

---

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 dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. Concreting over Green land, which is not only of historical importance but also crucial in helping to combat climate change, is at least short sighted. The Green Belt is also home to many species of plants and animals, some of which have protected status. The area provides an important release for many people suffering from mental depression which has been exacerbated by the pandemic. There is also the question of the current infrastructure which is already inadequate and under pressure with the existing population. There are a lack of schools, lack of community centres and we don't even have an A&E at Chase Farm hospital anymore (although there are a lot of new homes). The water pressure is also low in the Enfield area and this will only make it worse. If there is a need to reach targets in Enfield for building new homes then surely brown field sites are a better option. Over the last few years Enfield has already had its fair share of new builds, destroying the green belt is not the answer..

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. Many businesses have been hit very badly by Covid-19, but many have survived and things are turning around now. Since the pandemic many have turned to outdoor pursuits including golf and I have many friends who can attest to that.

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 not Canary Wharf. In an age where many old tower blocks are being pulled down, why build more? Tower blocks become prisons after a while, they are poorly maintained, (leading to poor physical and mental health) and become uninhabitable as we have recently seen in the news. There is also a question of fire safety. Demonstrably Local Councils rate cheapness over quality, as the deaths of 72 people at Grenfell has sadly shown us. If the towers are used as offices then this is redundant as more and more are working from home. Even when the pandemic ends this is likely to remain the case, as business have realised they can still function and save money.

The only people who will benefit from these plans will be the developers, not the people of Enfield.