

Enfield Council seems determined to further degrade my home town (where I was born and have lived for three quarters of a century) and surrounding areas. I want to object particularly to the following points:

3.10 Policy SP PL10, Chase Park, pages 80-87 and Figure 3.11 The Green Belt is supposed to be protected under law. It's value is that it is an area close to the built environment where people can feel that they are escaping to open countryside, with wide views in all directions. Furthermore Enfield Chase is an area of particular historic importance, almost unique in the London area. This development would undermine both of these points, and allowing it to go ahead would be a totally irresponsible action by Enfield Council who are elected to represent and protect the views of their constituents.

3.8 Policy SP PL8, Rural Enfield, pages 72-74 The very word 'park' implies a managed area, and interventions like a visitor centre and sculpture park could destroy the natural aspects of the area. Too often planners seem to have very little understanding of ecology, and think that planting trees will mitigate the loss of truly wild areas with their associated natural flora and fauna. An increase in footfall would also have a detrimental effect and cause disturbance to local wildlife. The recently proposed B-Lines scheme set up by the charity Buglife seems not to be mentioned; is Enfield going to ignore this nationally recognised initiative which will begin to reverse the devastating decline in our wildlife?

7 Policy DM DE6 Tall Buildings, pages 156-160 and **Appendix C** SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping Centre, page 321 Enfield Town is a Conservation area, which means that the character should be preserved. Tall buildings may be appropriate in the right setting (although who wants to live in one following the Grenfell Tower tragedy), but the centre of a Conservation area is not one of these settings. No new building should be higher than those surrounding it, and in this case 4/5 stories would not be out of place.

8.1 Policies SP H1 Housing development sites, pages 183-185 and **9.2** SPE1 Employment and growth, pages 227-228 The housing targets are far too high for the crowded South East. There are plenty of areas of the country which would welcome investment, industry and housing to regenerate the local economy, and where space is not at such a premium.

12.4 SP CL4 Sporting Excellence, pages 277-279 and **Appendix C** SA62 Spurs training ground, page 383 Tottenham Hotspur football club should not have been given space in the Borough of Enfield in the first place, and to expand even more would be a betrayal of many Enfield residents. Councillors may or may not remember when Spurs first applied for planning permission to build a training ground that many members of The Enfield Society gave donations to oppose the plans. Spurs then cynically withdrew the plans, only to submit new plans thus rendering all the donations wasted. This has not been forgotten. This development, unnecessarily taking even more green space, is not for the benefit of local people, but solely to increase Spurs bank balance, and should be firmly rejected by the council.