

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am writing further to your Local Plan proposals and absolutely object to a number of your proposals. I believe your underlying facts are flawed and lack any insight into changes brought about by Covid, such as estimates for work or retail space needed which you have not considered in your accompanying documentation, despite the draft plan being dated in 2021. Research and data showed even in 2020 that the UK onwards would be a very different place in how people shop and where and how they will work. There is also little regard to any infrastructure that would be needed for many of your proposals.

I also 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 dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These policies appear to be highly political and completely contrary to anything that residents may have voted for.

Most of these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which played an important role in the development and heritage 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, relaxation and the physical and mental health attributes of the footpath would be destroyed by development. We need to be conscious of food miles and impact on the environment and could readily turn this into productive 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. It brings people from far and wide to contribute to the economy and once lost, what will Enfield have to offer. 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 plants and attract people to come here.

A number of areas under threat are also long existing flora and fauna habitats, which host several special species. We know from science that once habitats are removed, several species will no longer exist. New habitats will take many years to develop and by then it will be too late to save species from extinction. This is a fact.

I also object to Policy DM BG10: Burial and crematorium spaces, which would take part of Firs Farm and other recreation sites for crematoria. This is an incredible site, full of wildlife and open space, something positive that Enfield have achieved, and yet it wants to waste that investment for short, ill-thought-out gains.

I also object to Policy DEG: Tall Buildings. Tall buildings are inappropriate in most parts of Enfield and the Council even admits in 7.6.4 that alternative building forms, such as lower-rise mansion blocks, can achieve a similar number of homes as tower blocks. Where is the progress in Meridian Water and other Brownfield sites that should help counter any need for such proposals?

You also target areas such as Sainsbury's in Winchmore Hill, whilst advocating cycling and shopping locally, this is nonsensical given that it is used by local people, often without the need to use cars. Where is your logic of asking people to travel further for weekly shopping, increasing pollution and adding to emissions?

While I support development and enabling people to have homes, I absolutely object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. I believe that there are many 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 far 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. I also extremely concerned that despite the London Mayor making it clear to Enfield Council that Green Belt must not be built on, Enfield has continued with these plans completely ignoring the fact that Enfield's Green Belt is part of London's Green Belt and will impact on other areas and eco systems. This is in my view completely undemocratic and flies in the face of what Londoners want and what is essential for the future of our capital and its future residents.