

---

Sir or Madam,

I object to the draft Local Plan as follows:

Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and figure 3.11; Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10; SA45, page 364; SA52 page 372; SA54, page 374.

Any building of houses or other structures on land that is currently Green Belt or agricultural land is unnecessary as there are sufficient 'brown field' and former retail or industrial sites. Former industrial and retail buildings can often be successfully converted for residential use thus not wasting the energy and materials used in their original construction. The destruction of any of the green belt, which is Enfield Borough's most precious resource, including the former royal chase, is to be avoided at all costs.

Such development is contrary to local, national and international efforts to combat climate change.

Developers will naturally prefer to build on clear green-field sites, if they are allowed to, as this is cheaper since they do not need to clear the site. This is not sufficient reason to include such areas in permitted development.

SA62 page 383 and SP CL pages 277-279.

Any further expansion of the Spurs training facility in Whitewebbs Park should not be permitted. This is not an appropriate use of public land gifted to Enfield Council for the benefit of local residents. In addition Spurs have not fulfilled previous environmental commitments linked to the original development.

Policy DE6 pages 156-160 and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre page 321.

Tall buildings, higher than those already in place, should not be permitted in sensitive locations such as the Town Centre Conservation Area as this will overshadow and spoil the appearance of the area. No doubt you intend to later reduce the maximum height and will pretend this is a compromise due to local objections. I won't be fooled.