
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am shocked and dismayed at hearing Enfield council's plans to destroy the green belt. 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 redesignation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. These sites are part of historic Enfield Chase, which is unique in the southeast and played an important role in the development of Enfield. 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. 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. 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. 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, 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.

In case you are not aware, the green belt is hugely important, providing many social, environmental, economic and wellbeing goods and services including:

- preventing urban sprawl
- large levels of biodiversity - encourages urban cooling, improved air quality, flood protection and carbon absorption (especially the woodland areas)
- agricultural production
- providing recreation and tourism, reducing stress and improving health
- preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

according to the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, green belts should only be built on in exceptional circumstances - It is not an exceptional circumstance to construct housing on greenbelt land when there are a multitude of brownfield sites available in Enfield which provide a much better alternative - there is no need to further develop the local infrastructure to support housing in these areas as they already exist. In fact, the CPRE have claimed that brownfield sites in Enfield could be used to develop 37,000 new homes if they are fully developed to their potential (2019). Further, there are many other sites which could be developed to make better use of space, such as supermarket sites with surface car parking, and poorly-used industrial/commercial sites in need of regeneration.

the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) consistently emphasises the importance of sustainable development, which is defined as "**Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.**" It therefore does not make sense to construct on the greenbelt simply for short term, financial gain, as it will cause long term, negative impacts in the long-run. This is not sustainable.

Ever since Enfield council's plans have been published to construct on the green belt, Enfield has received backlash all over the news and media. Enfield, which is a labour-run council, is highly hypercritical: labour's 2019 manifesto was very clear, and cited their commitment to restoring green spaces and habitats, and the protection of green belt land from development. How on Earth can labour councillors then support this decision which contradicts their previous commitments? This is betrayal by the labour councillors. It has turned Enfield council into a laughing stock, and even Saddiq Khan is highly critical of this and is telling you to reconsider. If Enfield council go ahead with this, they will be portrayed as a regressive council, especially at a time when the climate and environment is becoming such a huge topic of importance in the political climate.

I strongly urge you to reconsider your stance on developing green belt land, and I hope you consider the points I have raised very carefully. Not only will the negative impact of this development haunt our local area forever, but it is also illegal and opposes planning policy. Once this is given the green light, this be a slippery slope, and will be very difficult to regulate moving forwards.

You have a custodial duty to safeguard the locality for future generations and if you abrogate your responsibilities now then you will be held accountable at the ballot box. This is more than just playing games with party politics but what is right for our area now and for the years ahead.