## To whom it may concern,

My name is Sarah Jeffers and I have lived in Enfield much of my life (45 years). I have seen a lot of changes during this time. It was once a quiet, almost sleepy place to live. There have been some good improvements recently like Forty Hall and the pathways linking it to Hilly Fields and the beautiful open spaces. The Enfield Town library is another good example.

However, some of the plans in the Enfield Local Plan seem to undermine the characteristics of Enfield Town. I am mostly in opposition to the proposals for "tall buildings" mentioned in Strategic Policy SP PL1: Enfield Town pages 21, 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 feel that a building taller than 15 storeys would significantly change the skyline and change the character of this market town. I have always thought the Civic Centre (10-11 storeys) an eyesore and too tall in comparison to the other buildings nearby but to add more, even taller towers would in my opinion completely ruin the character of the town. I agree that the shopping centre does need change and like the idea of a more open environments, but I do object to the tall buildings. Throughout the pandemic the mental health of people living in tower blocks was greatly affected and the need for open green spaces so important during this time. I cannot see how more tower block living will improve the area and people's mental health. The sad fact is that there will be overcrowding in these small dwellings as families can't afford larger properties.

I also object to the other sites mentioned around Southbury and the retail areas for tall buildings. The area is unattractive, and I agree it needs to be

improved however I'm concerned that the pollution from the A10 and Southbury Road would be highly unpleasant and unhealthy for more people to live in tower blocks built here. However much the government/council want us all to stop using our cars, the people of Enfield love their cars. Personally, I think there are a lot of very bad drivers in Enfield, along with far too many boy racers who drive around loudly at great speed- what is going to be done to stop that? I wouldn't want to live next to the A10 with noisy and polluting cars going past constantly.

I am also opposed to the plan to build housing on the Green Belt areas surrounding Enfield. Please see my points below: -

- 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; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 all of which propose the destruction 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. My family have enjoyed many walks and cycle rides around the green belt of Enfield, and it breaks my heart that the Council are simply going to sell off this land to build houses for which they will profit.
- 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. My husband used to use this golf course, as it was an affordable place to play golf in the borough. Now it is overgrown and will soon be full of houses. This will destroy the look of the area and have a hugely negative affect on the wildlife in the area.
- 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.

## 5.2 DRAFT STATEGIC POLICY SP SC2 Protecting and enhancing social and

## community infrastructure

In the plan there does not seem to be much explanation about the "new and improved facilities" pg 109

"f. put in place appropriate maintenance and management arrangements, taking account of the needs of other infrastructure providers".

The leisure facilities in Enfield Town/Southbury are terrible. Southbury Leisure Centre is far too small as it is without an influx of more people wanting to use the inadequate facilities already on offer. In my opinion the Leisure Centre needs knocking down and moving elsewhere- possibly on the redevelopment of the retail parks on the A10. The facility needs to be much larger and designed in an exciting modern way. The current leisure centre is filthy and smelly. The pool is dirty and I always get ill if I ever venture in it. The current maintenance and management arrangements by Fusion are unacceptable and very poor indeed.

Please can you take a look at the Leisure centres in Harlow and St. Albans, these are both innovative buildings and the facilities are more like a private gym than a council facility. They are both managed by Everybody Active which seems to be far better at running excellent facilities. I would mention that I think it's appalling that Enfield Council does not subsidise the current Fusion facilities on offer. The swimming pools in Southgate and Albany are both incredibly old- however they are much better than the newer ones that have been built more recently.

I sincerely hope that these plans do not go ahead and that my suggestion regarding the location of a new Leisure Centre are considered.

Sent from Mail for Windows