

---

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you to let you know that I am opposed to the plan to build housing on the Green Belt areas surrounding Enfield. Please see my points below:-

1. I am 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 destruction 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. I and my family have enjoyed many walks and cycle rides around the green belt of Enfield and it breaks my heart that the Council are simply going to sell off this land to build houses, for which they will profit.

2. 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 used to use this golf course, as it was an affordable place to play golf in the borough.

Now it is over grown and will soon be full of houses. This will destroy the look of the area and have a hugely negative affect on the wildlife in the area. But this council do not seem to care about such things. They just want to make a profit. Also, I would like to see where this profit will be spent? I can't imagine that the local residents of Enfield are going to benefit!!!!

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 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.

Also, why are councils hell bent on building more and more flats in an already

overcrowded area?

Surely councils should be working with the government and start making use of the many office blocks

in London, which are still mostly empty due to many of the office workers now working from home since lockdown.

I have been an Enfield resident for over 10 years and in that time I have witnessed a decline in the area and a lack of investment by the council. The council do not even subsidise that local leisure centre, so we have to endure over the top price hikes to keep the place open.

I could go on about how I feel Enfield council are one of the worst in London, but that is not particularly relevant to this subject matter.

I sincerely hope that these plans do not go ahead.