
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 de-designation 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. We would lose prime habitat for **wildlife and productive food growing areas**. The proposed 7,000 + new homes in Crews Hill would inevitably be low density, non affordable and **car dependent**.

The roads of Enfield are already extremely busy; this would only increase **pollution** in the area.

There are approx 100 businesses in the area, many of which are family run businesses that may not be able to find alternative premises. The **loss of jobs** would be significant.

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. The golf club was affordable golf for all. We are being told that it is important to exercise to keep us **healthy** and yet we are losing a golf club and half of Whitewebbs Park that is home to untold **wildlife and ancient woodland**.

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. Rammey Marsh is an important **wildlife haven that's home to an astonishing variety of wildlife including Pipstrelle bats, Water Voles, bee and Pyramidal Orchids and no less than 225 other different plant species**.

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. Enfield Town is a Conservation Area, a tower block would overshadow our historic market place and St Andrews church.

The Government is quite clear in its manifesto that they are committed to **protecting and enhancing the Green Belt**.

Mayor Sadiq Khan pledged commitment to **increasing London's green credentials**, protecting parks and green spaces, **ensuring wildlife is abundant and that children can enjoy and learn outdoors**. He has **protected London's Green Belt** by helping to fund both 200 green space improvement projects and the planting of 170,000.

Enfield's open and green spaces were and still are paramount to the **residents mental**

health and well being during the ongoing pandemic.

The Green Belt is important for so many reasons, must we lose it all for the sake of profit for the already wealthy developers? There are many brownfield sites that must be used so that our open and green spaces are protected for us all to enjoy with our families and protect future generations.

The residents of Enfield deserve a future that provides access to a healthier, green, safe and a clean environment.