

---

I wish to submit the following observations to the current Draft Local Plan Consultation.

I wish to OBJECT to Strategic Policy SP PL 10, page 84. I do not wish to see building on the Green Belt until the Council has exhausted all other options. The Draft Local Plan does not make a convincing case for Green Belt development.

Policy SP H1, page 183

The housing target figures in the Draft appear to be significantly higher than those contained in the London Plan. The London Plan shows a 10-year target for Enfield at around 1250 per annum, whereas the Draft Local Plan appears to be aiming around 50% higher. I OBJECT to the Draft Plan working from a target which is higher than required by the London Plan.

Policy DM DE6 (Tall Buildings) page 156

I approve of the Council's aim to have a Tall Buildings Policy. However, I have reservations about the way this policy has been drafted. Central to the Policy will be the maximum building heights in various locations around the Borough, as documented in Figure 7.4 page 158.

The evidence which was used to derive this Figure is critical to the acceptance of the Policy and the evidence is not presented. There is mention of "evidence base" in Appendix A, but nothing is presented in the Draft Plan, neither is anything meaningful available on the Council website.

The Draft Plan says that the heights are "based on a rigorous assessment of townscape, character and the sustainability of the location for higher density development". Unless the Council publishes the full evidence base, we cannot be sure just how rigorous the assessment has been.

As a result of this lack of supporting information I must register an OBJECTION to the current draft of Policy DM DE6.

Sites SA6, SA8, SA10, SA12, SA19, SA20, SA22, SA32 (Existing Food Retail)

I OBJECT to these sites being targeted for mixed use as it will necessarily result in a significant loss of car parking for food retail. This is unacceptable.

Site SA1 (St Anne's School)

I OBJECT to this proposal on the grounds that schools are an important part of the Borough's infrastructure and this particular school has a good provision of playing fields, something else which is increasingly being eroded in the Borough.

Sites SA59 (Firs Farm Recreation Ground) & SA61 (Church Street Recreation Ground)

I see that these two sites are proposed for change of use to burial. I OBJECT to this on the grounds that as recreational grounds they make a positive contribution to wellbeing and health and this has a positive benefit to the local health system.

Policy DM H2, page 194

Whilst a sizeable target for affordable housing is welcomed in the Plan, 50% is unrealistic. Instead the Council should adopt a more achievable target and enforce this through the planning system. The current 40% target is frequently missed.

Policy DM H3, page 199

I welcome this provision. However without an Article 4 Direction the Council is very unlikely to be able to enforce provision (2) *Self contained units will be required to meet (or where possible) exceed the internal space standards of the London Plan.*

