

I am writing to object most strongly to policies in the **Draft Local Plan** relating to:

<!--[if !supportLists]--> · <!--[endif]-->**Proposed development of Green Belt land**

<!--[if !supportLists]--> · <!--[endif]-->**Proposed transfer of part of Whitewebbs Park into private management**

<!--[if !supportLists]--> · <!--[endif]-->**Proposal for Tall Buildings in Enfield Town**

I believe the proposals in Table 2.2. Option 2 (p.30) threaten the character and quality of life of this borough, in which I have lived for the past fifty years, and are totally at odds with positive statements made about them in Section 2.4, *Enfield's spatial strategy* (pp. 22-30) and elsewhere.

### **Proposed development of Green Belt land**

· <!--[endif]-->The so-called 'sustainable urban development' at Chase Park / Vicarage Farm on either side of Enfield Road (*Policy SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11*) is no such thing. Instead it encroaches on the Green Belt and creeps towards Oakwood, in direct contravention of the fundamental Green Belt policy to prevent urban sprawl and the merging of neighbouring urban areas. And how can it be described as 'deeply green' when it entails loss of countryside and public footpaths offering off-road, green connections between Oakwood and Enfield?

· The same applies even more to the appallingly large 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill (*Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10*). Additionally this represents a substantial urban extension outwards from Enfield – and indeed London – into the precious countryside north of the city

<!--[if !supportLists]--> · <!--[endif]-->As do the development described in *Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood (page 364)*, the big expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25 (*SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279*), and the appropriation of 11 hectares of agricultural land for new industrial, storage and distribution use east of M25 Junction 24 (*SA54, p.374*)

<!--[if !supportLists]--> · <!--[endif]-->Far from 'facilitating nature recovery and improvements to green and blue spaces' (*SP SS1: Spatial Strategy point 1, p.22*) the proposed developments negate them, and push 'access to them' much further out

<!--[if !supportLists]--> · <!--[endif]-->These incursions into Green Belt land will destroy some of the most sensitive landscape and historically important parts of Enfield Chase

<!--[if !supportLists]--> · <!--[endif]-->Moreover, widely-spaced as they are, they would set a dangerous trend, establishing a precedent for more development between them in the future and weakening contra-arguments

<!--[if !supportLists]--> · <!--[endif]-->The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. I reject

the loss of Green Belt and favour instead the building of affordable homes where they will bring regeneration to deprived areas

### **Proposed transfer of part of Whitewebbs Park into private management**

- Whitewebbs Park is a public amenity, and there is no guarantee that Enfield Council will have adequate resources to oversee the proper maintenance of the part of it that would remain accessible to the public if it were transferred to private management

### **Proposal for Tall Buildings in Enfield Town**

- I also object to many of the tall buildings proposed in the policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321. For instance, the proposed imposition of a 13 storey building in Palace Gardens Enfield, overshadowing the grade II\* listed parish church and other historic building in the town centre is in direct contravention of the statement that ‘tall building development will only occur where it is ... in appropriate urban locations’ (*SP SS1: Spatial Strategy point 1, p.22*)