
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Objections to planed developments

The 'many strengths' as described in your forward are being/have been eroded. Enfield, once a vibrant town, has now sadly deteriorated beyond belief. Palmers Green not fairing much better and now will be having gambling venue which will attract people who are already suffering high levels of debt into more debt leading the area into more depreviation. And now Enfield Council want to build on our Green Belt when it should be looking at its brownfield sites.

I am writing to object to the following Policies:

Policy SP PL10 Chase Park, pages 81-87, and Figure 3.11;

The above propose the dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. This 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. Clearly also taking no notice of

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.

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.

I also object to 6.10 Policy DM BG10 page 133: Burial and crematorium spaces at Firs Farm and SA59 p380. The local community over recent years have put a lot of effort into improving the area and the Trustees & Friends of Firs Farm have put in a planning application for a Community Hub with cafe and toilets and in conjunction with Enfield Council!!

If Enfield Council is genuine with their Policy PL8 page 72-74 it wouldn't be proposing building on the green belt, contradicting itself. I would so much enjoy

wild swimming as mentioned at point g. The borough used to benefit from an open-aired swimming pool at Barrowell Green which I enjoyed as a child. If only we could be like Berlin with lakes that families could enjoy in the summer.

I also strongly object to SA32 Sainsbury's Green Lanes, N21 3RS Page 351 due to the recent and future developments along Green Lanes of the old Travis Perkins and Capitol House. This Sainsbury's is highly popular and would force people to have to drive further. At present I can walk. This would affect the elderly, disabled and young families in the area and increase car usage. This would add to pressure on the local infrastructure eg doctors, schools.