

I am writing concerning various aspects of the draft local plan put forward for consultation by Enfield Council. Although I understand that there is a need to both refresh the housing stock in Enfield and to provide additional housing, and that the Council, in common with other councils, is under pressure from the Conservative Government to meet targets for building new houses, I do not understand the logic behind the choice of many of the sites and, in particular, am strongly opposed to those listed below where the plans seem to be trampling all over the areas heritage and conservation goals, public amenities and spaces, and green belt land. The sites which are particularly problematic are those which are described in the following sections of the draft plan:

- Policy 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;
- Policy SA62 page 383
- Policy SP CL4 pages 277-279
- Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279
- Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh
- Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321 and including the tall building policies on pages 156-160

Why are these sites being considered for development given the detrimental impact such developments would have on the residents of Enfield when there are existing alternative sites in the Borough which are either brownfield sites or largely abandoned industrial sites with a significant amount of the necessary road infrastructure already in place and are closer to necessary amenities such as shopping and transport.

The existing plans must be reconsidered with a view to properly supporting the community rather than pursuing expedient solutions to political pressures.