

Hello,

Please consider this my objection to the Enfield Local Plan.

I do not believe that this consultation has been conducted correctly or transparently. I have chosen not to fill in the questionnaire which is full of leading questions. The engagement with residents has been completely inadequate, and there is no excuse for this. To choose to go forward with this piece of work during a pandemic and not to make any effort to engage with residents is not democratic. I hope this is taken to judicial review.

I am objecting to the following:

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 dedesignation 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.

The green belt is the lungs of London. There is alternative land in the borough that could be used to build homes and that other responders to the Consultation have detailed. Where is your public health departments input in this? The Enfield green belt is a buffer between the borough and the M25 yet you are proposing to tear it up and put housing on large parts of it. These areas are needed and valuable for residents physical and mental health.

Building on the green belt is unacceptable. The green space is the reason many residents have moved to Enfield and remained here for years. The green belt is needed not only for people but for farming, animals and wildlife. I would like to know if you have asked any advice from any environmental consultants on the wildlife and landscape that will be destroyed by your plans. This land cannot have a value put on it as it's natural countryside that is a community asset and belongs to the nation.

I find it incredible that a Council so manically committed to green transport and cycling is willing to tear up green space for development. The questions you pose about this in the consultation document are leading and unacceptable. People move to Enfield to have gardens but also to enjoy the parks and green belt, which is everyone's gardens! You miss the point that the green belt space is for EVERYONE to enjoy and instead are proposing to sell what your residents collectively own. Why are you proposing that whatever developer or property speculator has more right to this space or this view than the people who already live here.

The green belt needs to be preserved and brown field sites could instead be used for housing.

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. Marshes are very important ancient habitats and this area of the Lee Valley is home to bats, water voles and other important species. This is not a

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. I have previously objected to the Southgate office village proposed development and believe that these high rises add nothing to the character of the borough and are nothing but greedy proposals from developers that don't deliver affordable housing and blight the skyline. This is a suburban area of London and people move here to enjoy a more beautiful and less urban place. Tall towers have no place in a suburb with family homes. There will be enough flats going into existing office blocks without increasing the size and scale of other areas in Enfield.

There is nothing local about this plan. The plans for the green belt and public spaces are against everything that Enfield residents want.

There is nothing in previous engagement to say that this is what you were intending to do. Therefore I would suggest that your consultation does not meet the Gunning Principles and if you try to take this forward, should be subject to a judicial review.

You have enough spare brown field land in this borough including Meridian Water where there seems to be little progress to build additional homes. The green belt and important habitats like Rammey Marsh are an absolute no go for Enfield residents. We don't want to sell or compromise our shared green space to meet a fantasy housing target. This is not in the interests of current residents, public health or the Council who will see a net loss in rate payers if this plan goes ahead. Many of us moved from other parts of London with few parks or green space, sick of high rise buildings and we moved here for a suburban life

The green belt in Enfield used to be its greatest pride. The borough boasted of 2/3 being green space and how much of the borough was natural environment. This consultation proposes to destroy Enfield, once the queen of boroughs and its ancient habitats.