

To whom it may concern,

I am sure that I am one of many that have written with objections to the mass redevelopment of the area that I called my home.

As a family, we moved to the area because of the perfect balance between an area that offered the perfect mix of historical buildings, beautiful green land and lesser traffic, lower population and nature on our doorstep.

The proposed plans to remove the greenbelt that we all so love are none other than shocking. I am writing 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.

For example whilst Enfield does need houses but identifying Crew Hill as an area because it has a station I don't believe really tackled the issue at hand. The houses would inevitably be low-density, non-affordable and car-dependent – this is not a solution to meeting the housing targets and would add mass traffic and pollution.

Down the road in Enfield Chase has longed played an important role in the development of Enfield. This 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.

I also object to the 11 hectares of new industrial and storage and distribution use at what is currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase. Why are we getting rid of the farm and beautiful surrounding green land there to make way for industrial units?

Please note I also formally object to the following policies in the draft local plan.

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 its reinstatement.

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.