
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the following Policies set out in the Enfield Draft Local Plan:

1. **Policy 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; and **Policy SA54**, page 374. These policies propose the de-designation of Green Belt for housing and other purposes. The sites involved 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. Once the Green Belt is removed, it cannot be restored. Have all brown-field sites within the borough been totally exhausted and redeveloped already (note, redeveloped, not simply land-banked by developers)? I think not. It is simply a question of cost to developers – clearly it is far less expensive for developers to redevelop minimal use agricultural land (etc.) than a brown-field site, but the long term consequences are terrible. No amount of Council-led tree-planting programmes will make up for the systematic destruction of the Green Belt. I note the Council's comments in the "Future Enfield leaflet", however it is **highly disingenuous** to suggest that some Green Belt development is necessary to prevent development of the entirety. This is simply not the case. The Council can legally prevent development occurring by the simple step of refusing planning consent. Drawing up a Local Plan encouraging development of the Green Belt is a shocking act of self-serving vandalism and contrary to current planning policies around the country. The Council may have an enormous deficit in funds, but destroying the Green Belt for future generations is not the way to proceed (also see my comments below re: tall building policies).
2. I am also specifically objecting to **Policy SA52** page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.
3. I am also objecting to the tall building policies on pages 156-160, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and **Policy DE6**, and **Policy 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 addition:
 1. I would note that the Council's own leaflet states "Enfield Council's Draft Local Plan guards against the development of inappropriate tall buildings" – so how can the Council be proposing the Palace Gardens Shopping Centre redevelopment plans? This will affect the **Enfield Town Conservation Area**. A Council cannot simply disregard Conservation Area status to build skyscrapers. I have already objected via a number of forums in relation to the proposal to build a **26 storey** building in this location (although I note this seems to have been reduced to 13 storeys, this is still unacceptably high). **It is crucially important that the Local Plan is not seen as a green light for developers to ignore concerns regarding high buildings (see below) and ignore Conservation Area status.**
 2. In light of the Grenfell Tragedy (and consequent legislative safety

requirements for any building over a certain height), the future cost of erecting “tall” buildings would be astronomical and unlikely to receive bank finance. Furthermore, subsequent sales of flats would be unlikely to pay off the development costs in full (even if the Council could persuade people to buy them), leaving the Council with an even greater deficit in its finances.

3. Parking is already an extremely contentious issue in Enfield Town and residential streets within walking distance (also to Enfield Chase and Gordon Hill), and the Council does not appear to be considering how to deal with the influx of cars owned by new flat-owners. Any development will have an adverse impact on key traffic routes whilst building is taking place, but the current tall buildings policy proposals will have a substantially adverse impact on all surrounding roads for extensive periods of time.

Please confirm you have received this email.