1st September, 2021

Strategic Planning and Design,
Enfield Council,
FREEPOST NW5036
EN1 3BR

Dear Sirs,

DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

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 redesignation of

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 also find it astonishing that a Labour council would do away with the only golf course where people who cannot afford the large membership fees to private golf courses can play.

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.

I am also objecting to the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figures 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. How any council could think that a high rise building in the centre of a historic market town would be acceptable beggars belief.

Yours faithfully,