

---

I would like to make the following comments on the proposed draft Local plan:

The time given to digest the huge amount of documents has been off putting and daunting and has not been long enough. There needs to have been far more clarification and explanations given to residents on such important proposed changes.

There seem to be many contradictions in this draft - particularly in relation to Green Belt areas and tall buildings and also in relation to the recently agreed London Plan and NPPF policies.

The consultation says it 'seeks to protect the openness of the Green Belt'. and yet it also says the need to develop on this land is 'inescapable'. There seems to have been little effort to look at suitable brownfield sites and land already built on. Many small developments have been built but these seem not to have been included in the big picture. The London plan clearly states that Green Belt land should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are justified (p141 and policy G2). The Green Belt is the 'lungs of the city' and help to prevent overheating and flash flooding. The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should be kept. Strategic Policy SP SS2 talks about making good places and para 4b) - the need to make a positive contribution to the borough's rich heritage and local distinctiveness. Nothing could be more distinctive to Enfield than the 'Enfield Chase'. This is a unique chase landscape to the South East of England - shown on maps dating back to 1777 and connected to the Old Park of Enfield mentioned in the Doomsday Book. How can LBE consider building on this area and spoiling this important legacy? Vicarage farm (SP PL10), Crews Hill (SP PL9), Holly Hill Farm (Sa 54) and Ramney Marsh (SA 52) all fall within this area. One can't help thinking allowing this land to be built on will be a developer's dream to get rich quick with no consideration for the consequences. I believe a developer already has got its plans in place for Vicarage Farm.

The Tall Buildings policy appears to be another contradiction. The plan talks about limiting tall buildings to appropriate locations. The plan seems to reverse the policy previously applied of applying correct tests of appropriateness such as whether they would be adjacent to heritage assets and protected views. In a recent summary the GLA Planning and Regeneration Committee stated "the committee does not believe tall buildings are the answer to London's housing needs and that 'tall buildings are neither sustainable nor suitable for family life'. The pandemic has shown that people's physical and mental wellbeing can be severely affected by living in tower blocks.

There needs to be a rethink on what housing Enfield will need going forward. Many people are choosing to move away from London to enjoy more space and working from home will be a way of life far more in the future. The government has already admitted that there is enough housebuilding already happening and that it will revise its policy of seeking to impose targets on local councils The Times (11/9/21).

If the draft local plan is not substantially altered the character of Enfield, an area so many of us love and cherish, will be irrecoverably changed and our future generations will be severely betrayed by short sighted actions.