

Good day,

I have strong objections to a number of features of the draft local plan. These are primarily about building on the greenbelt, the failure to take account of the climate crisis, seismic changes in shopping behaviour and office/home working and an institutional amnesia when it comes to the appalling impact of tower blocks on the people who live in them and the areas where they are built.

1. I am writing 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 which propose the redesignation 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.

2. I also object to Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10. (3,000 new houses in a ‘sustainable settlement’ at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion up to 7,500 new homes right up to the M25). Building on greenbelt land is irreversible, in the face of a climate crisis it is negligent thinking to even contemplate it. Further, we face an enormous change in working and shopping habits meaning vast amounts of retail and office space should be re-designated as housing to address the housing shortage, this should be more than adequate for the scale of housing demanded and is more appropriate and would allow for better housing densities - up to a five storey limit.

3. I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt. Again the objection is that this is irreversible and ignores the climate crisis we face.

4. 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. Furthermore a high rise in the heart of the town would forever damage the character of the town centre and one of the few destination areas for residents, visitors and consumers. How many of these areas are left to attract custom and customers? Tower block will isolate, cast shadows and remove the market town feel of the Enfield centre. In addition tower blocks have an appalling track record of creating ghettos in the sky or isolated wealthy spaces that have no impact on affordable housing. This is Enfield not the Thames river bank!

Please inform me as to how to articulate these objections if there is any further platform or opportunity to do so.

