

---

Dear Sir/madam

I am an Enfield resident of long standing - over 60 years, went to school here, worked for and in the Borough, raised my children here and now grandchildren.

This Borough in the north of London is unique with its mixture of urban and green belt areas. I feel that this balance should be retained and only brownfield sites developed.

THE GREEN BELT SHOULD BE LEFT UNTOUCHED and avoid urban sprawl.

In addition, where brownfield sites are developed consideration should be given to whether the infrastructure is sufficient to support proposed developments. The traffic is already a problem and more development will make issues worse.

We've already seen the White Webbs area being degraded since the golf course has left to 'rewild' - now a totally unmanaged area whereas before it was a valuable local amenity.

More specifically, I 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 Rammeay 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.

