Dear Sir/Madam,
I am writing to object to the following policies set out in the Draft Local Plan:

- 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 these propose the designation of Green Belt for the building of new housing and other purposes.

These sites are historical land and shape Enfield Chase, remain rare in the southeast and have a vital role in the development of Enfield.
It is what little there is as precious green land in our area, and a crucial asset. Loosing such a valuable part of nature would not only harm and scar the Green Belt, but strip the very source that is helping our planet breath. You will surely know that any more stripping of the natural landscape here will be a huge backward move in what is an almighty effort to take serious action for sustainability.
If Enfield Council want to play a real part in this effort, then any kind of future planning must surely respect sustainability as a top priority.

Further to the above policies, I also object to the following:

- Policy 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.
- Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.
- 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 mark the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

Look forward to your advice on my above serious concerns.

