

---

## General comments

- You are clearly planning major changes to our townscapes which I assume means significant demolition and rebuilding. While I am not opposed in principle to carefully selected changes I fear, as always, that irreparable damage will be done to our town centres. The report discusses, at length, the need for good and sympathetic design but these are just words. I have lived in Enfield all my life and rarely do I see sympathetic building occur. I really fear that the same old mistakes will be made again. The post-war planning/building era laid waste to our towns and high streets - Edmonton Green being a perfect example. Prince Charles was right - at least the Luftwaffe only left rubble. It was down to our local councils to brutalise our townscapes and I fear you have not learned the lessons of the past since you seem besotted with building towers (see below).
- The diagrams provided are not detailed enough to allow proper study.
- Green-belt development should be a last-resort and small-scale.
- I am pleased to see an emphasis on greening the borough although I worry that you will push through changes which will make living here increasingly difficult. Your pursuit of LTNs is a good example. You barred us from our own streets without meaningful consultation. I hope this is not an indicator of how you mean to continue.

## Tall Buildings

- This is my chief concern. Our towns were brutalised by the post-war building boom. Tower blocks went up everywhere and they destroyed the skylines and blighted the lives of people who lived in them. I thought we had learned our lesson, but apparently not.
- You state that towers should "provide a positive contribution to the skyline that considers views in the medium, short and long distance as well as contribution to a cumulative impact across an area." (7.6 Policy DM DE6, p156) How can a tower provide a "positive contribution" to the skyline? We live in a low-rise, low density suburb where towers will destroy any architectural coherence and beauty. They do not work.
- You propose "appropriate" areas for building which include Southgate, Enfield Town and Palmers Green (Figure 7.4). Edmonton Green has already been ruined as I stated above. Let's take the most egregious case - Enfield Town. It is a small-scale, attractive centre with an 11th C. Church and market square and you think it is appropriate to build towers there? In what possible world could such buildings be constructed to be sympathetic to their surroundings. What will you do, put a thatched roof on them?
- Your design quality criteria states that they should "be of the highest architectural and urban design quality (in terms of materials, silhouette, proportion, finishes and the treatment of the public realm).
  - What does the highest design quality mean? They all look the same.
  - How can the silhouette and proportion in any way be appropriate to Enfield Town?
  - Any tower will loom over the ancient church, market and high street and say "f\*\*k you" to its surroundings.
- Item 2.f (p156): "be carefully sited to avoid creating a wall of tall buildings or isolated and poorly defined buildings and spaces". I note that the design put forward for the redevelopment of Palace Exchange proposed just that - a single residential tower. I don't know what the status of the project is but it is a good example of

developers trying to sell a terrible design with weasel words and generic drawings. What was clear from that proposal was that Enfield Town would become a characterless, generic town centre, indistinguishable from any other. Is that our future?

- Look at the skyline of central London from Greenwich park. Spoiled by the succession of trophy-towers designed by the 'starchitects' like the Shard, Leadenhall Building and St Mary Axe. My London is being ruined by these 'statement' buildings and I fear the same will happen to Enfield.
- Good quality, attractive modern buildings are perfectly achievable - a great example is Paternoster Place next to St Paul's cathedral. It replaced the disgusting tower and windswept piazza built following the war. Note, it is low-rise and in-keeping with the Cathedral and surrounding architecture but is clearly modern. I