

To whom it may concern,

As a local resident of Enfield for the past eight years I am very concerned about the draft local plan that will result in the loss of many areas of Green Belt in the area. I chose to move into this area specifically for the benefits that the surrounding green areas provide for my family. Below I have outlined the specific areas of the plan that cause me the greatest concern. While I recognise the importance of creating affordable housing I cannot accept that this should be at the expense of our Green Belt which is part of what makes Enfield such a special place to live. It will severely damage the borough in the long run. There are many areas where housing can be built without compromising our countryside.

I am writing to 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 re-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.

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.

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 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.

I have copied in the three councillors in my ward in the hope that they too will oppose this plan.