

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the policies listed below:

I object 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 **devastation** of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

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 reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement. 3. Although it seems that this has already been agreed with Spurs?

I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammev 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.

The green belt forms part of Enfield's history. Many people have re located to our unique borough, as it has the appeal of being the countryside, but still, in London. The pandemic bought more people ironically, into our borough to discover its walks and garden centres.

The loss of Crews Hill, that brings into our borough so many people for the garden centres is an atrocious loss. I cannot see that any thought has been given to infrastructure other than the fact that Crews Hill has a station? One road in and out.

The green belt provides a sanctuary for wildlife that is always sacrificed at the hands of greedy developers. At a time when sustainability, climate change and the environment and all that this encompasses, is forming such a big part of our lives. To butcher the green belt, is a poor solution. I appreciate that the housing problem needs to be rectified. Whilst a solution must be found, this is not it.

