

---

I email within the 12 week consultation period on the Enfield draft Local Plan to object to the following policies and areas as outlined in the Local plan:

- 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

They all propose the dedesignation of Green Belt land for housing and other purposes. This land is unique and a part of Enfield's historical development. It is a uniquely valuable asset to this borough

- I object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279, as they transfer Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, to private management and I would 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.

The Green Belt and open spaces are a jewel in Enfield's crown, providing countless benefits from nature and wildlife, the sustainable environment and fight against climate change and to the health and mental wellbeing of Enfield's communities as so particularly illustrated during the national and local lockdown periods. What has evolved naturally and historically cannot be replaced by smaller, manufactured smaller local green spaces. The developments can only further increase traffic flow, congestion and pollution, destroying the natural benefits.

Loss of these areas as targeted in the Local Plan to building would be irreversible and permanent for the Green belt, and to the environment and the character of the borough that attracts so many people to relocate, live and remain here.

My working career over the last 35 years has been in the NHS at Chase Farm Hospital Enfield and I have over the years recruited staff who have specialist skills which are in scarce supply – the beautiful Green Belt and its many outstanding and wide ranging benefits were frequently the ultimate pull for these staff to work and live in Enfield rather than another London Borough which does not have this unique attraction.

We must protect and preserve the Green and I would urgently urge the re consideration of the plan to include regeneration of areas in the best interests for Enfield going forwards

I email within the 12 week consultation period on the Enfield draft Local Plan to object to the following policies and areas as outlined in the Local plan:

- 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

They all propose the dedesignation of Green Belt land for housing and other purposes. This land is unique and a part of Enfield's historical development. It is a uniquely valuable asset to this borough

- I object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279, as they transfer Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, to private management and I would 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.

The Green Belt and open spaces are a jewel in Enfield's crown, providing countless benefits from nature and wildlife, the sustainable environment and fight against climate change and to the health and mental wellbeing of Enfield's communities as so particularly illustrated during the national and local lockdown periods. What has evolved naturally and historically cannot be replaced by smaller, manufactured smaller local green spaces. The developments can only further increase traffic flow, congestion and pollution, destroying the natural benefits.

Loss of these areas as targeted in the Local Plan to building would be irreversible and permanent for the Green belt, and to the environment and the character of the borough that attracts so many people to relocate, live and remain here.

My working career has been in Enfield and I have over the years recruited staff who have specialist skills which are in scarce supply – the beautiful Green Belt and its many outstanding and wide ranging benefits were frequently the ultimate pull for these staff to work and live in Enfield rather than another London Borough which does not have this unique attraction.

We must protect and preserve the Green and I would urgently urge the re consideration of the plan to include regeneration of areas in the best interests for Enfield going forwards