

I wish to object to the following:

Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87 and Figure 3.11

A substantial amount of green space has already been lost in this area. This area of Green Belt countryside is integral to the qualities of Enfield, that make it so special. The large site, if developed would turn an area from unique to mundane. There would be considerable pressure on the traffic (already an issue) in that area and beyond.

Policy DE6 (pages 156-60) and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321

The introduction of overly tall buildings is unnecessary in today's world, with changed working practices, and will be unsightly in the extreme. In terms of Palace Gardens, over-development will reduce, rather than improve, the attraction, particularly taking into account the many alternative shopping options.

Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept plan figure 3.10

Crews Hill is an important and unique amenity. Its very existence helps to support the mental health and well-being of the many visitors, and is a major attraction and facility for not only Enfield residents, but also neighbouring areas. The only word to describe the potential loss is 'travesty'.

Rather than destroy this very special part of the Green Belt, there should be a major investment into the area in terms of developing nurseries, etc. In order to help Enfield to become self-sufficient with local produce.

Traffic into the Cuffley area is already problematic at peak times, and this will also be exacerbated.

I hope that you will take my views into consideration.

Thank you,