

Dear Sirs

I have been really horrified to read about the proposed plans to use green belt land to build new housing developments. At a time when the world should be focussed on minimising our impact on the natural environment, I find it utterly mystifying why these proposals are even being considered. The impact on our landscape and our people will be entirely negative, when there are so many alternatives to build AFFORDABLE homes where they will bring benefit to help regenerate deprived areas. Future generations will ask why we allowed this to happen.

I am therefore writing formally to object 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 – all of which propose the dedesignation 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. It is a rare and valuable landscape asset and its loss would cause permanent harm not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of the borough.

2. 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 alternative plans.

3. 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.

4. I am also objecting 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 which propose areas for and the acceptable height of tall buildings which, in many cases 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 already challenging this issue in Southgate.

I look forward to hearing from you – and hearing the news that these proposals have been rejected in order to consider more suitable alternatives that meet the dual objectives of protecting our environment and providing affordable homes for people who need them.