

---

Dear Sirs,

I would like to make a formal objection to the redesignation of any Green Belt land in Enfield. Its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the environment, the loss of habitat for wildlife, the loss of green open spaces which aid drainage and the off-setting of greenhouse gases, the opportunity for learning for children, the improvement of health for all from exercise to mental wellbeing, the production of local food from agriculture reducing the need to transportation, etc. which cannot be recovered once lost. Its loss would also destroy the very character of the borough.

I object in particular the following Policies: SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11; Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10; Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364; Policy SA54, page 374; Policy SA62 page 372; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 as they propose the loss of Green Belt land to be used for housing and other purposes. These areas are part of Enfield Chase, which is a historic area, unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset.

I also object to the proposed development of Crews Hill, Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10 as in addition to the above objections, it would displace the current, thriving, local businesses which draw people from outside the borough. This would increase unemployment and also increase vehicular journeys as locals would have to travel much further to access garden supplies thus increasing pollution.

I also object to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 as they transfer a large part of Whitewebbs Park to a private company. It is currently a valuable public amenity and I do not accept the Council's argument that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money. Golf is obviously very popular locally, so popular that many private local golf clubs have closed their memberships.

I also object to the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321 which propose areas for and the acceptable height of tall buildings which, in many cases would mar the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms such as mansion blocks could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy. High-rise flats is not where people want to live. There is a need in Enfield for affordable family houses with gardens, not more flats or luxury homes. The Covid pandemic has made this even more apparent. Homes with private gardens are essential for the well-being and mental health of the community.

I think the policy as a whole is attempting to over-develop the green belt area when there are plenty brownfield sites that should be used instead. The proposed Meridian Water site should be providing the original 10,000 homes, not the revised 5,000, which would negate the need to find alternative sites such as the Green Belt. This could be a

really nice riverside development of a former industrial area and should be encouraged.

Yours sincerely,