

I am writing with opposition 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 redesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

I believe that 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 irreversible damage, not only to the Green Belt, but also to the very character of our borough.

I further oppose 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 tarnish the landscape and are unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy.

Enfield has many green areas and considering our global ethos to protect and sustain our natural environment, these plans contradict this ongoing campaign.

I hope you carefully consider all current residents whose natural environment will be permanently destroyed. Are these works actually necessary or is financial gain the main driving force?