

---

I am writing to 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 valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt but also to the character of the borough.

I also strongly object to Policies SA62, page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 as they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, which is a public amenity, into private management therefore Whitewebbs Golf Course should be reinstated.

I also object to the tall buildings 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 the acceptable height of tall buildings which, in many cases would mar the landscape of the historic market square and its 12th century St. Andrews Church and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

The number of dwellings proposed by Enfield Council would have at least 2 or more occupants therefore has thought been given to the extra schools that would be needed as well as doctors' surgeries and at least another hospital in the borough. Also one or more cars per household would cause untold traffic congestion all over Enfield. Such congestion can be seen from the office windows of the Civic Centre on any week day during term time. Also serious illness is already caused by too many vehicles emitting dangerous fumes without encouraging more cars and delivery vans in and around the borough of Enfield