

Dear Enfield Council

I have lived in Southgate for almost all of my life – I am now nearly 90. I brought a family up here making full use of Enfield's green spaces. I am hugely concerned at the sections of the draft plan which threaten the Green Belt in Enfield. I can no longer get out on my own to enjoy these areas, but it is so vital that my children and grandchildren are able to do so.

### **Enfield Chase, Chase Park and Crews Hill**

Why is the Council not focussing on brownfield sites for housing and development? The proposal to designate Green Belt in the historic area of Enfield Chase for housing and other purposes is completely inappropriate. Enfield Chase has its origins in Enfield Old Park and is the only surviving example of a Chase according to research conducted by Dr John Langton of St John's College Oxford. How can the Council even consider destroying such a unique and valuable heritage which must be preserved for all residents?

On this basis I object to Policy SP PL 10, pp 80-87 and Fig. 3.11; Policy SP PL9 pp 77-80 and Concept plan Fig 3.10; Policy SA 45: Land between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, p 364; Policy SA 54, p 374; and, Policy SA 62 p 383 and SP CL4 pp 277-279.

### **Whitewebbs Park**

I object to Policies SA 62 pp 383 and SP CL 4 pp 277-279 and find it hard to credit that the Council is prepared to put a well used and loved public amenity of Whitewebbs Park into private management. The Council claims that the golf course was losing money but alternative analyses have cast serious doubt on this. All of Whitewebbs should be retained for public use, not hived off to a private organisation which cannot be held to account, whatever promises it may be making at this stage.

### **Rammey Marsh**

I object to the removal of Rammey Marsh from the Green Belt, which would affect both wild life and public access detrimentally. Once Green Belt areas are gone, they can never be restored and cannot be compensated for with urban planting, however desirable that may be in urban areas. I therefore object to Policy SA 52 p 372.

### **Tall buildings policies**

I was horrified by the proposed tower blocks for Southgate Office Village and object to your acceptance of taller buildings across Enfield contained in pp 156-160, Fig 7.3 and 7.4, and Policies DE6 and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre p 321. Alternative lower rise buildings would be capable of providing the same amount of accommodation without all the downsides for residents and locals which unacceptably and inappropriately tall buildings entail.

I am very concerned about the potential damage to Enfield which will be caused by elements of the Local Plan you have proposed and would like to see significant changes to this before it is finalised.