

Hi,

I have been a Crews Hill and Enfield Resident all my life and I am writing to object to the following Policies contained in the draft Local Plan:

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 the above policies propose the de-designation 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.

With regards to Policy SP PL9 - Crews Hill today has an open rural character and it's road infrastructure is simply not capable of sustaining the increase in traffic that would result from the introduction of significant new housing. Despite the local train station, most travel would be car-dependent thus rendering it an unsustainable proposal. The added traffic would result in severe congestion at Botany Bay, Bulls Cross and Clay Hill and would severely harm the rural character of Whitewebbs Lane, East Lodge Lane and the Conservation Areas at Forty Hill and Clay Hill.

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. This is a serious loss of a beautiful natural environment that can currently be enjoyed by anyone, and it also removes opportunities for outdoor recreation.