Whilst have appreciation that Enfield has housing quotas that it must meet from Central Government, I am in fierce objection to the loss of any Greenbelt land to housing or private ownership/ leasing which results in the loss of any green land and trees. The Greenbelt not only allows Enfield (who once held the greenest borough status), to be bestowed with such beauty, but acts as the lungs of London. The current administration claims to care about the health of its residents and the pollution levels in the borough. If they continue to pave over the Greenbelt (Trent Park in the first instance) they will destroy the land that has been dedicated to stop London sprawl and counteracts the ever-increasing pollution in our capital City.

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 redesignation 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. Stating in a public meeting that it is not fair that the West of the borough is so green, and it needs to be brought down to the same standard as the east of the borough is not enough of an argument. The current administration should be acting on behalf of all its residents, not just its voters, and saving this space and encouraging it for the use of all residents. Better transport links from the east to the west could be an option to ensure that the residents in the east are able to use the greenspace.

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. Unfortunately, the Council is nationally famous for being corrupt and downplaying the income of the facility is not enough to 'lease off' this land. Whitewebbs is not only used by golfers who cannot afford private golf club membership fees, but walkers, families, and nature lovers. The ancient woodland should be saved at all costs, not 'leased off' to business who have already not been reprimanded for going against planning agreements.

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. As above this not only provides an important 'gate' between the M25 and Enfield residents, but the Northern Gateway Access Road was not given permission as it destroyed this local birdwatching nature reserve. From memory there was also a dragonfly colony that was not allowed to be moved. This should be protected at all costs.

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.

With regards to Policy SP PL9 pages 77-80and concept Plan Figure 3.10, I oppose the Crewes Hill 'sustainable settlement'. The Council's handling of this reflects the level of corruption with the current administration. With several the businesses having already received their CPO letters, the Council has seemingly agreed this first stage of the development without any form of public consultation.

I oppose SA54, page 374, about the 11 hectares of new industry and storage distribution use at the agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new cottages and Holly Hill Farm.

All the above policies do not take into consideration the immediate and long-term loss of green space, the increased strain on the local infrastructure, education, and public health services. The Plan reads as a quick fix to making certain people and developers wealthier. It does not stand as a Plan to ensure that all residents in Enfield are considered, that our history or our greenspace is protected at all costs.