

**ONCE THE GREEN BELT HAS GONE - IT'S GONE FOREVER!  
HAVE YOU - ENFIELD COUNCILLORS - REALLY GOT THE RIGHT TO DESTROY SOMETHING  
WHICH CAN NEVER BE REPLACED?**

16<sup>th</sup> August 2021

Strategic Planning & Design  
ENFIELD COUNCIL  
FREEPOST, NW5036

Dear Enfield Council

**Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation and I sincerely hope my view, along with many thousands of others, will be given due consideration.

I am writing to object to the following Policies:

SP PL10 – pgs 80-87, and Figure 3.11;

SP PL9 – pgs 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10

SA45 – Land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood – pge 364

SA52 – pge 372

SA54 – pge 374

SA62 – pge 383

SP CL4 – pgs 277-279

All of the above propose the dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

I'm sure you are fully aware that all 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 south east 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 – which is constantly used on a daily basis by Enfield residents and many others.

The farmland could and should be used again by growing local food for local people.

Crews Hill is equally important to the borough and should not be destroyed.

It's garden centres and other businesses provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond. Instead of losing Crews Hill for housing, it's horticultural activities should be encouraged and enhanced so that it can once again be a hub for food and plant production. This area is used by thousands of people throughout the year.

I appreciate the Council have a difficult task in helping the many people in this Borough who are in need of housing , but it should NOT be solved at the cost of sacrificing the Green Belt. This is just an easy way out for the Council. Experts in this field believe there are alternatives available to meet housing targets.

THE GREEN BELT IS TOO VALUABLE TO LOSE FOR ALL THE MANY ENVIRONMENTAL, ECOLOGICAL ECONOMIC, PUBLIC HEALTH AND OTHER REASONS THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED, AND SHOULD BE PROTECTED AND PRESERVED FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS - WE DON'T WANT TO BECOME LIKE HONG KONG!

**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.**

Yours faithfully

