obviously been a lot of concerns raised by Enfield residents about these plans and I respectfully add my voice to those valid concerns.

I am writing to object to a variety of draft policies.

1. 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 redesignation 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.

2. I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement.

3. I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

4. 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 and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

5. I am also objecting to DM BG10 in the Draft Enfield Local Plan. This allocates Firs Farm Wetlands (Site ID SA59) as a site for burial and/or crematorium use. I oppose this policy because:

- Firs Farm wetlands is a vitally important community resource, essential to the health and The draft Policy directly contradicts Strategic Policy SP CL4 in the draft Local Plan. This identifies Firs Farm as facilitating and contributing towards developing sport and leisure facilities in Enfield.
- The proposal will significantly affect the local Site of Interest for Nature Conservation, and reduce the biodiversity and nature conservation interest of Firs Farm wetlands, contrary to several other policies in the draft Local Plan.
- The proposal will reduce the effectiveness of the flood alleviation provided by Firs Farm wetlands, which Enfield Council has spent more than £1 million to provide.
- The proposal will adversely affect the environment and local traffic, and this has not been properly considered in the Integrated Impact Assessment of the draft Local Plan.
- The policy introduces uncertainty into the future use of Firs Farm wetlands that jeopardises funding for projects secured by local community groups (e.g. from Thames Water) that have been endorsed and supported by Enfield Council.

I call on the Council to remove all reference to Firs Farm wetlands from Policy DM BG10.

6. I also object to SA32, Sainsburys Green Lanes N21 3RS. Page 351 of Enfield Local Plan - redevelopment of supermarket and car park to mixed-use homes and non-residential floor space.

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

Building on Green Belt land is a terrible idea for the future of Enfield, its residents and their children. Please take into account the valid concerns of the residents that live here who benefit hugely from what is so special about this borough – its green space.