
Due to the ongoing rather dubious handling of planning matters from Enfield council, firstly I would like to request that you send me confirmation of having received my e mail and that it's contents will be read and logged as part of the so called 'consultation' claimed regarding the council's local plan. To confirm, I absolutely object to both the travesty that is the draft local plan and the way in which you have launched this against Enfield residents in the most undemocratic way.

I am fully aware that Sadiq Khan, London National park city, Better homes for Enfield and the 35000 people at least who have signed the petition against your local plan to build on our precious green belt, are vehemently opposed to this ridiculous plan.

You have made the process of 'consultation' incredibly difficult and deliberately buried terribly destructive decisions in a weighty document that most people will be challenged by and many of which will have no computer access to this or be able to afford the extortionate cost of a hard copy.

Most Enfield residents did not know of the local plan, despite the council leader's last minute drop off of leaflets - only a few weeks before the end of the consultation period. With reference to the expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitwebbs Lane up to the M25, comprising of 42.5 hectares of land, for "professional sport, recreation and community sports/leisure uses" ([SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277-279](#));

I object to the corruption around the destruction of Whitwebbs park by Enfield council in selling off acres of nature's greenbelt to a football club, merely for greed. Most concerning is the process involved. The public were asked to put in bids for development - which in itself was outrageous. Parks are not for profit in a civilised world and the golf club was not operating at a loss, despite council propaganda stating otherwise. Concerningly, people who work at Spurs knew of the deal to sell it to Tottenham, before the bids were proposed. The decision clearly had already been made behind closed doors.

Tottenham have already colonised acres of our green belt in their training stadium and deliberately culled and destroyed animal life there. This was not taken into account, even though your own meagre policies state that in leasing council land - which is not actually yours but the public taxpayers - previous behaviour of known tenants would be looked at. Clearly then you agree with the regular shooting of foxes that Tottenham Hotspur's regularly enforce

The council's respect for wildlife is apparent in its neglect of all of our parks and the extent of dead fish and birds in all of our rivers.

The Tottenham 'bid' was not even presented at all alongside the other bids - all of which were rejected. This is because the council I believe had already made the deal to strip the land of nature and consume it with astroturf. The minimal land left that will be rewilded apparently, is already wild as the council stopped mowing any grass over a year ago. The club itself wanted to expand its empire no doubt and I imagine a huge financial payment to the council has been made. Nature itself and its value to our well being in one of London's most polluted boroughs is priceless. The council has no respect for wildlife and the rich bio diversity of Whitwebbs will be destroyed.

I object to the deceit behind the process of consultation and alleged bids for the use of Whitwebbs. And I object to the selling off to Tottenham Hotspur. It is not a lease when what you are leasing cannot be returned in its current form. Once taken away the wildlife will permanently lose their homes.

Regarding proposals :

- The 'Spatial strategy' ([section 2.4](#)) which identifies how growth will be distributed across the Borough over the plan period and gives rise to the strategies for housing, employment, town centres and countryside green belt;
- 3,000 new houses at a 'deeply green' 'sustainable urban extension' referred to as 'Chase Park' (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#));
- 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. ([Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#));
- 160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood ([SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364](#));
- Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammeys Marsh ([SA52 page 372](#));
- 11 hectares of new industrial and storage and distribution use at what is currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase ([SA54, page 374](#));

2 I object to the phallacies in your document and to you stating things as fact - when they are not. I object to the statements regarding how many homes Enfield has to build. The government has stated that any building must be contextualised to take into account the local environment, restrictions and what is reasonable. I also question your housing figures. If the homes built on small sites had been accounted for, then at least one of the green belt areas earmarked for development in the draft local plan would certainly not need to be developed - in fact no sites proposed on green belt land need to be developed.

3 I object to your omission of brown belt land sites in your draft local plan. Enfield better homes have written a substantial report and have found that :

far more homes could be built on brownfield sites than the council claims. There are two main reasons for this:

1. ***Anomalies in the council's calculations.***
2. ***The council has excluded brownfield sites***

This is shocking and your local plan shows that you have deliberately targeted our green belt - presumably because property developers pay a premium for this land.

I object to your priorities and values in devaluing the asset to our well being and mental health and long term emotional sustenance that green spaces give us.

Once the Jewell in Enfield's crown, our green belt is under threat

because of this current council administration.

4 With reference to :

Encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area ([see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#))

I object to the council's destruction of our heritage. History has taught us that tower blocks invite anti social behaviour and provide inadequate housing for individuals. They are a safety hazard and an eye sore, shrouding local architectures and are unsuitable for families.

5 I object to the council's use of the idea of precedent in planning decisions. Poor decisions are made and then the council quotes 'precedent' to exacerbate decisions and continue planning very poorly.

I went to the Sainsburys redevelopment 'consultation ' at Palmers Green library and your planning team informed me that you have no planning policy. You have hoodwinked an entire borough and not actually consulted anybody. The leaflets regarding this particular consultation were delivered to a handful of people on the day of the consultation. I object to this draft local plan for the reasons stated above and all of my thoughts are my own.