

Dear Enfield Council

1. I am objecting 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.

The above named policies want to re-designate current Green Belt land for use as housing and other non-Green Belt purposes, which I cannot agree with. Historic Enfield Chase is a rare asset for Enfield and should be preserved inviolate. In these days of awareness of the importance of green space and clean air to our mental and physical health, the proposal to eliminate such assets is negligent. Irreparable harm to the priceless Green Belt will arise from the loss of this asset.

2. I am objecting to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279. I absolutely oppose the transfer of any part of Whitewebbs Park into private management. I also absolutely refute the Council's assessment that Whitewebbs Golf Course was loss making and therefore request this be overturned.

3. I also object to Policy SA52 page 372, which proposes to remove part of Rammey Marsh, a precious wildlife habitat and public facility, from the Green Belt.

4. I also object 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. Tall buildings such as these are in many cases a blight on the landscape. As the same accommodation could be provided by other lower-rise buildings, they are also unnecessary.

5. Shame on the Council for not absolutely ensuring that all suitable commercial and brownfield sites are utilised in the quest for new homes, rather than attacking the Green Belt.