## Dear Strategic Planning and Design team

I write you to express our disagreement with the plans made to build in the green area of Enfield.

What we object to

1. 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.
Building in these sites will take away the beautiful, historic and unique landscape and it will be lost forever.
2. We 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 expect it to be an area of public use for the time to come. It does need a reinvestment, but it should come in a form that preserves the right for residents to use the area rather than making yet another unaccessible private green space for only those that pay membership. It can be a great entertainment space and the golf installations could be wonderful outdoor restaurants.
3. 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.
4. 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.
They propose areas and acceptable height of tall buildings that, in many cases, would spoil the landscape and are unnecessary because other forms of lower-rise buildings could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

Please reconsider the plan by revising which gray areas in Enfield can be rebuilt instead of building on the green. It might be less expensive to build on the green, but it is unnecessary considering so many parts of Enfield could use the uplift.

Please feel free to contact me by email and keep me updated on the subject

