

Dear Sir/Madam

1. This email is my objection 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 the above propose a change of use of Green Belt land for housing and other purposes, which I absolutely disagree with. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which cannot be replicated by any other assets of the borough, and played an important role in Enfield's development. Permanent harm to the much valued Green Belt will arise from the loss of this immeasurably valuable landscape asset. The deprivation of this asset for the people of Enfield will alter the very fabric of the borough and diminish its "lungs".

2. I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279. I categorically oppose the transfer of any part of Whitewebbs Park into private management. I also categorically reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was loss making and therefore request its this be repealed.

3. I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would see the removal of any part of Rammey Marsh, a precious wildlife resource 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. These policies propose areas for and the acceptable height of tall buildings. Such tall buildings in many cases would mar the landscape. They are also unnecessary because the same accommodation could be provided by other lower-rise buildings, as stated in the policy.