
As a resident of Greenway N14, and a regular user of Enfield's green spaces – a significant reason for returning to live in Enfield, where I grew up, 20 years ago – I would like to comment on the draft plan you have put out for consultation.

My biggest concern is over your proposals to build over significant swathes of Enfield's green belt. IF the last 18 months has shown anything, it is how vital open green spaces are to maintain mental and physical health.

Enfield Chase, Chase Park and Crews Hill.

As a regular walker in Trent Park and as a regular customer of the garden centres at Crews Hill I find it hard to credit that the Council can seriously consider mass development in these green areas. On this basis, I object to the proposal to designate Green Belt in the historic area of Enfield Chase for housing and other purposes. It is also not appropriate to obliterate an area which played such an important role in the development of Enfield. Enfield Chase has its origins in Enfield Old Park and in this context is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Enfield is the only surviving example of a Chase according to research conducted by Dr John Langton of St John's College Oxford. How can the Council even consider destroying such a unique and valuable heritage – this belongs to all residents, not to the Councillors and Property developers?

There are plenty of brownfield sites which must be used before such valuable and historic green belt land is lost.

On this basis I object to Policy SP PL 10, pp 80-87 and Fig. 3.11; Policy SP PL9 pp 77-80 and Concept plan Fig 3.10; Policy SA 45: Land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, p 364; Policy SA 54, p 374; and, Policy SA 62 p 383 and SP CL4 pp 277-279.

Whitewebbs Park

It is beyond belief that the Council is prepared to put a well used and loved public amenity of Whitewebbs Park – which I rode horses in regularly for years – into private management. The Council claims that the golf course was losing money but alternative analyses have cast serious doubt on this and all of Whitewebbs should be retained for public use, not hived off to a private organisation which cannot be held to account, whatever promises it may be making at this stage.

On this basis I object to Policies SA 62 pp 383 and SP CL 4 pp 277-279.

Rammey Marsh

I object to the removal of RAMmey Marsh from the green belt, which would affect both wild life and public access detrimentally. Once Green Belt areas are gone, they can never be restored and cannot be compensated for with urban planting, however desirable that may be in urban areas. I therefore object to Policy SA 52 p 372.

Tall buildings policies

I objected to the proposed tower blocks in the centre of Southgate on the brow of the hill, and object to your acceptance of much taller buildings across Enfield contained in pp 156-160, Fig 7.3 and 7.4, and Policies DE6 and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre p 321. Alternative lower rise buildings would be capable of providing the same amount of accommodation without all the downsides for residents and locals which unacceptably and inappropriately tall buildings entail.

It is hard to express sufficiently strongly in words my concern about the damage to the core of what makes Enfield a special place to live and work which the draft Plan will entail. The Council has a difficult task but must find alternative ways to provide the housing needed for the borough without destroying irreplaceable open and green spaces.