

---

Dear Enfield Council,

I have had an opportunity to read the draft local plan and I am extremely concerned that Enfield is choosing Green belt land rather than brown field sites which still remain available, therefore 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 will ruin our Green Belt for housing and other stated proposals. I am aware through reading about local history that these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase and its development. These plans I feel will ruin the borough know for its green open spaces

I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because as I understand it Whitewebbs Park, a public space will be privatised at a time when we all need to be exercising more and getting outside, for physical and mental well being.

In conclusion I question the rational and 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, will potentially be a blight on the landscape an unnecessary move when your policy states that lower-rise buildings could offer similar accommodation.

In conclusion would it not make more sense to build affordable homes where they can bring regeneration to deprived areas and preserve Enfields Green Belt?

Dear Enfield Council,

I have had an opportunity to read the draft local plan and I am extremely concerned that Enfield

is choosing Green belt land rather than brown field sites which still remain available, therefore 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 will ruin our Green Belt for housing and other stated proposals. I am aware through reading about local history that these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase and its development. These plans I feel will ruin the borough know for its green open spaces

I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because as I understand it Whitewebbs Park, a public space will be privatised at a time when we all need to be exercising more and getting outside, for physical and mental well being.

In conclusion I question the rational and 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, will potentially be a blight on the landscape an unnecessary move when your policy states that lower-rise buildings could offer similar accommodation.

In conclusion would it not make more sense to build affordable homes where they can bring regeneration to deprived areas and preserve Enfields Green Belt?