

---

I am writing to object to the draft plan as detailed below. However, I am confused as I thought I lived in a suburb of City where I could enjoy the benefits of the city and the country side. I do not want to live in an area of dense population without the infrastructure of doctors, hospitals, schools and other facilities that this level of population density will require. I do not want to lose my green belt, my ability to drive (partially disabled) to park my car so that I can access the facilities I need and use. To be able to travel to work when I need without a 3 hour journey each day going by bus to the station, train into town, train out of town. This plan seems to want to create an inner city on the outskirts of a city. We do not all work locally or somewhere we can immediately access via bus or tube. I do not want to live in a high rise area. If I wanted those things I would not have chosen to live in Southgate. This plan is destruction of environment on every level.

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 also object to Policy DM BG10 on p380, the loss of public space and amenity from the conversion of the recreation fields at Firs Farm and to the east of the A10 (south of Church Street) for crematorium use
5. I also object to SA42 the development of Ford's grove car park as this was allocated as free parking to make up for the loss of parking spaces when the cycles lanes were introduced on Green Lanes and will negatively impact business and shoppers, especially the disabled, elderly and those with children who will have to walk further.
6. I also object to SA32, Sainsburys Green Lanes N21 3RS. Page 351 of Enfield Local Plan - redevelopment of supermarket and car park to mixed-use homes and non-residential floor space.
7. I also object to the plan to remove all public parking spaces at, particularly at stations. This will be detrimental as mentioned above but also to women who may live within 10 mins walk of a station but would still need to undertake that walk at times in the dark, late at night and alone.

