

---

I am writing to object to the following aspects of the Draft Local Plan as noted.

In addition I would like to make a personal statement in general regarding the plan in that I do not believe it recognises the varied nature of Enfield and the need to protect those parts of it which we have attracted increasing numbers of people to make Enfield their home. A significant part of the attraction of Enfield over many other London Boroughs is how green Enfield is and how it has retained within Enfield Town its place as a historic market town. Enfield has managed to expand over the years to encompass less green, but equally more varied parts of the borough and a culturally diverse borough, with a significant mix of townscape and housing. All of that makes Enfield an attractive place to live to a large variety of the community. Stripping away any part of the green belt would start a dangerous domino trend to remove more, until it no longer exists and the consequent urban landscape impacts and environmental cost. Any removal of the green belt in Enfield would reduce its significantly high regard as a green borough to the point that Enfield would be indistinguishable from most other London Boroughs and offer no greater attraction and loss of quality of life. In addition have issues with the increase in the need of resources been addressed – e.g. security, waste disposal, etc.

I do not believe there are such exceptional circumstances in place as would be required to justify removing part of the green belt, which has long been established as a safeguard against urban sprawl.

To the extent the housing targets need to be met by Enfield, which are not proven, development should only be considered for available brownfield sites and where there are existing developments of a similar nature and without removing any green belt. Sites such as Meridian Water, Edmonton Green, Southbury Station, Silver Street & Brimsdown, do offer some scope for development alongside existing higher capacity transport networks, without the need to damage the fabric & green variety which Enfield offers.

Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11 – I object to this policy as this is part of Green Belt land and is not as suitable as other available land in the borough for housing development and available brownfield sites. It also comprises part of the historic Enfield Chase which is a site important to the borough

Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10 - I object to this policy as this is part of Green Belt land and is not as suitable as other available land in the borough for housing development and available brownfield sites. In addition, whilst there is an existing train station, the Hertford line is already extremely busy with very limited scope to increase capacity. With the extent of land taken up with housing there would be a reduction in the horticultural businesses and much reduced scope for local employment.

SA54, page 374 - I object to this policy as this is part of Green Belt land and is not as suitable as other available land in the borough for housing development and available brownfield sites. Nature needs space to play its crucial part in tackling the climate crisis and eroding this at this crucial time in the world would be counterproductive to saving the planet.

SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279 – I object to this as the arguments in favour of closing the public golf course were significantly flawed and done without public consultation. It is not right to transfer public owned land to private ownership. Tottenham Hotspur have not proven to be a reliable owner of the land as they have not made good their promise to invest in improving & enhancing the sustainability of the surrounding area they occupy and therefore there is no trust in them to honour any future commitment for public access.

Pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre

page 321 - the proposal for tall buildings should be removed – it would be a shocking blight on the landscape and irreparably damage the historic nature of the Town.

9.9 Policy DM E9 Page 243 – The 'night time economy' is a generic phrase and needs definition. This 'typically' would involve late night bars & nightclubs, all of which create anti-social behaviour, crime and a general feeling of unease & safety for local residents, whilst returning very little to the local economy. This is separate to the evening economy of existing bars & restaurants and new outlets of similar use, including Arts venues, which bring far more benefit to the local economy with much less scope for anti-social behaviour. I object to all plans for the night time economy to be encouraged without full scope & definition being provided and such plans to include how to the fullest extent possible, the problems of anti-social behaviour would be tackled, not just discouraged by 'lighting' for example.

12.6.2 & 12.6.3 page 285 – Whilst totally agreeing with the need to retain historic pubs for all of the societal and community benefits they can provide, I do not agree that any exceptions should be permitted to remove them on the basis they can be 'relocated'. Unless you are able to rebuild an historic pub brick by brick within 100 metres of its current location, any such removal would result in premises of no historic nature or character and impact the local community which the public house served. I therefore object to any provision to remove historic public houses.