

---

Dear sirs,

With regard to the 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; Policy SA62 page 372; 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.

The reasons for my objection:

This is a beautiful and undeveloped natural landscape;

It is a haven for wildlife;

It is visited by many residents and visitors to the borough;

Many people take exercise here which supports their physical and mental well-being;

Green space is a valuable commodity, both intrinsically but also financially;

Local businesses use these sites - where will they go?;

These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, removing them is removing part of Enfield's rich history;

There are brownfield /grey sites which could be developed instead;

These brownfield/grey sites need to be regenerated;

These brownfield / grey sites are situated near to existing infrastructure;

Development here will increase traffic - as it has already done with the building in Trent Park - what measures would be put in place to deal with this? None seems to have been introduced with the Trent Park development;

Pressure on other services and facilities, such as schools, is also a concern;

London Boroughs should be at the forefront of protecting green spaces. We are all aware of climate change issues and should be working to reduce our impact on the environment. These plans might not only increase Enfield's carbon emissions but by removing trees and other vegetation, which help to remove carbon from the atmosphere, might compound the issue still further.

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.