

---

Thank you for initiating this consultation phase and I hope our email will be considered during the decision process.

I moved to Oakwood (Enfield) 17 years ago with my family. My parents took us to the equestrian in Oakwood and we (my family of 7) all fell in love with the borough, it was hard to believe we were still in London, and as a family we had enough of the congested, polluted, high crime urban environment that we once had, living in Islington. Since the move we have considered the green landscape to be a blessing, a place of beauty, an escape from the busy lives we have during the working week. We're always excited to explain to friends, families and colleagues that Enfield is not an urban, high crime, industrial borough as it is perceived, but we describe it as a beautiful green unspoilt escape from busy central London.

We have been eternally grateful to the area we live in, our mental wellness and wellbeing, especially during COVID, has survived with thanks to the daily walks, fresh air and beautiful unscared landscape. My partner and I stay fit by Road Cycling some 30miles a week all around our beautiful Enfield Borough and I fear that the urbanisation and destruction of these lush landscapes will lead to an increase in traffic, people, crime and a reduction in the safety and wellbeing of road users and residents. If the development continues as currently drafted I'm afraid that we would have to move out of Enfield if not further out from London to maintain a healthy work/ life balance. We are both doing high pressure jobs serving communities and therefore:

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 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.

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.

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.