

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to some elements of the Draft Local Plan for Enfield.

1. The Tall Building Policies, pp156-160, Fig 7.3, Fig 7.4, Policy DE6 and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre p321. Each of these proposes areas and acceptable heights for tall buildings which are unsuitable for those locations, when other forms of accommodation could be used to provide the same amount of space. In particular, the proposals for the Enfield Town area are completely out of character for a Conservation Area such as that around Enfield Town.

2. The impact of the proposals on Green Belt land around Enfield. The draft Enfield Local Plan includes proposals for development on high-quality local countryside rather than concentrating on 'derelict and unsightly' parts of the Green Belt (London Plan 8.2.2).~

I am writing to object to the following policies.

- SP PL10, pp80-87, fig 3.1
- SP PL9, pp77-80, fig 3.10
- SA45 - Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, p364
- SA54, p374
- SA62, p383
- SP CL4, pp277-279

All of the above propose re-designating Green Belt land for housing and other purposes. These are important parts of Enfield Chase, and its loss to development would cause massive harm to the Green Belt and the character of the borough.

Furthermore, it seems unlikely that these developments would bring any significant quantity of Affordable housing (8.2.2 Local Plan) because the locations would be very desirable, and only provide homes for more affluent people, especially given the locations being in close proximity to the railway line that serves the City of London. This would come at enormous cost, destroying unique areas like the garden centres at Crews Hill and bringing housing developments directly adjacent to Trent Country Park.

The Borough should instead look to redeveloping brownfield sites, including sites in the Lee Valley, and some mixed-use areas.