

---

We are writing to you to wholeheartedly object to the below policies which form part of your draft local plans.

Personally, I moved to Enfield over a decade ago because of the fact that it was an area that didn't feel over urbanised and had lovely protected green areas.

I am disappointed that the thought is even being entertained to chip away at our beautiful green landscape.

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;

Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279

All of these propose the dedesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of the history of Enfield Chase. 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 moved to this Borough because of its beautiful Green Belt and feel that once the first step has been taken to build on this, that a precedent will then be set for further development by future councils. My question to you is, where will we end up if we start chipping away at our countryside? People can be relocated and work from anywhere nowadays, why must Enfield be the borough to lose any part of its nature to make way for more residents when it already struggles to provide for its current residents?? Bin collections have already been reduced, as an example, due to cost cutting measures.

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 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 also object 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.

Please please do not let these plans go ahead. In an era where anyone can work from anywhere I don't believe we should be over developing our beautiful borough. We should be using existing sites and redeveloping old properties.

