

---

Dear Sirs

I am writing to register my very strong opposition to certain proposals in your draft local plan. If carried out, the resulting developments would completely destroy many aspects of the character of Enfield that I, and many local people, know and love. Certain areas of Enfield have great charm, historic interest and natural beauty that both residents and visitors can currently enjoy. It would be very detrimental to all who live in the borough if development takes place in these areas.

My main objection is to the proposal to use Green Belt land for housing and other purposes, as laid out in the following Policies:

SP PL10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11, Chase Park;

Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10, Crews Hill;

Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364;

Policy SA54, page 374, Land East of Junction 24, warehousing on the Ridgeway;

Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279.

These sites are part of the unique and historic Enfield Chase, and form a valuable landscape asset whose loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough.

Referring to specific areas:

the Chase Park area provides the necessary 'green lungs' to an already well built-up corner of Enfield. The local roads including two main roads feeding into Windmill Hill and Enfield town are already very congested at certain times and the local infrastructure eg doctors' surgeries are struggling to cope with demand as it is. A large development in the area would cause many problems;

the land East of Junction 24 on the Ridgeway provides an attractive landscape for the approach to Enfield and considerably enhances the visual appeal of the borough for visitors and residents alike.

Warehousing here would be very detrimental to Enfield's image as a green borough;

the garden centres at Crews Hill are used and loved by many, both Enfield residents and people from a wide area of North London. They are good local businesses and a great recreational asset for the whole community.

Furthermore I object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. This is a lovely facility which many Enfield residents have always been able to enjoy when walking in the Whitewebbs area.

I would also like to add my objection 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 accommodation. The centre of Enfield has considerable historic charm which should always be retained and would be completely destroyed by these tall buildings, especially when alternative sites could probably be found.

Please will you take the above serious objections into account and find alternative sites for the development needed. The character of Enfield is at stake and once destroyed can never be resurrected.

