Having read through all the literature that has been produced in connection with the above, as a resident of Enfield for over 20 years. I am writing to express my views on the proposed developments put forward by Enfield Council.

Rather than adding to the quality of life of this borough, the plans are destined to destroy ,the very environment that residents like myself enjoy, and have benefited from, especially whilst we've endured this pandemic period.

Specifically 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 de-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. Furthermore they present Enfield as an attractive area of suburban London, for those who do not have direct access to "green spaces", for exercise and recreation.

In addition, 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.. 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. With this proposal and the other proposed development of Crews Hill, public access to recreational activities is being denied to residents, for their physical benefit.

Finally, having viewed the on-line consultation earlier in the year for the proposed development of Palace Gardens, 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.

There is no question that additional housing is required in the borough, though the numbers widely differ as to what is required. But by destroying Green Belt areas, as a governing council, you're proposing irreparable damage to the nature & fabric of our open spaces, which will adversely affect this borough, now and in the future. Please reconsider, and look to build a better future for all, by maintaining rather than destroying our Green Belt areas, and town centre.

Your sincerely