

Dear Sir or Madam

I write as a resident of Chase Ward living at 33 Brodie Road, Enfield EN2 0EU.

I strongly object to the proposals in the draft local plan on many counts. I understand that there is a need to build housing in Enfield but to do so on Green Belt land when the Meridian Water development remains unfulfilled is to deprive this beautiful green borough of the lungs that supply London with fresh air and recreation space. To concrete over such land is showing no respect for the environment and for the needs of the residents and the residents of surrounding areas to enjoy, recharge and take recreational respite.

*A deeply green place – A place where enhanced green open spaces and waterways permeate through the urban fabric from the wild places in the rural north, providing access for all to nature on their doorstep. Improved biodiversity, greener urban environments and better air and water quality will deliver places where residents lives enriched with nature. We will successfully respond to the climate crisis through effective mitigation and adaptation, delivering sustainable buildings and transport options, and effectively managed flood risk. We will be a Borough that is carbon neutral.*

What on earth does the above mean? Please explain how you would enhance green spaces by building on the land, improve biodiversity by building on it, improve air and water quality by building on it. Plus what effective mitigation and adaptation exactly will enable you respond to climate crisis?

I object to the following:-

1. Section 2.4 Enfield's Spatial Strategy- the use of the term 'rural gateway settlement' for Crews Hill is ambiguous but I can see that 3,000 homes is not a settlement, it is a small town. This is green belt land with nurseries and inadequate roads and does not provide a sustainable nor 'rural' outcome for the area. The same kind of terms used for the green belt area referred to as Chase Park described as a 'deeply green extension to the urban area' is neither specific nor treats this vital resource as something to be respected and preserved. I cannot accept that building on these green areas and the other, currently, rural locations (eg besides Junction 24 of M25) mentioned will provide better living and recreational areas than we currently have. Where have brownfield sites been considered? Do we really need such numbers of housing given the Brexit and Covid impacts on EU immigration?

Section 2.4 Strategic Policy SP SS1: Spatial Strategy. Table item 11. What small sites on the edge of the urban area near Forty Hall? Have these already been built or are you planning to consider or already considering to develop part of the Clay Hill and/or Gough Park allotments?

2. While I have covered the generalities above, regarding the Spatial Strategy as an overview, I want to object specifically to Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87 where Chase Park is proposed and is completely inappropriate for green belt land - I am not convinced by any of the 'Placemaking Vision' descriptions and it is absolutely not on to take the green belt from the residents of Enfield and adjoining boroughs. The statements that have been heard from the council on making the west of the borough as built on as the east merely serve to confirm that the council has not considered any of its residents in these proposals. The residents of the East deserve access to these areas as much as the residents of the west. It spells further disappointment in the decision making and consultation that this administration undertake (viz Whitewebbs 'consultation' as an example of no such consultation being done!).

3. Further, I object to Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 which is currently garden centres, very green and recreational and again, the description of it becoming a re-wilded landscape....with residential led development brownfield sites is laughable.

4. I further object to SA52 page 372 and SA54, page 374 for the building on agricultural land which should be left as agricultural land if we are to feed ourselves and be sustainable environments.

5. I object to SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279. I have already written about this at length to the Leader and the councillors and received a variety of responses. I call for the golf course to be

re-instated as a valuable asset for residents who do not possess the means to join a club where membership fees are required (at significant outlet) when Whitewebbs offered a pay and play model. I am not sure how the removal of this facility serves the needs of the mental health and obesity challenges of the residents of Enfield. The scheme has not been well received in the adjoining ward and the promised consultation has not taken place to their satisfaction.

6. I object to the provision of tall buildings at pages 156-60, Policy DE6 and SA2 Palace Gardens at page 321. The high rise living has not benefitted those who have lived in them from the 1960s and they are not conducive to being part of the town scape of Enfield being out of character and fail to see how they will 'make a positive contribution to the skyline' as stated.

7. I have to question why the record of building is so poor yet this plan is so ambitious? Therefore until this administration can prove it can deliver on Meridian Water then why the need to begin concreting the green belt?

8. Enfield Chase - the proposals make no allowance for the use the plan makes of the historically significant Enfield Chase. Previous developments have been refused where they have impacted local nature reserves and wildlife area and this historical royal hunting ground will be obliterated by the proposals here. Enfield is the only remaining example of a chase with particular rights which must be respected.