
Dear Sir,

Thank you for this opportunity to submit my views on the Local Plan for Enfield. I set them out as follows:

I object to building on the countryside, citing policy SP PL10: Chase Park, and SP PL9: Crews Hill. Besides being residents, my husband and I belong to the Ramblers Association and regularly walk the routes over these areas. Both have proved lifelines, especially through Lockdowns, but I would point out that the route from Cockfosters, Trent Park past Old Rectory Farm over towards Clay Hill, Lavender Hill Cemetery, Hillyfields Park to Turkey Brook, edge of Forty Hill Park, across A10 past Enfield Cemetery, on to Albany Park to finish at Enfield Lock station is part of **The London Loop**. It's urban enough at the end of this section of 14km/8.7 miles and the contrast is appreciated. It would not be as pleasant if further housing were built and in any case will give no easy access to those new residents to green spaces either as it's likely only very small pockets would remain which don't allow freedom to roam. We all need to see horizons and that's the beauty of walking in these spaces and indeed over the M25 from Crews Hill via the New River then to Theobalds and back to Crews Hill Golf Course and via Hillyfields returning to where we live on the Willow Estate.

Crews Hill is very important to the borough and should be retained, not built upon with further housing. **Capel Manor Horticultural College** draws on the businesses here for its courses in landscape design, floristry and even crafts like saddlery. It provides training that equips young people to have lifelong skills and careers in this field. And I've known apprentices that have actually been employed by Crews Hill businesses at key times like Christmas so providing good experience as young people enter the world of work. Having attended Capel Manor to do City & Guild courses myself in floral design over 3 years as a mature student one day a week I know that such courses could not be offered if businesses like Springtime or Van Vliet were lost. Course attendees simply could not obtain the materials, flowers and foliage to participate so that would impact over time on the viability of such a wonderful college staying - even Enfield Council could not draw trained staff from here to deal with its trees in the streetscape or engage them in Parks teams in the long term. I strongly believe we should retain Crews Hill glasshouses, businesses and indeed attract investment to develop it further as a local food hub too to cut mileage as a step in the right direction for addressing Climate Change impacts.

I object to tall buildings in inappropriate locations, citing Policy DM DE6 and SA2.

I attended the webinars presenting proposals for Palace Gardens and am not comfortable with the plan to create a 26 floor tower block in the middle of Enfield Town. It will change the look and feel of what is essentially an historic market town centre. In my view, it will lead to the loss of Waitrose as there will be no car parking provision above the store for customers and the alternative the other side of Cecil Road is too far to wheel a laden trolley. That is potentially a significant loss to the local economy in employment and in drawing people to shop in the precinct. Waterstones and indeed WH Smith would be impacted too as the tower block is to be where these shops are along with Millets etc. Another gym is not really needed as there are several nearby nor is a cinema. My objection is the sheer size of the tower as will eclipse the one by Enfield Town Station. The focal points are the Market Square, St Andrew's Church and Pearson's in fact. The development proposal is not sympathetic to what already exists and exhibits bad design in planning terms for the goal of providing affordable rental accommodation for a section of the population. It is short-sighted to not consider these renters would not want car parking but depend solely on public transport. I know that not to be true for my own niece living in a Hammersmith shared house who has bought a hybrid car recently so she can travel outside the Capital to visit family and friends!

I object to a new warehouses at the Ridgeway citing policy SA54: Land East of Junction 24.

To take 11 hectares of agricultural land for more industrial storage and distribution seems mad. Why can't such facilities be built on existing industrial space or brownfield site? Instead of creating more infrastructure it could use existing networks. The M25 already has a number of such facilities around it and it'd be awful to have a ring of warehouses instead of some open land used to feed this country.

I am a geographer who studied Town Planning as part of my degree originally so I have always maintained an interest in developments in this arena and keep apprised of what is happening UK wide through not only what I read in the news but through my fellowship at the Royal Geographical Society with IBG. I do understand the need for more housing with population growth and to accommodate refugees and others coming to this country. However, I am convinced that there are alternatives available to meet targets that Enfield and other Councils endeavour to meet. Using brownfield sites first, rather than the Green Belt has to be the priority as done at Meridian Way. We cannot allow Enfield to become part of one vast conurbation or megalopolis with no access to outside space. One of the reasons we live in Enfield is because we can get to green spaces quickly both on foot or out via the A10 and M25. It'd be very sad if we didn't preserve the Green Belt for future generations any less than we try to preserve our National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It's why I have personally been involved in Friends of the Parks particularly Aldersbrook and have worked with the Council to rejuvenate this small pocket park that the benefits to local people and schools has been immeasurable and satisfying. We have to do the same for the Borough in keeping our green spaces else the name of this place will become meaningless.

So, I remind the Council then that it has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that any intentions to release parts of it should be removed from the Local Plan.