

---

To whom it may concern,

Whilst I appreciate that Enfield council has housing quotas that it must meet from Central Government, I am in fierce objection to the loss of any Greenbelt land due to housing or private ownership/ leasing. The Greenbelt not only allows Enfield to be bestowed with green open spaces which can be enjoyed by all, but acts as the lungs of London. The current administration claims to care about the health of its residents and the pollution levels in the borough. If they continue to pave over the Greenbelt they will destroy the land that has been dedicated to stop London sprawl and counteracts the ever-increasing pollution in our capital City.

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 redesignation 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. Stating in a public meeting that it is not fair that the West of the borough is so green, and it needs to be brought down to the same standard as the east of the borough is not enough of an argument. People from all over the borough have the opportunity to come and enjoy the green open spaces on offer and if this is taken away, EVERYONE will feel the impact, no matter which part of the borough they live in. Our open spaces are the one thing that makes Enfield a unique and attractive borough in which to live and if the Greenbelt is destroyed, we will just become another part of the featureless London sprawl. Better transport links from the east to the west could be an option to ensure that the residents in the east are able to use the greenspace.

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. Whitewebbs is not only used by golfers who cannot afford private golf club membership fees, but walkers, families, and nature lovers. The ancient woodland should be saved for all Enfield residents to enjoy.

I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammev Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. As above, this provides an important 'gate' between the M25 and Enfield residents.

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.

I oppose SA54, page 374, about the 11 hectares of new industry and storage distribution use at the agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new cottages and

Holly Hill Farm.

All the above policies do not take into consideration the immediate and long-term loss of green space, the increased strain on the local infrastructure, education, and public health services. The Plan reads as a quick fix to making certain people and developers wealthier. It does not stand as a Plan to ensure that all residents in Enfield are considered, that our history or our greenspace is protected at all costs.

During the past 18 months, we have lived through extremely difficult and testing times. One of the most important factors in helping people to manage their mental health has been the ability to enjoy the outdoors, to walk in our woodlands and parks and to connect with nature. As a primary school teacher who is about to embark on Forest School training to enable our younger generation to reap the benefits of outdoor play and exploration, I find it absolutely appalling that the Council could even consider the destruction of our Greenbelt to be a viable solution to the housing issue. We should be protecting our green spaces for future generations to come and I find it very sad that so-called intelligent people cannot come up with a more imaginative solution.

Yours Sincerely