

---

Dear Sirs,

I am angry that the Draft Local Plan appears only to place emphasis on attracting what would inevitably be high-value residential development, on current green belt land. I see inadequate mention of providing the affordable housing the borough sorely needs. I have no doubt developers will be eyeing-up the land under discussion with the intention of building only luxury dwellings, which Enfield most certainly does not lack.

The process by which bids for the land were considered was anything but honest and/or transparent. I simply do not believe the Council has been truthful with residents about the number, quality and viability of interests shown. I reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement; I exchanged emails with Mark Bradbury who was highly evasive when I pressed him on Whitewebbs's finances, and - to be blunt - downright rude in response to some of my concerns. The council has a severe credibility problem here which I believe you are morally obliged to address. Who would bet against the Tottenham Hotspur organisation one day choosing to dispose of the land for profit?

I object in the strongest possible terms to Policies SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 because they transfer part of Whitewebbs Park - a public amenity - into private management.

I also object to 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 dedesignation 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

I object to policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area - and another public amenity - from the Green Belt

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.

Yours Sincerely,