
It is with great sadness and concern that I write to 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; 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.
- 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.
- Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.
- 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.

Further important reasons for my objections:

- Enfield Council have ignored sites with good potential that would bring homes, jobs and investment in public services to urban areas and avoid building on the Green Belt.
- Enfield Council's plan will not deliver housing that most local people need. What Enfield needs are affordable homes in areas with existing public services and good transport links, not unaffordable and sprawling executive homes in rural locations that use land inefficiently and increase car-dependency.
- Removing 10% of the borough's open space, including farms producing local food for local people and grasslands that are helping to fight against climate change, can never be outweighed by a few new footpaths and pocket parks.
- Population projections are educated estimates at best. The number quoted by the council (50,000 people by 2039) does not reflect the latest projections from the Office of National Statistics and does not account for the impact of changing migration patterns or Covid and could be a big over-estimate. Why sacrifice the Green Belt for a guess? Let's wait for the 2021 Census results to become available in 2022 and get some reality into the plan.
- Areas of the Green Belt that are targeted for development are home to endangered species and rich mosaics of biodiversity, which cannot be replaced.
- Enfield Council will not '*preserve statutorily recognised character areas and heritage and historic assets*'. Historic Enfield Chase is a unique and beautiful landscape that is now targeted for more than 12,500 homes, while the proposed siting of unnecessary tall buildings will mar protected views and heritage areas.

