Dear Enfield Council,

I am writing to object to the following Policies:

- 1. 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; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 all of which propose the redesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough and lessens the life quality for all residents.
- 2. I also 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. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and ask for you to reinstate it.
- 3. I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. Some 225 plant species are present on the site, including pyramidal orchid and a colony of over 5000 bee orchid believed to be the largest group of this type in South East England. Birds such as reed bunting, skylark, meadow pipit, linnet have been recorded and the marsh is also an important site for spring visitors. Grassland provides a good habitat for the grass snake. Mammals seen on the marsh include pipistrelle bats. The Small River Lea provides an important habitat for the water vole. We need to protect the nature that surrounds us, especially now as we force nature back on every corner, worsening the climate crises we are already in. The Lea Valley area is one of the few perfect places for many local residents to find peace and new energy and must be protected. Please preserve the habitat for these plants and animals who do not have a voice, the idea of losing places like these just saddens me for them.
- 4. I am also objecting 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 could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy. High rise buildings are on top of it not only unsightly, they take a lot of daylight from the surrounding area.

Please take this objection/concern seriously.