

Dear Sir / Madam

Having been informed of the following plans, I would very much like to voice my Objections to them. I moved back to Enfield recently (having grown up here) to enjoy the Green nature of the borough. I am shocked at such plans being put forward especially after the recent IPCC's report, which surely highlights how important our Green Spaces really are. We were attracted to Enfield for reasons such as getting a seat on the train to work and finding plenty of quiet spaces to walk etc... How much of that will remain the same if we have how many thousands more people living here and how much less Green space to enjoy? I'm shocked and a disappointed at how Greedy this council appears... Specifically I'd like to object to the following plans:

1. 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. Surely Enfield is becoming crowded enough! These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, (where the King would go hunting many years ago – the “Chase” – as my Father taught me) 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. Once it's gone – it's gone!
- 2.
3. 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. Another beautiful walking / golfing spot and another haven for

wildlife. Surely the council should have no right to take any public amenity away – again, just to line their own pockets.

4.

5. I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammev Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. Marsh lands are especially important and quite frankly it should be a crime to even suggest such a move – disgusting.

6.

7. 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 is another terrible idea – It would ruin the skyline of Enfield and turn it from an attractive Green Town to an ugly Estate – how many people would lose their views to have them replaced by tall ugly buildings. How many gardens would be ruined by the sudden lack of sunlight. How many flower beds on pavements / public gardens etc. would just die off and how many thousands more people would suddenly all be crammed together in these buildings, causing overcrowding in our streets and public transport. How much wildlife in the form of birds especially, would suffer? And what would Enfield then look like? Would it even be recognizable as Enfield anymore?

In general I find the plans Greedy and thoughtless, with no care for the environment or for the people living in Enfield itself. I would like to Object as strongly as possible and express my very real concern that should any of these go ahead, they cannot be reversed and I fear Enfield will shortly after become a place where I will no longer want to live.

Really hoping you take the time to read my concerns and thank you so much in advance for taking them into your consideration.

Kind Regards.