

I would like to register my objections to following aspects of the draft local plan

SA62 Page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277-279  
Spurs football training ground.

This land is for the use of Enfield residents, it was purchased in the 1930's solely for this purpose with no right for the council to use it for any other purpose or to see it or build on it. The council has stated that the reason they need to lease it is because the golf course was losing money. However, they have decided to include part of the ancient woodland, both entrances and car parks, the beautiful pond area and give that to Spurs so taking away local residents rights to access to these additional areas. Spurs history for sticking to their promises is appalling, they got the original training ground on the basis they would set up a ecology centre for schools next to it. Not only did they not do this, they have now flattened the area, built huge soil banks and put in training pitches so destroying the area that they said was so important for ecology. Although they were contractually obliged to do this Enfield Council not only failed to enforce this requirements but they are now rewarding them with giving them an additional huge area of public land to also destroy. So whatever planning they put in we can assume anything beneficial will be for PR purposes only and they will just build on the area at a later date. We all want to know why have Enfield council not held them responsible for completing their original project plan????

Their plan is to install plastic football pitches, flood lighting and to prevent any public access to land that we, as Enfield residents, own. So destroying the land from any ecological benefit and having. Massive impact on the wildlife. Their claim they are going to install wild flower meadows on the lower half of the golf course but this simply means they will not have to maintain it and once they have the lease as they have total freedom from Enfield council to do what they like they will probably build further on this area at later date as they did with the hotel at their existing training ground.

They are paying Enfield council a paltry rent of £100,00 a year for all this land, yet will be able to easily cover that simply by charging residents for parking and rent for decent hospitality venues so effectively are being given the land for free and the users of the park will be paying for it. If all Enfield Council required was to remove their responsibility for the golf course why did they simply not advertise for the golf course to be taken over by a private company first before allowing other bids to take the land away from the public.? I believe there was a bid put in that would leave access to the land, would remove all Enfield councils financial loss but did not pay this paltry rent so therefore was rejected - even though it met their objectives. I like most Enfield residents believe this whole process was started because Spurs wanted the land to expand their training ground and Enfield Council have done their bidding.

The relationship between the current council and Spurs football club is highly questionable as they do not seem to be held to account, are allowed to do whatever they want on green belt land e.g. they were allowed to build a hotel for the players on green belt land whereas everyone has been totally restricted and held to the rules. The head of Enfield council openly accepts gift of hospitality from Spurs during the bidding process thereby clearly illustrating how unethical the bidding process was.

This is even more disgraceful based on the fact they want to extensively build houses in this very area whilst at the same time removing access to public land, again showing their complete lack of concern for the resident health and physical and mental wellbeing.

I would also like to object to the huge volume of new houses being built in one small area of Enfield Chase. We can understand developing one of the areas but to do all these and to put in place an additional 8,000 homes and an industrial estate in such close proximity is unbelievable.

Enfield council have openly stated their objection to Enfield Chase having the beautiful green belt land that we have which protects us from the pollution from the M25, therefore they do not seem to want to explore brownfield sites for further development to spread the increased population across the borough and give the infrastructure a chance to cope. They appear to want to destroy the Enfield Chase area, put local services under

unsustainable pressure and cause massive traffic congestion problems as none of them live in the area and so have no interest in the wellbeing of the residents. I am sure they would not be voting for this if this was on their doorstep.

The Mayor of London does not agree with this development, he believes green belt land is important to London and should remain protected. Therefore how can this go ahead with the level of objection from all of the residents in this area and from the Mayor?.

I have complained before about this and received a standard email response which did not address any of these points.

Please respond to explain why SPURS were allowed to ignore their contractual promises yet are being considered for more public land???

What are they being given the additional woodland and car parks not just the golf Course?

Can you please also respond as to the financial benefit that Enfield council will get from developers for allowing them to develop this land? These numbers should be transparent.