

---

We are writing to express our concern at the developments mentioned in the Draft Local Plan.

We object to the following policies: SP PL10, pages 80-87, & Figure 3.11; Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 & Concept Plan Figure 3.10; Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way & Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364; Policy SA54, page 374; & Policy SA62 page 383 & SPCL4 pages 277-279. All of these proposals put forward parts of the Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These areas of land were part of the old Enfield Chase and are of historical value,

they contribute to the character and history of the borough as well as providing green breaks around and between the urban areas. These places help to provide protection against the pollution from the M25 and other main roads in the area. To build in these places would increase pollution and traffic and decrease wild habitats and ecosystems.

We also object to Policies SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277-279 relating to the transfer of part of Whitewebbs Park into private management. The main reason for this apparently being that the Golf Course was not cost-effective but we understand that this reason is disputed. This is a valuable area for people and wildlife and to sell such a large part of it to a private concern sets an alarming precedent. We walk here regularly and through the lockdown it clearly became a sanctuary for many people, not just those living nearby. Together with Forty Hall it provides a valuable wildlife corridor as well as a barrier to the noise and pollution from the M25. Any development here will definitely increase traffic, noise and pollution. We are concerned that having given this area over to private management that they will continue to develop that area in ways that will degrade it further.

We also object to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Ramney Marsh from the Green Belt. This is a much needed wildlife area and public amenity which is of importance in this industrial landscape. Again this place is helping to reduce pollution and supporting wildlife and

ecosystems and providing a break between built-up areas.

We are also objecting to the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 & Policy DE6 & SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321 which proposes areas for and the acceptable height of tall buildings. The tall buildings which we have in Enfield Town already stand out and spoil the area. To consider building any taller buildings is of concern. They will dominate the conservation area and the shopping centre and change the feeling of the Town for the worse.

In addition to these concerns is the lack of infrastructure to support more housing and people in Enfield. Better transport would be needed together with increased school provision and access to medical services. Ironically more access to green spaces would be needed and that is the very benefit that is being sacrificed for this plan. Various local agencies are convinced that there are enough brownfield sites to meet these housing needs and that must be investigated thoroughly. It is documented that housing on Green Belt land rarely provides affordable homes or accommodation for social rent, it largely benefits developers and wealthier people. Due to poor transport links and the lack of local services it also forces people to use cars more.

We are lifelong residents of Enfield who have lived and worked in the borough. We are worried about these plans that will change this area forever. Please take our concerns

into account when this document is considered.

---