

---

Please find below my objections to the local plan.

Broadly, I have huge concern over proposals to build on green belt land and the proposals for high rise towers. I also challenge the planning assumptions that underpin the plan as they were developed before the pandemic and do not take into account new paradigms affecting workplaces, commuting into city centres, working from home and access to green spaces.

I therefore believe that the local plan and the associated evidence, particularly for the required provision of new homes, must be revised in the light of the fundamental changes brought about by the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. The Local Housing Needs assessment is based on data from 2019 before the pandemic and overstates the requirement for both the quantity and type of accommodation required. The plan needs revising to reflect

1. A drastic reduction in the number of people commmuting into London from Enfield to work. This will both increase the migration away from Enfield as a place to live and commute and similarly reduce the migration into Enfield.
2. A change in the type of accomodation required for people who are working from home.
3. A significantly increased need to preserve green space to enable those working from home to exercise and enjoy the outdoor space (also in the event of further lockdowns in the current or future pandemics)

I specifically wish 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 these policies propose the dedesignation 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.

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 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. No tall building should be allowed to overshadow the Market Place, the Town Park or the Library Green. Nothing higher than any of the existing churches in the town centre should be permitted, as this will permanently damage the character of the town centre.

Yours sincerely

