

FAO: Strategic Planning & Design, Enfield Council

Please note my strong objection to the proposed dedesignation of Green Belt land for housing and other purposes. Specifically, I 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. These sites are fundamental to Enfield's identity as a 'green' borough. Given concerns about climate change and the lack of green space elsewhere in the Borough and Greater London, the Council should be looking for inways to preserve, conserve and serve the green spaces of Enfield. Housing development on Green Belt land will cause irreparable harm to the Borough and will be frowned upon by future generations. The Council should be looking to redevelop so-called 'grey' sites - housing developments that need further development and investment, and eco-tourism, which would take advantage of Enfield's green spaces.

Linked to the above, I also object to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park, a public amenity, into private management. This is wholly unacceptable. The Park should remain for the use of all Enfield residents and should not be privatised. S

Finally, I also raise an objection to the tall building policies as outlined 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 such developments and the acceptable height of tall buildings. As I live in a conservation area, I am well-aware of the importance of skyline to the overall landscape and the proposed changes would negatively impact the historic landscape and in the case of Palace Gardens, ruin the identity of Enfield Town centre. Rather than enhance the old town, the proposed looming towers would directly impact local residents by cutting out light. It makes no sense, when according to the policy, other lower-rise building forms could provide the same level of accommodation. Moreover, Enfield Council publicly abandoned its previous tall buildings policy when it demolished the Barbot Street Estate, citing the various social problems caused by the housing configuration. It makes no sense to readopt this housing strategy once more, when the Borough of Enfield has cogent proof that that the model is flawed.

Please confirm receipt of my objections.