

---

Enfield Council's plans to destroy much of the area's historic and environmentally vital green belt are at best misguided and at worst an act of vandalism that will blight the lives of both us and our children for generations to come.

The Green Belt is the lungs of London, providing space to live in peace and harmony with nature and for nature itself to thrive. In an age of increased environmental awareness it defies belief that any council could propose throttling the air we breath with concrete and steel.

Enfield Council pretends to be proud of its green credentials. If you implement this plan you will commit an act of environmental vandalism equal to that of Brazil in destroying the rainforests. Posterity will judge you harshly.

For the record I list below my specific objections which are in line with those of Enfield Roadwatch and other concerned groups:

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 dedesignation 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.
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.

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.

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.