

I am writing (in agreement with husbands email to you) because I feel very strongly that the green belt area should be protected. I feel that the greenbelt was introduced for good reasons which are still entirely relevant today. London cannot just continue to sprawl outwards endlessly. It's bad for the quality of life of its residents and also for the environment. If the regulation only stays in place until its more convenient to disregard it then it is entirely pointless. We have to maintain it. Other London boroughs can't expand into neighbouring boroughs because they need more housing- they have defined borders which are immovable. I strongly feel that the green belt should be an immovable border for development in Enfield. I appreciate that housing is required but I think that the Government needs to look into bigger solutions such as building more new towns like Milton Keynes which has proven to be an extremely successful solution. I also feel that there are brown field sites which can be developed like the area around the Olympic Park bringing purely positive results for local communities.

I hate the fact that in modern day London any patch of green space or pub is very likely to be turned into housing. There are only so many residences you can cram into an area before you destroy the very fabric of the area and I feel that Enfield has reached that point. I don't want tower blocks in our historic town centre and I don't want housing on our green belt. I want Enfield Council to protect this great borough and not just tick boxes and take the developers money. If we build on these sections of green belt and change the face of the town centre then where does it stop? Once new tower blocks have been approved in such an important area and development on green belt land has been approved there will be nothing to stop these policies from rolling on through phase after phase of development until all is lost

The specific elements of the plan to which I object for the reasons above are:

1. 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 de-designation 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. 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. Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

4. 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.