

---

Dear Sirs

I live at 28 Fernleigh Road N21 3AL and am writing to make the following observations on the latest draft of the Enfield Local Plan ("ELP").

### Consultation

-  
I was first notified of the ELP consultation by way of a leaflet dropped through my door in the week commencing 16 August 2021. Given that the consultation closes on 13 September 2021 I have had less than one third of the consultation period to consider the detail and complexity of the ELP. For this reason my response cannot address all the issues I would like to cover. Many other Enfield residents that I have spoken to are unaware of the ongoing consultation.

Locally, I understand that there was a meeting arranged with officers of the council to discuss the ELP on 17 August 2021. I would have liked to attend but only found out about it after it had taken place.

It is noted that the leaflet drop, already 2 months late given the consultation period, coincided with the peak summer holiday period.

The ELP mentions that the ELP consultation started in 2018-9. This is news to me and everyone else I mention it to.

Overall I would suggest that the consultation process is badly flawed and the time limit for observations should be extended by another 2 months to 13 November 2021 to give residents a reasonable opportunity to make all their observations.

### Data

-  
In the ELP you state the evidence base used to reach the proposals and preferred option. Many of the reports, including those relating to housing need and economy, were concluded in 2020 and will therefore have been prepared using data gathered prior to the Covid pandemic and Brexit being concluded. These factors are causing structural changes to society and should be reflected in the ELP. For example many people no longer wish to use public transport; many now work from home and will continue to do so; many EU migrants have returned to their home countries; there has been a dramatic shift towards online shopping etc. It may be that there is no requirement for 25,000 new homes (say 75,000 more people or a 20% population rise) in an already overcrowded borough.

### Transport

-  
The ELP, particularly in relation to urban developments, imposes a car free policy seemingly, in part, to align with the Mayor's actions against atmospheric pollution (ULEZ, congestion zones etc). This seems short sighted. From 2030 (half way through the ELP period) new fossil fuel cars will not be available and will have been replaced by green alternatives. Car parking should be provided in new residential developments to

accommodate this. I would add that although car parking is omitted from most urban developments this doesn't mean that the residents of those units don't drive. They do but find parking on the streets surrounding their car free home.

Enfield, unlike many inner London areas, is a large partly rural borough with much poorer public transport provision. I suspect it also has an proportionately older population who would struggle to get around by walking and cycling as advocated by the ELP. I happen to be fortunate in that I am fit enough to walk and cycle but my 85 year old mother, who relies on me for transport, can hardly walk from my front door to the car on the driveway. I am not in denial; my mobility will decrease as I age and I don't want to become housebound by reduced car policies.

I would add that walking and cycling have their limitations. There are significant hills around the proposed Green Belt developments which will be beyond most casual cyclists. Also it is not possible to carry the weekly shop, or a large bag of cement for example, on a bike!

### Tall buildings

-  
I am surprised that tall buildings are considered to be a suitable housing solution given the social issues identified with the 1960 and early 1970 high rise tower blocks and the more recent Grenfell Tower tragedy. I also do not think that such blocks are appropriate to most parts of Enfield which comprises mainly 2 storey 20<sup>th</sup> century housing.

From the ELP it is not possible to determine the areas affected by the proposed Tall Buildings policy. Section 7.6 refers to 2 plans at figs 7.3 and 7.4 however their scale is such that landmarks/roads cannot be identified even when the plans are fully magnified. Accordingly one cannot precisely determine which areas may be subject to which proposed policy nor the heights of buildings where in excess of the London Standard. In order for a proper consultation to take place these details should be on plans that can be enlarged to show full detail.

### Green Belt

-  
London's Green Belt was established in the middle years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to provide green space for Londoners and to stop the uncontrolled green field development of the inter war period. It is because of this policy that London has it's green lungs as mentioned in the ELP. I am firmly against the erosion of the Green Belt because once this starts, and a precedent is set, it will be chipped away at until it no longer exists. For example the ELP suggests that the proposed Chase Park Placemaking Area adjoins housing and so is suitable for development. In fact, north of Enfield Road, the only nearby housing is in the south east corner and the majority of the area is surrounded by fields. If one follows the logic that any Green Belt land adjoining residential property should be developed then in time the whole of the Green Belt will be lost. It's for this reason that the policy was established and should be respected.

### Proposed development of Sainsbury's 681 Green Lanes N21 3RS

-  
My house backs on to this land so I have a direct interest in its proposed redevelopment.

I gather from the ELP that the council have already had detailed discussions with Sainsbury's about the redevelopment leading to it being an "allocated development

site” despite no local consultation. The ELP states that the site will support at least 13,325 sq m of non residential use plus 299 residential units. Please set out how it is envisaged that the site will support this level of development including:-

- Nature and positioning of the non residential uses
- Scale, height and positioning of the residential units

You will be aware that this is a sensitive site having previously been a school recreation ground. From the limited information available via the Council’s website it seems that its development as a supermarket was decided by the Secretary of State for the Environment rather than the local planning department. I cannot find a copy of the planning inspector’s decision on the Council’s online planning portal although reference is made to it when the Council dealt with subsequent applications to change some conditions imposed by the decision. Please treat this response as a request under the Freedom of Information Act for the council to provide me with a copy of the Inspector’s decision dated 9 September 1987.

The shrubs, mature trees and grass of the parkland surrounding the Sainsbury’s store provides an important wildlife oasis when combined with the mature gardens of the housing surrounding the store. The ELP emphasises the need to retain such amenity so it is important that the green areas on Sainsbury’s land are retained. The park is also used by many residents for recreational purposes and as a more pleasant walking route compared to Green Lanes which is now frequently congested due to the effects of the cycle lane, bus stops being in the middle of the carriageway, traffic lights at Sainsbury’s entrance and the bottom of Station Road etc.

I have copied my comments to Councillor Caliskan and the Fernleigh Road group of concerned residents.

Yours faithfully