To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to you to object to the Enfield Local Plan proposed and request this objection is considered as part of the consultation phase.

1. My objection is to the following Policies that propose a Green Belt designation change for housing and other purposes:

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

The Enfield area and it's landscape are an important and valuable part of London's community and we should be protecting our environment rather than causing irreversible damage. It is essential our green-belt areas remain so that Londoners have the opportunity to enjoy open land and the recreation/sport and health benefits it offers. We shouldn't underestimate the significance of the ecosystem benefits Green Field sites bring - it is key we continue to protect and preserve these areas given the climate change challenges we face. With that in mind, we shouldn't consider changes to our current green belt boundaries until we have maxmised the use of suitable brownfield sites (physically not just conceptually) and only open up more areas for development when the current housing developments promised has actually been delivered.
2. 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 and Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management.
3. I would also like to object 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. Other lower-rise building
forms could provide the same accommodation (as stated in the policy) and have less impact on the landscape.

