

---

Good afternoon,

I am writing to strongly object to 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; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279. All of which propose the dedesignation 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 wildlife and the very character of the borough. As well as a great area to walk around which many residents have done including myself throughout the pandemic and we can't lose it. Building where the garden centres are at Crews Hill would be very damaging for residents like myself who visit regularly and have used them for years and staff who would lose their jobs. All to just build more unaffordable homes which no one can afford unless you are very wealthy.

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 call for its reinstatement. The course was closed during the pandemic so it wouldn't have made money. But I'm sure it would have picked up again after the lockdowns as it was the only affordable course in the area. Therefore allowed everyone to play golf. Whitewebbs has been a great asset to residents especially during the current situation for walks. Football pitches are all over the place and are not necessary and will destroy Whitewebbs. The future of the surrounding area isn't certain either. Such as the ancient woods and lake. Both of which are lovely and need to remain for the public.

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. Green belt land is very important to ensure the area doesn't get overcrowded with homes. Also these planned homes won't benefit residents as they won't be affordable. So it's pointless.

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. Enfield Town is already looking sorry and these high tower blocks would only make it look worse. Instead build low rise homes in appropriate places and invest in the town.

So overall these plans are ridiculous and won't benefit anyone who lives in Enfield. As a Chase Ward resident these green belt plans will affect myself and other Chase Ward residents the most as we are fortunate to have most of the green spaces in the borough and we can't lose them. Residents all over Enfield and visitors enjoy these green spaces too. So these plans will only cause upset, overcrowding, damage to wildlife and people losing their jobs. Green belt was added for a reason and shouldn't be removed. We need to protect wildlife and ease overcrowding. As well as maintain our green spaces which have been around for years and be around for future generations to enjoy. In order to house more people build affordable homes and to respect residents' wishes build them in appropriate places and not have high rise buildings. I hope the right decision will be made.

Yours sincerely,