

Dear Sir/Madam,

We wish to object most strongly to the proposed development of Green Belt Land in the Borough of Enfield, specifically to 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 which propose the designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield.

We were dismayed to read your proposals, which, on so many levels, are detrimental to the residents of the Borough of Enfield and indeed to the surrounding boroughs and counties.

In the current world, where climate change is rapidly affecting and even destroying our environment, for the council to push forward with building on Green Belt Land which helps us to protect us from the effects of emissions is reckless. The proposals, cited as being to provide thousands of houses and industrial land, can only be in the interests of money making and ease of Enfield Council attracting property developers who prefer to build on green-field sites due to lower costs. There are numerous brown-field sites available in the borough and The Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, is completely opposed to any use of Green Belt land for development. He has already voiced his stated view and trusts that any appointed Inspector will fully take his views and objections onboard during their review of the LBE's PLAN. Indeed, in a recent BBC London broadcast, the proposals to destroy our beautiful green belt land with all its species of wildlife aiding much needed clean air to the local residents.

We 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. In addition, I was also shocked to read that Enfield Council also propose, in PL9 which is contained in section 3.9 "Crews Hill" on pages 75 to 80 of the plan (inclusive) the building of houses on Crews Hill Golf Course.

Our son, Ross, relies on his membership of Crews Hill Golf Club, for physical fitness for his mental health. To close another local course, when the council has recently closed Whitewebbs, would be a disgrace. Not only do the courses provide recreation for their members and guests, they also provide space for wildlife, paths for walkers and much needed clean air.

CHGC has 553 members (at 16th August 2021) and makes itself open to members of the public to book and play in accordance with the requirements of its lease with LBE. Of CHGC members around 75% live in the LBE area. The Club provides highly regarded opportunities to walk and enjoy leisure and sports time within well maintained Green Belt land. We are losing Golf Courses everywhere and during the recent lease offering to outside interests by the LBE of Whitewebbs Park (Golf Course and Woodlands), the LBE closed Whitewebbs Golf Course and stated in their publicity that CHGC was a place where those golfers displaced by the closure could play golf. So it begs the question, where is the logic of LBE using CHGC to enhance their reasons for selling-off the lease at Whitewebbs then in this PLAN trying to remove the same facility upon which they rely?

Please reconsider this plan, which would be disastrous for local residents. The proposed homes would, of course, not be affordable for low paid local residents. There are many other brown field site options which should be considered, much needed low-rise structures for building sustainable communities rather than the proposals for tall buildings, to which I am also objecting (pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321) which would mar the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

We are also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. This green space is nearer to the most deprived areas of the borough, where clean air and recreation is a must due to the already highly populated surrounding areas. There are many brown-field sites that could be considered in this area, why choose to develop here?

In conclusion, we cannot stress enough our disappointment that Enfield Council are proposing to destroy our much loved Green Belt land without consideration for the future well being of local residents. The effects of climate change are in the news almost daily, and for our borough to completely disregard this is negligent and ill-advised.

