

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. Our green spaces are what make Enfield a great place to live, it is what makes it special, it's what makes families want to live here. Pollution is less than other boroughs. The air feels cleaner, it is a fantastic place to walk in nature, breath and keeps my mental health well! If we lose our greenbelt we lose Enfield's unique qualities and what makes it a beautiful place to live. Our roads and services are already to capacity and expanding to all the extra housing will make it impossible for our hospitals, doctors surgeries, roads and other social services to function effectively. Services are already struggling and cannot provide for us as a community now!

2. 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 totally ruin the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy. There are many listed buildings in the area and building any developments over five stories would not be in keeping with the area. Enfield Chase and Enfield town have a unique and beautiful quality, it's what makes our area special! Any high rise building would totally ruin the area's character and would be a blot on the landscape. I feel very strongly against this, I am not opposed to modernising the town centre but it has to be right. No high rise buildings which are not in keeping with Enfields character.

3. 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. Tottenham Hotspur already have a large piece of Enfield land and could surely use that to expand their pitches for girls football.

4. 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.

The council's prediction of an increase in population which are estimated are not true figures and are massively overestimated. It does not match the government's statistics. Enfield council made the same mistake for increase in school places.

Our community's future is in your hands, please do not decimate and kill our diverse, green borough. Do not take away our children's future, do not take away our clean air, environment and biodiversity. Once gone out future will be very bleak.

