

---

To whom it may concern

We find it astonishing that building on green areas, thus destroying farmland, wildlife habitats, outdoor leisure facilities and the opportunity for residents to enjoy the countryside has even been considered, particularly now, when the importance of a healthy environment has been recognised - and emphasised by the Pandemic. We understand that more housing is needed but Enfield Council appears to be ignoring sites and buildings that can be regenerated and will be affordable to those on lower incomes. As everyone knows, new-builds on new sites profit only rich developers and rich buyers. Having studied the plan and revisited the relevant sites, we list below our specific objections.

1. We strongly 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; Policy SA62, page 383 and SP CL4, pages 277-279, all of which propose the redesignation of the Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of the historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the South-East and played a vital role in the borough's development. This landscape is a valuable asset and would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt but to the character of the borough.
2. We also strongly object to Policies SA62, page 383 and SP CL4, pages 277-279: these propose transferring part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. Whitewebbs Park provides a beautiful walking area for Enfield residents - we use it frequently and during the lockdown, when we were not permitted to drive out into Hertfordshire for country walks, it saved our sanity and that of many others. We have it on good authority that the Council's claim that Whitewebbs Golf Course was under-used and therefore unprofitable is false. We appeal for its reinstatement.
3. We also strongly object to Policy SA52, page 372, which would destroy part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity.
4. We also strongly object to the tall buildings policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6 and SA2, Palace Gardens Shopping Centre, page 321, which propose complete redevelopment, including unacceptably tall buildings which would mar the landscape. These are unnecessary: as stated in the policy, lower-rise buildings could provide the same accommodation. (We have already stated our views on the plan for the redevelopment of Palace Gardens on the 'Let's Talk' consultation and in a letter to the Council.)

We trust you will seriously consider our objections and those of other residents and reject your plan to build on green areas.