

Re: Re-sending as a New Thread

From: Rewired Rewired (re_wired@ymail.com)

To: georgina.solan@enfield.gov.uk; ronnie.lyon@enfield.gov.uk; tenancy.council.housing@enfield.gov.uk

Date: Thursday, 9 July 2026 at 16:50 BST

Subject: Important – Succession Documents Attached Following New Correspondence

Dear Housing Services,

Following the recent correspondence and the new reason provided for denying my legal right to succeed the tenancy at 23 Byron Terrace, I am sending the two attached documents which set out my full legal position. Part 1 explains the statutory and procedural issues with the previous handling, and Part 2 provides a clear summary of each evidential exhibit relevant under the Housing Act 1985.

These documents address the points raised in your latest communication and contain material facts that must now be considered by the appropriate authorised officer. Please confirm receipt and that this matter is being handled correctly. If anything, further is required, I can provide it immediately.

Kind regards, Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

On Wednesday, 8 July 2026 at 12:22:24 BST, Georgina Solan <georgina.solan@enfield.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Cordell,

Thank you for your recent emails and for providing further information regarding your current circumstances, together with the legal authorities you consider relevant to your request for succession to the tenancy of 23 Byron Terrace.

I have noted the concerns you have raised regarding the recent court proceedings, the restrictions now in place, your current living arrangements, your personal safety, and your views in relation to both 109 Burncroft Avenue and the succession decision for 23 Byron Terrace. I have also acknowledged the legal arguments and case law referred to in your correspondence.

The Council has carefully reviewed the information and representations you have provided. However, the Council's position remains unchanged.

Whilst we acknowledge that the existence of another tenancy does not, in itself, automatically prevent a person from succeeding to a secure tenancy, the Council must consider all available evidence when determining whether an applicant occupied the property as their only or principal home at the relevant time, in accordance with the requirements of the Housing Act 1985.

In reaching its decision, the Council has not relied solely upon the fact that you remain the tenant of 109 Burncroft Avenue. Rather, the Council has considered the wider evidence available regarding your occupancy and residence arrangements. The continued holding of another tenancy is one factor amongst a number of considerations relevant to determining where your principal home was at the material time.

Whilst I acknowledge that you disagree with the Council's decision and have referred to legal, medical and personal circumstances in support of your position, the Council is not

satisfied that the evidence provided demonstrates that 23 Byron Terrace was your only or principal home for the purposes of a statutory succession claim. Accordingly, the Council remains satisfied that you do not qualify to succeed to the tenancy.

I also acknowledge the concerns you have raised regarding alleged harassment, neighbour disputes and the impact these matters have had on you. However, these issues are separate from the succession assessment and do not alter the Council's determination regarding your request to succeed to the tenancy at 23 Byron Terrace.

The authorities referred to in your correspondence have been noted. However, each succession case must be determined on its own facts and evidence. Having reviewed all information available, the Council remains satisfied that its decision has been reached in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions and the particular circumstances of this case.

If you have concerns regarding anti-social behaviour, harassment or other tenancy management issues at 109 Burncroft Avenue, these should be reported through the appropriate channels so they can be assessed by the relevant service. You may also wish to seek independent legal advice regarding your housing circumstances and any rights you believe you may have.

This correspondence constitutes the Council's final position in relation to your request for succession. Unless significant new evidence is provided that has not previously been considered and materially affects the facts upon which the decision has been made, the Council's position will remain unchanged.

Kind regards

Georgina Solan
Resident Relationship Officer
Housing & Regeneration
Enfield Council
Edmonton Centre
36-44 South Mall, Edmonton Green, N9 0TN
Tel: 0204 534 2653

Georgina.Solan@enfield.gov.uk

Protect the Environment – Think Before You Print.

"Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough, fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities."

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 10:06 PM
To: Ronnie Lyon <Ronnie.Lyon@Enfield.gov.uk>; Tenancy Council Housing <tenancy.council.housing@enfield.gov.uk>; Georgina Solan <Georgina.Solan@Enfield.gov.uk>
Subject: Fw: Re-sending as a New Thread

I have forwarded this email again with it attachment due to its urgency and no response, please respond!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
To: Georgina Solan <georgina.solan@enfield.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, 6 July 2026 at 12:21:52 BST
Subject: Re: Re-sending as a New Thread

Subject: Succession Review – Legal Precedent Submitted (Request for Reconsideration)

Dear Ms Solan,

Thank you for your response. I am requesting a **formal reconsideration** of the Council's succession decision for 23 Byron Terrace. I previously requested a review, but the Council did not consider the legal position or the evidence provided at that time.

I have now submitted the relevant case law authorities, including the London & Quadrant (L&Q) Ombudsman decision, which directly confirms that statutory succession remains lawful even where the successor holds another tenancy. This case mirrors my circumstances almost exactly and uses the correct legal wording for modern succession assessments.

The Council's position that my tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue automatically disqualifies succession is **legally incorrect**.

The correct legal position is as follows:

- **London & Quadrant (Housing Ombudsman)** – a second tenancy does **not** prevent succession; the landlord must assess *actual occupation* and *principal home* properly.
- **Housing Act 1985, s.87–88** – the **ONLY** test is whether I occupied the property as my *only or principal home*.
- Supporting authorities:
 - a) **Crawley BC v Sawyer (1988)** – principal home is a *factual test*.
 - b) **Islington LBC v Boyle [2011] EWCA CIV 1450** – registration elsewhere does **NOT** determine principal home.
 - c) **Camden LBC v Goldenberg (1996)** – another tenancy does **NOT** automatically bar succession.

Your email states that I “remain the tenant of 109 Burncroft Avenue” and that this alone prevents succession. This is not supported by the Housing Act, the L&Q decision, or the case law above. The existence of another tenancy is **not a legal barrier** to statutory succession.

I therefore request:

1. A lawful reconsideration applying the correct statutory test under s.87–88 Housing Act 1985.
2. Confirmation that the Council will now assess principal home properly, rather than relying on the incorrect assumption that another tenancy automatically bars succession.

Please confirm receipt of this email and the attached legal authorities.

Yours sincerely, Mr. **Simon Paul Cordell**

On Thursday, 2 July 2026 at 17:24:23 BST, Georgina Solan <georgina.solan@enfield.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Simon

Thank you for your email.

I acknowledge the concerns you have raised and appreciate that you feel anxious about your current circumstances.

The Council has considered the information available regarding your occupation of 23 Byron Terrace. As previously advised, you do not have succession rights to this tenancy and therefore do not have a legal right to succeed to the tenancy of 23 Byron Terrace.

The Council's records confirm that you remain the tenant of 109 Burncroft Avenue. Whilst you have outlined concerns regarding that property and your personal circumstances, the Council is not aware of any legal restriction that prevents you from returning to and occupying your own tenancy address.

The matters you have raised regarding neighbour disputes, court proceedings and personal safety concerns do not alter the Council's decision regarding succession at 23 Byron Terrace.

I appreciate that this may not be the outcome you were hoping for. However, the Council's position remains unchanged.

Should you wish to report any anti-social behaviour you are experiencing at your substantive property you can do so by access the link below.

[Antisocial behaviour | Enfield Council](#)

Kind regards

Georgina Solan
Resident Relationship Officer
Housing & Regeneration
Enfield Council
Edmonton Centre
36-44 South Mall, Edmonton Green, N9 0TN
Tel: 0204 534 2653

Georgina.Solan@enfield.gov.uk

Protect the Environment – Think Before You Print.

"Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough, fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities."

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 4:51 PM
To: Georgina Solan <Georgina.Solan@Enfield.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Re-sending as a New Thread

Subject: Urgent Update: Court Restrictions, Safety Concerns, and Access Issues at 109 Burncroft Avenue

Dear Housing Officer, Georgina Solan

I am writing to urgently update you with information that must be added to my housing file regarding the recent court case, the restrictions now placed on me, and the ongoing safety issues at 109 Burncroft Avenue.

I was recently taken to court and wrongly found guilty. I am now appealing the conviction. As part of the outcome, a **five-year restraining order** was issued against me. The conditions are as follows:

- I must not contact the complainant, **Rebecca O'Hare of 115 Burncroft Avenue**, directly or indirectly.
- I must not enter the **second floor** of the building at Burncroft Avenue.

These restrictions directly affect my ability to safely access and manage my home at 109 Burncroft Avenue.

I need to make it clear that the allegation made against me was fabricated. I was unfairly found guilty, and the decision does not reflect the true events. I am actively appealing the conviction.

Since the court outcome, I have returned to the flat. However, due to ongoing hate-motivated behaviour directed at me by Rebecca O'Hare and others, I have had to **record myself entering the building** to protect myself from being set up again. This is not sustainable or safe. I cannot record myself, walk into the building, and use my keys at the same time or carry bags of food or articles, this is unfair.

I also no longer have my mother's support, which previously helped me manage these risks. I now have to **phone around to find someone who can attend the flat with me**, as I cannot safely enter alone. I also avoid going to the **local shops** in case I encounter Rebecca, which further restricts my ability to live normally.

The council has repeatedly avoided acting in accordance with law and policy, despite myself, my mother, her solicitors, and others contacting you about the illegal behaviour taking place — including banging on walls, creaking floorboards, and other intimidation tactics. My evidence proves this pattern of behaviour.

Since returning to the flat, I have already seen Rebecca outside. I had to drive away immediately rather than park near her or her vehicle — the same vehicle I was falsely accused of threatening to destroy. I cannot safely walk into my corridor or collect food deliveries without fear.

While tidying the flat after the conviction, I have been subjected to deliberate banging above my head and banging on the walls intended to intimidate me. This occurred even at 5 AM while I was with a female friend and her child. This behaviour is clearly designed to make me fear staying in the property.

I have not been safe in the home for years. This is why the Judge previously ordered the council to move me into a like-for-like two-bedroom property. The ongoing harassment, fabricated allegations, and failure to act have left me exposed and vulnerable.

I am genuinely scared of reprisals. I believe Rebecca claims she is scared as well, but her claims are fabricated and used strategically to harm me.

I urgently request that this information is added to my housing file and escalated immediately. My safety, legal rights, and ability to manage my home depend on the council acting correctly and without delay.

Please confirm receipt of this update and advise on next steps.

Kind regards, Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

On Monday, 29 June 2026 at 17:21:45 BST, Georgina Solan <georgina.solan@enfield.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Simon

Thank you for your email.

I acknowledge receipt of your request for a review of the decision regarding your succession application for 23 Byron Terrace.

I note the points you have raised concerning your circumstances, the succession legislation, your residency, and the reasons given for the refusal decision.

Your correspondence has been forwarded to management for consideration and review.

Once the Council has considered the matters you have raised, you will be provided with a formal response.

At this stage, I am unable to comment further on the legal arguments contained within your email, nor can I provide any further information regarding the decision-making process while the matter is under review.

With regard to your request for internal records, officer details, notes and other documentation, requests for personal information and Council records should be submitted through the appropriate information rights process. Any such request will be considered in accordance with the relevant legislation and Council procedures.

For the avoidance of doubt, the Council's position remains as set out in the decision previously communicated to you. However, the issues raised in your latest correspondence will be considered by management and responded to formally.

Kind regards

Georgina Solan
Resident Relationship Officer
Housing & Regeneration
Enfield Council
Edmonton Centre
36-44 South Mall, Edmonton Green, N9 0TN
Tel: 0204 534 2653

Georgina.Solan@enfield.gov.uk

Protect the Environment – Think Before You Print.

"Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough, fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities."

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2026 3:09 AM
To: Georgina Solan <Georgina.Solan@Enfield.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Re-sending as a New Thread

Subject: Statutory Review Request – Unlawful Succession Refusal (23 Byron Terrace)

Dear Georgina, Dear Housing Management Team,

I am writing to formally request a **Statutory Review** of the refusal decision issued regarding my succession application for **23 Byron Terrace**.

After reviewing the Housing Act 1985 (Part IV, Succession on Death of Tenant) and the Enfield Council's Tenancy Agreement, (3.11 Right to Succeed) as well as the information provided in your refusal email, it is clear that the decision is **not compliant with the statutory criteria** and must be reconsidered.

I set out the relevant facts and legal points below.

1. The refusal reason is not a lawful ground under the Housing Act 1985

Your email states that my succession was refused because:

"You already have your own tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue."

However, the Housing Act 1985 does **not** list "holding another tenancy" as a disqualification for succession.

The Act requires only that the successor:

- 1) **Occupied The Dwelling as Their Only or Principal Home at The Time Of Death.**
- 2) **Lived With the Tenant for the 12 Months Prior, And**
- 3) **Is A Qualifying Family Member.**

I meet all of these statutory requirements.

There is **no provision** in Sections 87–89 that allows a council to refuse succession because the applicant holds another tenancy elsewhere.

2. 109 Burncroft cannot be treated as my “principal home” under the Act

The Housing Act focuses on **actual occupation**, not the existence of another tenancy.

109 Burncroft was **not** my principal home because:

- 1) It Is Medically Unsuitable (Confirmed by the 2018 Court Proceedings).
- 2) I Was Legally Prevented from Entering Due To Bail/Tag Restrictions.
- 3) The Court Ordered the Council to Process a Housing Management Transfer.
- 4) My Mother Provided the Support I Required At 23 Byron Terrace.
- 5) I Was Displaced From 109 Through No Choice of My Own.
- 6) I Have Never Abandoned the Tenancy; I Was Prevented from Occupying It.

A tenancy that is **unsafe, unsuitable, and impossible to occupy** cannot be treated as a “principal home” for succession purposes.

3. Why I cannot return to 109 Burncroft or live there alone

Returning to 109 is **not possible, not safe, and not lawful** because:

- 1) The Property Is Medically Unsuitable for My Disability-Related Needs.
- 2) The Court Recognised Safety Concerns and Ordered a Transfer.
- 3) Bail/Tag Restrictions Legally Prevent Me from Entering the Property.
- 4) I Cannot Live Alone Due To Disability-Related Support Needs.
- 5) My Mother Provided Essential Support At 23 Byron Terrace.
- 6) The Council Failed to Provide the Required Two-Bedroom Replacement.

For these reasons, 109 cannot be considered a viable or lawful residence.

4. My legal right to remain at 23 Byron Terrace

Under the Housing Act 1985, a qualifying successor has the right to remain in the property **until a lawful decision is made**.

Your refusal email does not constitute a lawful decision because:

- 1) It Is Not a Formal Decision Letter.
- 2) It Does Not Include the Legal Basis.
- 3) It Does Not Include Evidence.
- 4) It Does Not Include Review Rights.
- 5) It Does Not Include Signatures or Authorisation.
- 6) It Does Not Include an Equality Act Assessment.
- 7) It Does Not Include a Safeguarding Assessment.

I request written confirmation of my legal right to remain in 23 Byron Terrace during the statutory review.

5. I am the only legally qualifying successor under Section 89(7)

Section 89(7) applies only when more than one person qualifies.

In this case:

- 1) I Am the **Only** Person Who Lived with The Tenant.
- 2) I Am the **Only** Person Who Meets The 12-Month Rule.
- 3) I Am the **Only** Person with Evidence of Residency.
- 4) My Sister Does Not Qualify Under the Act.

Therefore, under Section 89(7), the council **must** treat me as the successor.

6. Equality Act 2010 and Care Act 2014 duties were not considered

The refusal does not address:

- 1) My Disability,
- 2) My Support Needs,
- 3) My Dependency on My Mother,
- 4) The Council's Duty to Make Reasonable Adjustments,
- 5) Safeguarding Concerns,
- 6) The Risk of Harm If Displaced.

This is a breach of statutory duties.

7. Request for full disclosure of decision-making records

To ensure the statutory review is conducted lawfully, I request **full disclosure** of the following:

- A. **The name, job title, and department of the officer who reviewed my application.**
- B. **The name, job title, and department of the manager who approved the refusal.**
- C. **A signed copy of the refusal decision.**
- D. **The internal notes used to reach the decision.**
- E. **The evidence relied upon to justify the refusal.**
- F. **The policy or legal guidance used to support the refusal.**
- G. **Any safeguarding assessment carried out.**
- H. **Any Equality Act reasonable adjustments assessment carried out.**
- I. **Confirmation of whether any other succession applications were submitted.**
- J. **Confirmation of whether those applicants meet the statutory criteria.**

This information is required for a lawful statutory review and for transparency under housing law.

8. Summary

The refusal reason given ("you already have a tenancy") is:

- Not Supported by The Housing Act,
- Not Supported by Enfield's Tenancy Agreement,
- Not Supported by Case Law,
- Contradicted By The 2018 Court Order,
- Contradicted By My Evidence of Residency,
- Procedurally Unlawful,
- And Must Be Reviewed.

I respectfully request written confirmation that the statutory review has now commenced.

Based on the Housing Act 1985, the 2018 court order, and Enfield Council's own policies, I further request that the refusal be reconsidered and overturned as part of this review.

Kind regards,

Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

23 Byron Terrace Edmonton, London N9 7DG

On Friday, 26 June 2026 at 12:17:54 BST, Georgina Solan <georgina.solan@enfield.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Simon

I have re-sent the email to you. For ease, I have also copied and pasted it in bold below:

Hi Simon

Thank you for your email. A decision has now been made.

Your succession application has been reviewed by management and has been denied as you do not fulfil the criteria for succession due to having your own tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ.

This means that you have no legal right of occupation of 23 Byron Terrace.

I cannot comment on any actions taken by the police.

I cannot comment on any disputes between yourself and any of your family members.

The above information would be shared with the police upon request.

Kind regards

Georgina Solan
Resident Relationship Officer
Housing & Regeneration
Enfield Council
Edmonton Centre
36-44 South Mall, Edmonton Green, N9 0TN
Tel: 0204 534 2653

Georgina.Solan@enfield.gov.uk

Protect the Environment – Think Before You Print.

"Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough, fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities."

From: Georgina Solan
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2026 12:16 PM
To: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Subject: FW: Re-sending as a New Thread

Hi Simon
Please see my previous email below

Kind regards

Georgina Solan
Resident Relationship Officer
Housing & Regeneration
Enfield Council
Edmonton Centre
36-44 South Mall, Edmonton Green, N9 0TN
Tel: 0204 534 2653

Georgina.Solan@enfield.gov.uk

Protect the Environment – Think Before You Print.

"Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough, fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities."

From: Georgina Solan
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 1:57 PM
To: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Subject: RE: Re-sending as a New Thread

Hi Simon

Thank you for your email. A decision has now been made.

Your succession application has been reviewed by management and has been denied as you do not fulfil the criteria for succession due to having your own tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ.

This means that you have no legal right of occupation of 23 Byron Terrace.

I cannot comment on any actions taken by the police.

I cannot comment on any disputes between yourself and any of your family members.

The above information would be shared with the police upon request.

Thank you.

Kind regards

Georgina Solan
Resident Relationship Officer
Housing & Regeneration
Enfield Council
Edmonton Centre
36-44 South Mall, Edmonton Green, N9 0TN
Tel: 0204 534 2653

Georgina.Solan@enfield.gov.uk

Protect the Environment – Think Before You Print.

"Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough, fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities."

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 1:06 PM
To: Georgina Solan <Georgina.Solan@Enfield.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Re-sending as a New Thread

Subject: Urgent: Immediate Written Confirmation Required Regarding My Lawful Right to Remain at 23 Byron Terrace

Dear Georgina

I am requesting **immediate written confirmation** of my lawful right to remain in occupation at **23 Byron Terrace** while my succession application is being processed.

A previous Housing email to the police, which simply stated that my name is not on the tenancy, has been **misinterpreted** by officers as meaning that I have **no right to be inside the property**. This interpretation is **incorrect**, has caused significant harm, and is not supported by the Housing Act 1985.

To avoid further misunderstanding, I need Housing to clarify the legal position **without delay**.

Background and Legal Position

- I am my late mother's **eldest son** and have **never fully moved out** of the property due to long-term disabilities and dependency.
- I have been a **permanent member of the household**, and 23 Byron Terrace has remained my only stable base.
- I contacted the relevant departments regarding succession immediately after my mother's passing and have since **completed and submitted the formal succession application**.
- Under the **Housing Act 1985 (Sections 87–89)**, a qualifying family member residing with the tenant at the time of death has the **right to remain in occupation until a formal succession decision is made**.

Evidence Regarding My Sister's Non-Residency

My sister, who has raised a dispute with the police, **was not living at the property** at the time of my mother's death or at any point before her recent return from holiday. Her claim of residency is contradicted by clear evidence:

- She has her **own flat**, where she was living before she travelled.
- I provided police with evidence of her residence at her own address before she left the country.
- While abroad, she sent threats to me and to my friends, stating she would "set me up" on her return.
- Upon returning from holiday, she went to **her own flat first** and dropped off her belongings there.
- She then arrived at 23 Byron Terrace with **no suitcase, no clothes, and no personal belongings**, which is visible on police body-worn cameras.
- The rooms at 23 Byron Terrace show **no signs of her occupation**:
 - The bed in my mother's room remains on its side where I left it while cleaning.
 - The bed in my former room remains dismantled.
 - No one has been sleeping in the front room; friends have checked and confirmed this.

These facts demonstrate that she was **not resident** at the address and therefore her claims do not affect my legal position or my right to remain.

Police Involvement

This is a **civil housing matter**, and the police have no authority to determine succession or occupation rights. Their current position appears to be based on:

- a misunderstanding of Housing's earlier email, and
- my sister's inaccurate statements.

The officers involved have stated that they will be contacting Housing for clarification. I therefore require **urgent written confirmation** from you so that I can provide it directly to them.

My Requests (Strengthened and Legally Precise)

I respectfully request that Housing confirm **in writing**, as a matter of urgency:

1. That I am lawfully entitled to remain in occupation at 23 Byron Terrace while my succession application is under consideration, in accordance with the Housing Act 1985.
2. That the earlier email to the police should not be interpreted as meaning I have "no right to be inside the property", and that such an interpretation is incorrect.
3. That this matter is governed solely by Housing legislation and not by police powers, and that the police cannot determine or restrict my occupation rights.
4. That my sister's dispute and her claim of residency do not alter my legal standing, do not constitute evidence of occupation, and do not affect my right to remain in the property.
5. That Housing will provide clear written clarification to the police if requested, to prevent further misunderstanding or unlawful exclusion.

Thank you for your assistance. Given the current circumstances and the involvement of the police, I would appreciate your **prompt written confirmation**.

Kind regards,
Simon Cordell
Care-of: 23 Byron Terrace
Enfield

On Tuesday, 16 June 2026 at 12:46:39 BST, Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com> wrote:

Message: Hello, I thought it would be best to resend this message as a new thread. Please find the document attached again for your review.

Kind regards,
Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

[Follow us on Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) www.enfield.gov.uk


Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities. Opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and not necessarily those of the London Borough of Enfield. This email and any attachments or files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the named addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient and receive it in error you must not copy, distribute or use the communication in any other way. All traffic handled by the Government Connect Secure Extranet may be subject to recording/and or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

This email has been scanned for viruses but we cannot guarantee that it will be free of viruses or malware. The recipient should perform their own virus checks.


[Follow us on Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) www.enfield.gov.uk

Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities. Opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and not necessarily those of the London Borough of Enfield. This email and any attachments or files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the named addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient and receive it in error you must not copy, distribute or use the communication in any other way. All traffic handled by the Government Connect Secure Extranet may be subject to recording/and or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

This email has been scanned for viruses but we cannot guarantee that it will be free of viruses or malware. The recipient should perform their own virus checks.


[Follow us on Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) www.enfield.gov.uk

Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities. Opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and not necessarily those of the London Borough of Enfield. This email and any attachments or files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the named addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient and receive it in error you must not copy, distribute or use the communication in any other way. All traffic handled by the Government Connect Secure Extranet may be subject to recording/and or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

This email has been scanned for viruses but we cannot guarantee that it will be free of viruses or malware. The recipient should perform their own virus checks.



[Follow us on Facebook](#)

[Twitter](#)

www.enfield.gov.uk

Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities. Opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and not necessarily those of the London Borough of Enfield. This email and any attachments or files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the named addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient and receive it in error you must not copy, distribute or use the communication in any other way. All traffic handled by the Government Connect Secure Extranet may be subject to recording/and or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

This email has been scanned for viruses but we cannot guarantee that it will be free of viruses or malware. The recipient should perform their own virus checks.



27.1. Sent Soon Pt1 of 2 -08-07-26.pdf
124.5 kB



27.2. Sent Soon Pt2 of 2 -08-07-26.pdf
262.6 kB