

I wish to state my fierce objection to the following:

- Policy 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;
- Policy SA62 page 383
- Policy SP CL4 pages 277-279.

All of these propose to reallocate essential Green Belt land to housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, a unique area pivotal to the development of Enfield. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause irreparable harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough. When we settled in this area some thirty years to raise our children, it was this very landscape that drew us. Though living in a modest house in urban Palmers Green, we knew we could take advantage of the countryside with a journey of some ten minutes or so into the Green Belt. Currently we have the best of both worlds and your plans will make it impossible for succeeding residents to enjoy the same freedom.

I 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.

I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

Finally, I wish to show my opposition 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 will mar the landscape when other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy. It is particularly vexing (even insulting) that the proposed development for Palace Gardens is sited by the historical conservation area of Enfield Town. Similarly, the Hadley Wood development is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area.

There are many alternative options to using Green Belt Land, such as the wastes of Harbet Road, Meridian Water East Bank, and Brimsdown. A number of these sites benefit from the advantage of excellent walking and cycling links.

The loss of the nurseries at Crews Hill is immeasurable. Putting aside the loss of employment, these nurseries are known nationally. You talk of such development leading to "sustainable ecotourism .. for visitors". Your focus instead should be on Enfield residents who treasure the nurseries and the Green Belt land. Botany Bay, where both my son and husband have played cricket, will be irreparably damaged by such changes. This policy must be rethought.

