

1. 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 dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. why is this even necessary? Residents of Enfield, Barnet and other inner North London boroughs love going to these places for days out - they are accessible and give us all somewhere more peaceful and tranquil to go, an escape from our congested cities and towns whilst still being 'local'. This is imperative to a balanced lifestyle for all and our mental health. These plans will completely destroy these areas and be nothing but a detriment to the residents of the Borough - forced to travel further afield to enjoy the green spaces, nature trails and fantastic garden centres which have been integral to the community for decades. How will this leave those with disabilities, the elderly, vulnerable, families on low income who can easily hop on local transport to reach these places? Once again these groups will be left behind, stuck in their immediate areas and the only possibility of change is if they can scramble money/help/assistance to get them to places further out such as Essex. Not feasible and frankly just not fair. The loss of these spaces is nothing but a detriment to the community and character of the Borough. A cruel, heartless proposal.

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. Why?????? The wildlife should be protected at all costs. There is plenty of brownfield land to develop on in Enfield and all over London - derelict wasteland areas crying out for investment. But instead you are choosing to kill established wildlife and greenbelt land which we all cherish and need in our lives!

4. 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. Disgusting proposal. **NO ONE WANTS TO LIVE IN TOWER BLOCKS.** Learn from the high rises of the 60s/70s and how these destroyed communities, attributed to social and economic cleansing, were a detriment to residents physical and mental health - cramped up in prison like blocks with little to no interaction amongst neighbours. They are also a hub for crime as it's easy to go unnoticed in the many floors/corners overshadowed by ugly imposing **UNNECESSARY TALL BUILDINGS.** You should be creating spaces people **WANT** to live in - not because they have no other choice!

ENFIELD - you should be ashamed of yourself with these proposals, they do nothing but cause harm and upset to the community, residents and businesses. All these proposals do is line your pockets with a nice brown envelope from greedy developers.

