

---

1. We are 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 de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. We are shocked to find that so much housing development (more than 6000 homes) is proposed on high quality Green Belt and countryside in our local area. The historic Enfield Chase is a rare and valuable landscape. More than 12,500 homes proposed here !!! It's loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the area. Brown field sites should be further explored before Green Belt is used. Wildlife, biodiversity and countryside need to be protected for future generations living in urban areas . We've recently seen the destruction of wildlife habitats in Trent Park by housing development, and at Spurs training grounds. These proposals further erode what Green belt assets we have left in the Borough.

2. We 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. Whitewebbs Park is wonderful public amenity enjoyed by vast numbers of Enfield residents. It is highly valued Green Belt land. Parks are essential for good mental health and well-being. The woodland is unique in the Borough. Access to existing footpaths should be maintained. We understand that the Golf course made a relatively small operating loss, but did not get income from a bar, restaurant or function room. This is a park for the public to enjoy in a variety of ways.

3. We are also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. This area provides a unique and rare habitat supporting 220 plant species. All the more precious because it is in a heavily urbanised area.

4. We are 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. Proposed tower blocks in the heart of Enfield town would be totally unsuitable. This is a Conservation area. The town's heritage needs to be celebrated, enhanced and conserved for future generations to enjoy. Heritage buildings add to the social and shopping experience in Enfield Town. Tower blocks would detract from the historic feel and undermine efforts to improve the local town environment. It would damage the character of Enfield Town.

