

---

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 – in a time of climate emergency it is seems absolutely unbelievable that Enfield council would see fit to consider developing on green belt land. Green belt land is important for nature and the biodiversity of the area. It is there for the health and wellbeing of everybody and needs to be preserved and not destroyed.

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. It should not be sold for private enterprise and should be open to everyone. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement.

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. Green belt land should not be developed!

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 offer very little to the people being housed, with problems including light deprivation and uncomfortable interior temperatures. Not an appropriate way to house families. They are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.