

Dear Sir

Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

I am writing to let you know that while I support the Council's ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I am 100% opposed to the plan to dedesignate Green Belt land for this and other purposes because:

- There are alternatives sites available
- This plan will not produce affordable homes
- Traffic on our roads will not be reduced
- This plan will not improve our environment
- Enfield Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. To destroy any part of it for housing-led development would be an act of pure vandalism and would stand against all National, London and Local Policies
- Enfield's green spaces are a valuable and essential resource for the town and for its people, and they must be preserved for future generations.

I 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 SA52, page 372; Policy SA54, page 374; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279.

Most of these sites are part of historical Enfield Chase which played an important role in the development of Enfield. Those parts of the Chase that remain today are unique in the southeast and are a valuable asset to Enfield. Their loss would cause permanent harm to the very character of the Borough.

SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10 – Crews Hill

I strongly believe that Crews Hill with its long history of agriculture, horticulture and food production, should be cherished for its unique character and for its benefit to the borough. It would be a massive loss to the people of Enfield – and those who come from further afield – if it were to be transformed in the way this Labour Council plan is proposing.

The plan to build over 3,500 new homes will not deliver the stated objective of delivering affordable houses so will have no effect on the housing waiting list for Enfield residents. As we know, the housing development around Chase Farm delivered only 5% instead of the proposed 25% for social housing. Market forces dictate who buys houses. The only profiteers of such a project will be the Council (with a short-term financial gain), landowners and developers. This is just wrong.

Crews Hill is a thriving mix of garden centres, nurseries and retail outlets. The associated costs of

development in this area would be the loss of many valuable and successful businesses that provide employment and income for local people, loss of visitors to the area and loss of Crews Hill Golf Course – which still has 34 years left on its lease.

I fail to see how this policy is even up for consideration since there is no infrastructure to support 3,500 new houses. The roads are narrow and at times cannot cope with existing traffic. 3,500 new homes would result in a huge increase in the number of cars. This will not fulfil sustainability objectives such as encouraging walking and cycling. Where will the new schools, health care, community facilities, places of worship be built that will be needed? Allowing sprawl in this area of the Green Belt will result in overcrowding; overcrowding leads to increases in the levels of crime – where will money for required policing come from? New access roads and road widening would be needed which would potentially result in the existing properties becoming unsellable.

Not forgetting the important issue of where will this huge number of residents in the area go to enjoy the benefits of green spaces and clean air when there are none left as they have all been built on?

SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – Land North of Whitewebbs Lane

I object to the planned expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25. Due to its position this particular green space is one of those that is important for being the lungs of Enfield as it acts as a buffer between the town and the M25, providing many benefits which we cannot afford to lose. Part of the environmental impact of replacing grass with artificial pitches is the tonnes of microplastic that are lost each year, around half of which ends up in the environment. This is extremely concerning.

SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – Whitewebbs Park

I feel strongly that Enfield Council does not have the right to transfer any part of Whitewebbs Park – a public amenity – into private management. I simply cannot comprehend how this can even be considered. The plan to lease part of it out to Tottenham Hotspur makes no sense at all. A public park exists to offer a benefit to the people of Enfield – important for being among other things a place in which to be active or to relax, clean air, better health and mental well-being – and no part of it should be leased out because that would mean that the people of Enfield would lose access to parts of it whilst someone else profits from it. A public park is not for private profit.

I understand that the original 999 year lease specified public access for the whole of the park and, if this lease has been changed then the people of Enfield should be told that this is the case, also when it was changed and by whom.

If it were to be leased to Tottenham Hotspur we would see grass replaced with artificial pitches. As I have said above, part of the environmental impact of this is the tonnes of microplastic that would be lost; each year around half of this ends up in the environment.

There has been no proper consultation with community and stakeholder groups regarding Whitewebbs Park. Enfield Council, please engage with us so that together we can come up with a plan for the future of the Park that will benefit our community – not one that would be used by

a small section of the population which is what it will be if the commercial investment with Tottenham Hotspur is allowed to go ahead.

SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11

Vicarage Farm is crossed by the Merryhills Way footpath which is a path well-used by Enfield residents and others. The physical and mental health attributes would be destroyed by development and this beautiful farmland would be gone.

Policy SA54, page 374

Part of the Green Belt, this land should not be built on. It is open land with footpaths and small country roads, it gives people access to beautiful countryside with views across to the Ridgeway with beautiful trees and fields.

Policy SA52, page 372 Rammey Marsh

Two reasons for not building on it: 1) it is a haven for wildlife, and 2) it is a flood plain .

MORE REASONS FOR MY OBJECTIONS

The Green Belt

The five original purposes of the Green Belt are still just as important today: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, to help safeguard the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Climate Emergency

We are facing a climate emergency and preserving our green spaces is now more important than ever. Enfield's green spaces are varied and their complex biodiversity has accumulated over hundreds of years. They are important for improving air quality, reducing temperatures, reducing the risks of flooding, they are also important for wildlife, pollination and food production. They have enormous benefits for people's health and mental well-being. If mature trees are removed and the ground concreted over all of those benefits will be gone for good. The environmental impact of that loss of biodiversity will be huge.

Alternative sites are available

The people of Enfield deserve better from this Labour Council which so far has demonstrated an appalling lack of creativity. There is no justification for dedesignating Green Belt land in order to try to fulfil Enfield's housing needs. We have many previously developed brownfield sites which would benefit from housing development, as would other proposed sites in the Local Plan that are not within the Green Belt which are better connected to necessary infrastructure and which could massively improve deprived areas.

In summary

Preserving Enfield's green spaces would go towards it being recognised as a climate friendly community – that is the legacy that I believe we should aspire to leave to future generations.