Please note , this is a potential duplication as I had previously sent it from my personal address but received some bounce backs that my original was blocked. Thank you.

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.

I write to you with regards to the disastrous Draft Local plan that the Labour council has submitted to unnecessarily destroy our green belt land and remove it permanently , thus preventing future generations from enjoying it as we have . As well of course then allowing London's urban sprawl to continue uninhibited, which is one of the main reasons for its existence.
This is a disastrous and ill thought out plan to develop on the precious green belt in Enfield , which is also unnecessary given the vast amounts of brownfield sites available for regeneration in the borough, some of which are underway but not delivering the levels of affordable housing promised by the council. Maybe this needs to come under further scrutiny before looking at wanton destruction of the green belt and of Enfield's qualities .
Not only does this historic green belt hold a vast amount of wildlife and green space for leisure and recreation , it has provided myself , my family and many others a place of peace and solace especially during the pandemic but also through my entire life whilst living in this borough as an escape from city and town life .

It has previously been land that was farmed successfully and it can again be in the future , like the neighbouring Barnet green belt that is still farmed today and generates locally produced goods.

This is a borough that's greatest assets are being both close to the city and having green belt country side, rich with nature and history, on its doorstep for the whole borough and surrounding areas to enjoy.
As you know , amongst many other things , the green belt is there to prevent London's sprawl and should be protected at all costs and only considered as a last resort , which this is clearly proven to not be the case in this instance .
There are greater brownfield areas which can be redeveloped , also in areas with existing infrastructure to accommodate development in the form of large main roads , multi lane orbital roads and train lines . As well, this can provide these areas with much needed development and re-development for new communities to thrive whilst keeping the treasured green belt for all in the area to enjoy .
In addition , the area under consultation will put even more strain on older smaller roads that can barely accommodate today's traffic let alone any greater numbers that developments of several thousand homes will add . This area simply does have the infrastructure to support it or the additional services that it will require and associated pollution would only be another detrimental side effect of this plan. This short sighted and short term plan would be a total disaster, not only for the residents directly located next to the proposed sites , but the borough and surrounding areas for generations to come .

This is unlikely to solve Enfield's housing crisis and will only serve to have a massive detrimental effect on the borough when there are proven to be viable alternatives.

Why would the council wish to destroy green belt countryside , the same green belt country side that the Mayor of London himself has vowed to protect and has publicly said this goes against his London plan ?

As a lifelong Enfield resident I politely request you and your fellow Labour Party Councillors to pause for a breath and consider whether you really want this needless destruction of green belt and negative impact on the quality of life of the area's residents to be your legacy to the borough and to prevent this proposal from going any further, whilst looking at the number of viable alternatives that exist with the preservation of the many qualities the area has, as outlined above .

Below: A small part of the areas under consideration - why would anyone want to unnecessarily remove this beautiful piece of countryside and potential farm land from the area ?

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.

One of the few "pay and play" golf venues in the area , providing much needed leisure and recreational facilities for residents and also a beautiful area for walkers , horse riders alike and would be another big loss for the community should it fall into private hands which according to initial plans would remove much of the current access for the community as well as the golf course in its entirety.

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, 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.

Enfield has a rich history as a market town , adding tall buildings would be a final nail in the coffin for any remaining character it has , when there is ample opportunity to create a thriving town centre offering quality services for its residents in a form that doesn’t involve the building of unsightly high rise building out of keeping with the surrounding areas .

Thanks in advance for your consideration of the above .