

---

1. I am writing to object to the following 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; Policy SA62 page 372; 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.

2. I also object 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 reject the Council's analysis that Whitewebbs Golf Course was losing money and call for its reinstatement.

3. I am also objecting to Policy SA52 page 372, which would remove part of Rammey Marsh, a wildlife area and public amenity, from the Green Belt.

4. 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.

I live at South Lodge, Beggars Hollow and wish to know the following as I have received no information regarding Whitewebbs Park

1. Why does Tottenham want so much of Whitewebbs Park?

2. Enfield had promised to show the bids to the Stakeholders but didn't. Why?

3. THFC/ENIC need about 40 acres for pitches and facilities, why are they bidding for 140 acres (Everything except the woodland)?

4. Nowhere is there an explicit guarantee of public access to the old golf course. (There are no rights of way). No mention of parking. What exactly are parking plans?

5. What is happening regarding clubhouse cafe and toilets?

6. Will all the main entrances be controlled by THFC/ENIC.

7. 19th Century Parkland is not the same as a public park. This is a private landscaped area for the benefit of the owners. Please explain.

8. Looking closely at the map in the THFC/ENIC brochure. The bid is for a country estate with clearly marked and controllable borders. Will the public access to these areas?

9. Looking at the map for the North End of the park. The bid includes all the land and gardens around Whitewebbs House (Toby Carvery) including the Lake and the North Lodge entrance. Is the plan is to take over the carvery, with its long lease, turn it into a hotel / hospitality facility for visiting teams and run the whole park as the THFC/ENIC country estate? Will the public have access to these areas?

10. Nearly 100 years ago the Council bought the estate for the people of Enfield. It looks as if our present council wants to sell off this land to a multi billion dollar corporation based in the Bahamas tax haven. THFC is owned by ENIC. The distinction between leasing and buying appears irrelevant in this instance.

This is a well used PUBLIC park and I do not wish this to happen.

Karen Alligan