

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to you to object to the Enfield Local Plan and wish for this objection to be used as part of the consultation phase.

My objection is 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

These policies propose a change of designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

I am seriously concerned about the impact that these proposals would have. The Enfield area and its landscape are an important and valuable asset in its current form not only of the local community but also for the wider London community.

The permanent environmental damage that would be caused by these proposals is incredible. I am not unaware of the need for housing and this is not a case of purely being opposed to plans because they impact the area that I live. This is about protecting an environment which is vitally important now and will continue to be in the future. There is no good reason to build on the Green Belt until brownfield sites have been fully exhausted.

By fully exhausted I mean these brownfield sites should actually have homes built on them before we start granting permission to build on the Green Belt. The pace of home development in the area is already behind plan so if we must allow private developers approval to build on land, lets only do so when the housing development that has been promised has actually been delivered.

Otherwise we will end up in a position where the protection of the Green Belt has already been removed and there is nothing to show for it.

**Any proposal that impacts the Green Belt should be shelved until brownfield sites have actually, physically been exhausted not just conceptually.**

\*\*\*\*\*

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 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.

The privatisation of public amenities and the removal of public amenities from the Green Belt would continue a concerning trend towards reduced public access and increased prioritisation of private interests.

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

Kind regards,