Dear Enfield Council

Lam 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 SA465 Land Between Carrier Way and Chroscort Way. Hadiley Wood, page 849: Policy SA46, page 3872 and Policy SA67, page 3872 and Policy SA67 gage 3873 and SP CL4 pages 277:279 – all of which propose the de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes.

I strongly Object to the proposal to release Green Belt for bossing or other purposes. I believe that there are many alternatives as aithlets to most howing trays and that that Green Belt is a precision must that should be protected and preserved for fitting againstian. It is too valuable to most howing trays and that that Green Belt is a long-tray of the strong trays and the strong trays are the strong trays and the strong trays are the strong trays are the strong trays are too fitted that it is story more on that have been formed fined. It is improved that it is kept and sheed for the feature of the strong trays are the strong trays are the strong trays are the strong trays are the strong trays and the strong trays are the strong tr

The loss of any of these beautiful sites would be terrible and cause permanent harm to our borough. We not only lose the unique landscape views but the environmental advantages too.

The Merryhills Way footpath for example is an excellent way for residents/visitors to use for exercise or relaxation helping with physical and mental health particularly during and now post pandemic

The farmiand could be put back into productive use growing local food for local people. Crews Hill is equal important to the borough and should not be destroyed. Its garden centres and other businesses provide employment and a resource for people from Enfeld and begond, Instead of losing Creen Hill for locality, it is horicultural activities should be encouraged and enhanced so that it can once again be a hub for food and roles referred.

Areas such as Crews Hill are rare and different to the usual urban town centres and should be celebrated and aided and encouraged to grow, not be destroyed.

The greenbelt is a major historic character of the borough. Many of the sites are historic and iconic parts of Enfield chase. They played an important part in the development of the borough and surrounding area.

The Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

I am writing to object to the following Politices: DP II-10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11; Polity SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Rein Figure 3.10 Polity SR40. Land Between Camel Way and Onescert Way, Medially Words, page 382. Polity SR40, page 172. and Polity SR40 page 372. and Polity SR40 page 373. and Polity SR40 page 372. and Polity SR40 page 373. and SP CL4 pages 277.799 – all of which propose the de-designation of Green Bell for housing and other purposes.

I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Beld fire benefing or other purposes. I believe that there are many abstractives available to meet benefin upon the thin the Green Beld is a precision used that should be protected and processed for finite generatives. In it is so visible, the proposed of the propose

The greenbelt is a major historic character of the borough hence the name En-FIELD. Many of the sites are historic and iconic parts of Enfield chase. They played an important part in the development of the borough and surrounding area.

The Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

What an ill-thought way of trying to improve the borough. Destroying parts of the area which are huge reasons why people enjoy living, working and visiting Enfield.

From: Greg Gountal (ages consulting mail con)-Date: Mon, Sep 13, 2021 at 11:32 PM Subject: Ped: Deat Local Plan consultation To: Selfa Gountal (seeing) according mail con)-

Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

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 SA46. Land Between Camiel Way and Crescent Way, Hadisy Wood, page 341; Policy SA46, page 342; Policy SA46, page 372, and Policy SA62 page 372, and Poli

I strongly objects to the proposal to release Gross that for bossing or other purposes. I believe that there are many alternatives available to enter beoning upon seas and that the Gross that this is precious assured that the dead for personned for latting personness. It is to volumble to lose feed the many environmental, ecological, economic, public health and other reasons that have been identified. It is imperative that it is keep and should not be destroyed.

Areas such as Crews Hill are rare and different to the usual urban town centres and should be celebrated and aided and encouraged to grow not be destroyed.

The greenbelt is a major historic character of the borough hence the name En-FIELD. Many of the sites are historic and iconic parts of Enfield chase. They played an important part in the development of the borough and surrounding area.

The Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

What an ill-thought way of trying to improve the borough. Destroying parts of the area which are huge reasons why people enjoy living, working and visiting Enfield.

Regards, Greg Goumai

37 Hadley Road, Enfield, EN2 8JT

Sond