

I am are writing to object to the following Policies in the Enfield Draft Local Plan.

Firstly, I would remind all Councillors that at the last General Election all the parties promised to protect the Green Belt. As far as I am concerned this is a very important promise. Labour Manifesto 2019: "Green Belts protect one tenth of our land and offer conservation of some of our natural environment. Introduced by Labour in 1947 to provide access to the countryside, they are threatened by developments. A Labour government will maintain agricultural and rural structural funds but repurpose them to support environmental land management and sustainable methods of food production". Conservative Manifesto 2019: "The Green Belt. We will protect and enhance the Green Belt.In order to safeguard our green spaces, we will continue to prioritise brownfield development, particularly for the regeneration of our cities and towns". Green Party Manifesto 2019: "strengthen Green Belt".

I object to the creation on Green Belt land of 3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green' 'sustainable urban extension' referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#)). No "deeply green sustainable urban extension" can be as green as the Green Belt no matter what is artificially put in place. The Enfield Road and Hadley Road are both single lane roads and added traffic would be horrendous. Enfield Chase is historically important and should not be eroded further.

I object to the loss of Green Belt land for 3,000 new houses in a 'sustainable settlement' at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7,500 new homes right up to the M25. ([Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#)). The excuse for this development is the twice an hour train service. No thought seems to have been given to the dozens of small businesses that are on this site that will be closed. Worst of all is the loss of the fantastic amenity Enfield residents have of the whole raft of nurseries and this site must be unique in London.

Again I object to 160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood ([SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364](#)). This area has a wider setting of numerous heritage assets including Grade II listed buildings and the Battle of Barnet Registered Battlefield and should be properly preserved for posterity.

I object to the lost of more Green Belt by Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammey Marsh ([SA52 page 372](#));

I object to the loss of Green Belt of 11 hectares of new industrial and storage and

distribution use at what is currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase([SA54, page 374](#)).

I object to a big expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25, comprising of 42.5 hectares of land, for “professional sport, recreation and community sports/leisure uses” ([SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279](#)). The Whitewebbs golf course is a fantastic local amenity which should not be removed.

We absolutely abhor the Encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area ([see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#)). A [higher quality version of figure 7.4](#) is also available, showing proposed maximum building heights across the Borough. There are many other proposed tall buildings with which we disagree, namely on the B&Q site, Palace Gardens, Cockfosters Tube, Enfield Chase. The loss of the amenity of both Dunelm and B&Q is grievous and means travelling further afield by car to their next nearest branch which is counter to all current thinking. After all a bag of concrete can't be carried on a bike. Apart from the fact that these tower blocks, to quote Prince Charles, are a carbunkle on the landscape and are visually unattractive, these schemes are seriously altering the whole ambience of what it means to live in leafy and historic Enfield. Most importantly, of course, is that these homes in tower blocks are not a new idea; after the war many were built and it was soon found that they were not conducive to a happy life for their occupants and many were torn down because of this.

Finally, before any more erosion of the Green Belt is undertaken ALL BROWNFIELD sites should be utilised instead. The rationale for the introduction of the Green Belt in 1947 is still as strong for Londoners today and it must be protected at all costs. To just snip away 10% here and 10% there is unacceptable. In recent years there has been a gradual erosion of the Green Belt and the direction of this travel must be stopped