

---

Dear proponents of the Draft local Plan Consultation, Southbury & Chase Ward councillors, and Feryal Clark MP

I am writing to object to the following Policies and seek a re-think on how to provide housing without the destruction of local wildlife in wards neighbouring to my area which is in Southbury Ward. This destruction is in complete contradiction to the long overdue focus on the protection of our local wildlife in order protect human survival LONG TERM. This is in contrast with panic caused by politicians about climate change, which distracts people from dealing with their local wildlife, which has always been in our hands to protect for our own good in order to counteract any pollution caused by society since the industrial revolution:

The policies which I have read about include the following:

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

De-designation 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.

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 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.

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.

Please let me know your views on these proposals and preserving wildlife as part of and not separate from the vital need for housing and social cohesion,

