

Dear Sirs,

I am angry that the Draft Local plan appears only to place emphasis on attracting what would be high value residential development, on current green belt land. I firmly believe that there are plenty of brownfield sites within the borough which could be used for housing.

I see hardly any mention of the providing of affordable housing that Enfield Borough needs so badly. I am certain that developers will be looking at the land under discussion with the full intention of building only luxury dwellings which Enfield most certainly does not lack.

I am therefore 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 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. Losing our Greenbelt bit by bit is unacceptable. The amount of traffic and disruption that will be generated will be enormous. The roads can barely cope with traffic at the best of times. I realize that Enfield Council is very much against the residents using a car but cars are a fact of modern life, and at my age, I cannot cycle or indeed walk to Crews Hill and bring back plants! I specifically moved to this area from Southgate some years ago to enjoy the green spaces around here, and with the so-called leasing of Whitewebbs and the proposed building on the Greenbelt, our green spaces are being depleted at a rate of knots.

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.

I've spent a huge amount of time enjoying this park (I'm not a golfer) and I'm horrified it will be "leased" to a private concern. At least leave it to a 9-hole course and allow the residents of Enfield and general public enjoy ALL this local amenity.

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.

Yours faithfully

