

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

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; Policy SA52 page 372; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 – all of which propose the de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

I have lived in Enfield all my life, and have recently purchased my Family home in Oakwood. One of the main draws for the area is the feel of living almost in the countryside. Having access to local farm shops, pick your own fruit and veg farms, a vast horticultural industries within crews hill and views of such large expanses of green fields is a rarity in London and not one that should be thoughtlessly sacrificed to allow Enfield Council to meet housing quotas.

I do not believe that the area has the infrastructure to cope with such a large scale development, with roads already very congested during the week, and following the 'Closure' of Chase Farm Hospital, the current local hospitals are already unable to cope.

I work in construction managing several large residential, and commercial developments across London for over a decade, all of which have been constructed on Brownfield sites. The decision to

use the green belt for development is a poor and short sighted choice and should be avoided at all costs once all potential brownfield sites have been assessed. This seems like a solution proposed with economic reasons in mind, as Green belt is typically much cheaper to construct on as it is 'virgin' ground which doesn't incur the costs of demolition and remediation.

This development of the greenbelt will deny future generations to enjoy all the existing benefits of the green belt, which following the Covid Crisis, people relied on making use of such large areas of green space to help with their mental well being.

Most of these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which played an important role in the development 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 and relaxation and the physical and mental health attributes of the footpath would be destroyed by development. The farmland could be put back into productive use 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. 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 plant production.

While I support housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. I believe that there are 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 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.

The comments provided in this response to the consultation are my own views.