

---

In reponse to the Enfield Local Plan Consultation.

1. I am objecting 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. There is enough Brownfield sites available in Enfield for affordable housing.
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 object 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 is unnecessary because other lower-rise building forms could provide the same accommodation, as stated in the policy. Enfield Town is historically a Market Town and being surrounded with tall buildings will lose it's historic character.

I believe :-

- a. This plan will destroy Enfield's Green Belt, Enfield's History and Enfield's character which is irreplaceable.
- b. The Green Belt is is valuable for the environment, ecology and public health. It is essential in tackling pollution and climate change which is currently a great problem and needs to be protected.
- c. Enfield has enough Brownfield sites that can be used to build affordable housing.

I am Enfield born & bred and the future of Enfield is very close to my heart and I would appreciate that my concerns are heard.