

To who it may concern,

I have lived in Enfield for over 23 years having previously lived close to Epping Forest. I have always enjoyed walks in the countryside mainly to escape roads and houses and to see the wildlife. I chose Enfield, and particularly the north of Enfield, because of the access to lots of tracks and footpaths which afford me with much pleasure as I am able to exercise while spotting the numerous species of wild birds, small mammals, butterflies, moths and other insects which make up the eco-system – the chain of life.

I notice and feel the effect of the pollution in the town centres more and more. Without the green belt we have, the eco-system will be degraded even more. No amount of tree planting or re-wilding in the remaining locations will make up for this because there will be a fundamental loss of green area which cannot be replaced once it has gone.

The impact on traffic congestion and pollution from the loss of green belt to housing will be severe and flooding will become even more prevalent as the absorption area is reduced.

Consequently I want to make the following points:-

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. These sites are 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.
2. 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. 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.