

---

Dear Sir / Madam,

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 designation 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.

I support housing development for housing needs for the needy but strongly object to release of the Green Belt for housing or other purposes and believe that the all possible options such as development of brownfield land and regeneration of such land previously developed should be considered first by the Council and believe there are enough such land to be carefully considered . Also Council has a duty of care for protection of the Green belt for future generations and the Green belt brings Economic, Ecological, Environment and health and mental benefits to its residents.

Moreover I believe the houses built in the Green built will be beyond the affordability of who are in real need and such houses will benefit only the affluent and developers and are low density and car dependent.

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. The inappropriate locations of the sky scrapers planned will invariably would damage the character of the borough .

Regards,