

Saturday, 11th September, 2021.

Strategic Planning and Design  
Regeneration and Environment,  
Enfield Council,  
Freepost NW5036  
EN1 3BR

Dear Sir/Madam,

With reference to the Draft Local Plan for Enfield: 2019-2039. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to respond to this consultation.

My main concern is that Enfield Council wants to build on land that is currently designated as Green Belt. The Green Belt was designed to prevent unhindered urban sprawl.

It has many benefits:-

- 1) Provides close access to the countryside for people living in urban areas. Residents who live in urban areas have the opportunity to enjoy walking through woods, across farmland and observing wildlife.
- 2) Walking in the countryside and being able to connect with nature has been shown to be good for the well-being of people and reduces mental health problems.
- 3) Access to the countryside provides residents with somewhere to safely exercise (walking, running, cycling); away from the dangers of road traffic and associated pollution.
- 4) Biodiversity is preserved both for its own sake and for future generations.
- 5) Trees and other plants absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen for us humans to breathe. They also mitigate the harmful effects of air pollution.

The process of building houses and roads produces pollution. Concrete and mortar as construction materials produce large quantities of carbon dioxide; a greenhouse gas. These buildings often replace the trees and grasslands which would absorb this carbon dioxide. The people occupying these buildings will have cars etc which produce even more pollution and congestion. Therefore, building on Green Belt land at least doubles the environmental damage.

In order to keep this letter brief I will only comment on two aspects of the Draft Local Plan :-

1) With respect to the Crews Hill Placemaking Vision (page 75), figure 3.10 (page 76) and Strategic Policy SP PL9: Crews Hill (pages 77-80), I wish to comment as follows:-

a) Paragraph 14 (page 78) and the Vision state that Crews Hill will become a gateway to the London National Park City and the green and rural north for new and existing residents of the Borough.

However, the plans of this Crews Hill development show that the footpath linking Strayfield Road with Cattlegate Road has been deleted to facilitate housing on the current Crews Hill Golf Course. I regularly walk this path from my home to access the nurseries. It is a very pleasant walk with beautiful views across the golf course. All this will be lost with the housing development.

How can Crews Hill be a gateway to the London National Park City if this footpath is removed?

b) I note from the Review of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) Report November 2020, Appendix C, which forms part of your Evidence Base, it states that for Crews Hill Golf Course (LUC site ID 19; SINC ID EnB04):-

“The site supports unique relict grassland habitat, which has previously been considered to be one of the best examples in the borough and is of distinct value in London. The habitat is particularly rare in London and is considered irreplaceable.”

13

and "Crews Hill Golf Course is considered to be of strategic value in the north of the borough."

"In addition, the presence of ridge and furrow indicate the historical nature and value of the site."

The report states that the site should be upgraded to a Metropolitan SINC site.

If this is the case, how can any housing development be considered appropriate on this site?

How is building on this site upgrading its SINC status?

Enfield Council is ignoring its own evidence!

2) With respect to Strategic Policy SP CL4: Promoting Sporting Excellence (Pages 277-279) and Site Allocation SA62: Land at Tottenham Hotspur Football Club Training Ground (Page 383), I wish to comment as follows:-

a) Why does SP CL4 under paragraph 12.4.1 (Page 278) state that, "Enfield offers unrivalled access to sporting attractions, including golf courses (e.g. Whitewebbs Park)" when, in fact, Enfield Council has closed Whitewebbs Golf Course?

b) The site plan for SA62: Land at T.H.F.C. Training Ground features that of SA60: Sloemans Farm; which is incorrect. How can these site plans be considered as adequate documents for this Consultation? There is no labelling of features, such as roads, buildings etc and it is not set in the wider context of the surrounding area. Most people would not understand it. The whole plan/development for the T.H.F.C. is vague.

If T.H.F.C. are going to develop the land between Whitewebbs Lane and the M25 why do they need to lease the northern part of Whitewebbs Golf Course (SA57 on page 378)?

The Green Belt land they have already taken for their Training Ground is obscured by ugly high security fencing and earthworks, where once it was open fields. Surely T.H.F.C. have taken enough of the Green Belt.

Either the golf course at Whitewebbs Park needs to be reinstated

or the whole site should be open parkland managed for native biodiversity. Site allocation SA57: Whitewebbs Golf Course (page 378) states that this site should provide nature recovery uses.

With regard to SA60: Sloemans Farm (page 381) I agree that natural burial uses is appropriate for this site.

When I was a boy (40 years ago!), competing in athletics for the school at the Queen Elizabeth II stadium in Donkey Lane, the skylark could be heard in the skies above. From my house in Morley Hill the call of the cuckoo in Spring could be heard from the direction of Whitewebbs Park. Twenty years ago, in Trent Park, the beautiful song of the nightingale. Now all are silent. Biodiversity in Enfield is declining. The plans for Crews Hill and the proposed Chase Park will only accelerate this decline.

I object to Enfield Council building on any Green Belt land or changing the boundaries and would urge you to reconsider your plans.

Yours faithfully.