Dear Sirs

Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

I write in response to the Enfield Local Plan consultation. I have lived in Enfield all my life and one of the reasons I have chosen not to move away is because of the special rural areas it holds.

I write to object to the following policies: SP PL10, pgs 80-87 & fig. 3.11; SP PL9, pgs 77-88 & concept plan fig. 3.10; SA45, pg 364; SA52, pg 372; SA54, pg 374; SA62, pg 383 & SP CL4, pgs 277-279; (pgs 156-60, figures 7.3, 7.4 & policy DE6, & SA2 pg 321)

Taken as a whole, it seems large areas of our precious green belt may finally be lost to developers. We have of course been objecting to this desecration of not only Enfield's but the whole of north London's lungs for many years. This is indeed one of the most important consultations Enfield council has ever held and as such I hope the views of its citizens are taken into account. If the draft plan goes ahead unchanged, parts of the green belt will be lost to our children and future generations. And that means forever. There will be no going back. More people, means we need more green space, not less, in order to prevent mental and physical health problems in the future. If lockdown has taught us nothing else it must be the importance of nature and greenery to our health in order to function as good citizens in a community. We desperately need more open spaces in order to cope with the climate disaster now imminent. At least these absorb carbon dioxide rather than create it which is what building and concreting over would do.

As it stands, the plan will lead to expensive, car reliant homes on environmentally valuable land such as Vicarage Farm and that behind Crews Hill station. These two developments are particularly damaging and would undermine the special

character and identity on north Enfield. Evidence is that houses built here certainly won't be available to most local people and key workers. We need homes, but put them on brownfield sites which can be reused/recycled. Has this aspect even been considered in the plan? We face a housing crisis at the same time as a climate emergency - neither of which seem to have been realistically tackled in the draft local plan. Enfield's Labour Council now need to become much more creative and maximise the opportunities for uses of industrial land.

The National Planning Policy Frameworks (para 79) states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence; the Green Belt protects the countryside.

(Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, & figure 3.11) Vicarage Farm

3000 houses proposed. This beautiful farmland is part of the Green Belt so should not be touched.

(Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and concept plan figure 3.10) Crews Hill

3000 houses proposed. Crews Hill and the surrounding farmland are in the Green Belt and the farmland/woodland should not be touched. The only possibility here are the brownfield sites, such as the car breakers /rubbish dump on Theobalds Park Road, but only with a much clearer picture of the new road system which would need to be put in place. At present it is not fit for purpose for those currently here let alone 6000 more people at a conservative guess. Where would all the new schools, religious buildings, community centres, shops, doctors surgeries, police stations etc be put? This is already a heavily congested area. What happens when the M25 has a problem? Traffic around Crews Hill currently comes to a standstill when that happens. Enfield Garden Centre has I am told been bought by Berkeley Homes and they definitely do not agree with affordable housing. Crews Hill golf club is also to be built upon. That will be the second golfing facility in Enfield to disappear in a very short time. The great thing about Whitewebbs Golf course was that it was open to all. Where have those that played there gone

now, especially if they are pensioners and cannot afford membership fees? I understand Kings Oak Equestrian Centre is also threatened. You say retention of existing rural uses is considered important, but how far away will they be for Enfieldians to access if these facilities are closed? You say there are plans for providing a better walking/cycling infrastructure, but the fact is most people don't want to do this in a built up area or roads teeming with traffic. They like to be, at least almost, 'in the country'. You say Crews Hill should be regenerated and reinvigorated with re-wilded landscapes. What will be left to re-wild after you have built on it? You tout the local plan as a green and pleasant environment for exercise but where will the green and pleasant areas be when these are concreted over and the above facilities are gone? We can't make new ones out of nothing. Building here would also undermine the Council's efforts to tackle obesity! It is not fair to either those living here now or the new influx if this goes ahead. Businesses in Crews Hill are long-standing and generational. What provisions have been made for them? They bring numerous visitors and create employment for local people.
The council's time would be much better spent promoting Crews Hill's primary functions - the value of horticulture and agriculture. Gardening is extremely beneficial to stressed minds. Also, gardening centres added nearly £1billion to the UK GDP in 2017!

(SA45: land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364)

160 houses proposed. This is Green Belt land and should not be touched

No building scheme in Enfield has ever turned out to be affordable to those economically challenged. The houses built on this land certainly won't be. House owners already living here will make sure of that if no one else does.

(SA52, page 372) Rammey Marsh

Green Belt and a wildlife haven so should not be touched. Plus, I understand this is part of a flood plain. Hardly the best place to build.

(SA54, page 374) Holly Hill Farm

Green Belt so should be left alone. Though you have already built a road here to access the land profiling for Holly Hill Farm. Again, this is beautiful farmland that needs to be nurtured for all our sakes.

(SA62, page 383 & SP CL4, pages 277-279 Spurs football training ground north of Whitewebbs Lane to M25

This forms a sort of buffer between the motorway and Whitewebbs Lane. There is much wildlife here. Plastic pitches, like plastic lawns, so bad for the environment, really shouldn't be put anywhere in this area.

Proposed Whitewebbs redevelopment

Can someone please in the first instance let us know what exactly will happen if Spurs take over? Where are the demarcation lines? The plans seem completely unclear. Initially, they didn't include the lake. Now it seems they do. Will access for the public continue to be from Whitewebbs Road? Have we indeed lost our beautiful lake which gives such solace to so many? Is access to the southern part of the park to be retained at Beggars Hollow or will spurs eventually take this over too? Looking at the plans, we have no other choice but to vote against Spurs' application. The woods, which I am led to believe are designated as ancient woodland, should not be touched other than to be conserved. They are a vital resource for the borough. The grass meadows are a delight now for bio-diversity. We hear enough about this in the media to know how important this issue has become. I'm afraid the possibility of plastic pitches is not an option. These break down and finally leach into our waterways. Surely the pitches Spurs already have are enough. The bridle way should not be curtailed by the Spurs proposal.

The loss of our park, which was gifted to the people of Enfield in 1933 on a 900 year lease, to private investors who will ban those very people to whom it really is for, is a scandal and the council should be ashamed to even think of allowing such a thing.

We have just been given a red alert re climate change. We, individuals and every other institution, must be seen to be doing all we can to aid the slowing down of this catastrophe. If not, each and every one of us is adding to the inevitable outcome. You won't need your new houses if there is no one left to buy them.

(Pages 156-60, figures 7.3, 7.4 & policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Garden shopping centre, page 321) Town centre

This has already been spoiled many years back. The plans for the Town Centre should concentrate on beautifying it rather than building more eyesores. I say beware tall buildings if they are to be housing. In the past they have brought much misery to residents both living in them and around them.