
Subject: Objection to Enfield Local Plan SP SC1, SP BG1, DM BG6, DM BG8, SA32

I am writing to object to the Enfield local plan with specific attention to the redevelopment of the Sainsbury's site at 681 Green Lanes under: SP SC1 (Improving Health and Wellbeing of Enfield's diverse communities); SP BG1 (Blue and Green Infrastructure Network); DM BG6 (Protecting Open Space), DM BG8 (Urban Greening and Biophilic principles); SA32 (Sainsbury's Green Lanes).

I live at 28 Fernleigh Road, N21 3AL and therefore am most concerned with the redevelopment of the Sainsbury's site at 681 Green Lanes. Under your strategic policy SP SC1 I would like to know what health impact assessment has been carried out into the construction of '299 dwellings'. We have already had some redevelopment on Green Lanes, specifically at 'River View' where 91 dwellings have been constructed in a 6-storey building. What has been done to accommodate the influx of new residents this will create? There seems to be no increase in school places or GP provision.

Winchmore Hill GP practice already has over 20,000 patients on its list. The River View development makes much reference to sites at Trent Park, Firs Farm, etc, for health and leisure activities, but looking at your plan these facilities will be redeveloped too. One as a small town of 3000 dwellings and one as a crematorium.

Under SP BG1, DM BG6 and DM BG8 this new development at Sainsbury's does not demonstrate how urban greening factors will be 'maintained or exceeded' if the whole site is built on. Reference to the site proforma SA32 Mixed Use shows a redevelopment of the store to provide 13,325 sq m of 'industry/logistics' and '299 dwellings'. The red outline is carried out to the boundaries of properties on Fernleigh Road, the boundary with Haselemere Road, the boundaries of properties on Orpington Road and Coombe Corner, and the existing boundary with Green Lanes. If this is so, how can this development avoid harm to amenity, especially in terms of outlook and privacy?

I understand that when the site was first developed planning had to go through the Secretary of State for the Environment, under the Freedom of Information Act I hereby

request a copy of the decision dated 9 September 1987.

To date the development at Sainsbury's has park land around the store (not shown on the site pro forma SA32). Many of the trees are subject to Tree Preservation Orders. If, indeed, the whole site is to be developed this will mean a loss of amenity to local residents and the loss of a green corridor between Green Lanes and Haselemere Road. This green boundary is a refuge for wildlife such as bats, other mammals such as foxes, birds - including tawny owls, and insects such as stag beetles. What will be done to preserve the diversity of the wildlife, some of which may well be endangered? It is infinitely preferable to walk through this green area than along Green Lanes and the congested traffic idling behind buses and at traffic lights - sometimes queueing as far back as the junction with Fernleigh Road.

Returning to Strategic Policy SP SC1: (Improving Health and Wellbeing of Enfield's diverse communities) how will the health and wellbeing of the community around this proposed redevelopment be protected? There will be many months, perhaps years, of noise, dust, pollution, and the immediate problem of a major supermarket being rendered out of use by its redevelopment. I cannot imagine that people could carry on shopping there whilst the construction work is carried out.

It is worth noting that the London Borough of Enfield is not alone in its plans to deliver considerable amounts of development (eg: Barnet, Hertsmere and Waltham Forest to name just three). The increased urbanisation of these areas will put enormous pressure on resources, such as water, air quality, heritage and ecology. Not to forget the generation of additional traffic and transport requirements. The London Borough of Enfield's apparent 'No Car' policy will be at odds with the lack of transport infrastructure. We don't have tube stations close by at Winchmore Hill and our interconnectedness with other areas even within Enfield is poor. To travel from Winchmore Hill to Myddleton House by public transport would take a minimum of 49 minutes and involves a 17-minute walk from home to a bus stop and then an 8-minute walk from Turkey Street through to Myddleton House. By car the journey would take 15 minutes. There seems to be an inherent ageist and ableist stance on car use in the borough. Not everyone can use public transport or cycle the distances involved in going from Winchmore Hill to Enfield Town. To reach Southgate or further afield involves steep hills (cf Wades Hill, Church Hill). Young people and the elderly cannot afford electric cars and so use older petrol or diesel vehicles, some 'better off' residents will of course purchase an electric vehicle and dutifully charge it at home - where is the provision for electric vehicle charging at these new developments?

I would have liked to respond more fully on other aspects of this plan but as time is limited I have only addressed my immediate concerns. It is only by accident that I found out about this consultation and the leaflet that came through my door didn't mention anything about the scale of the local plan. It would seem that the council is determined to change the face of Enfield. People choose to come and live in this borough precisely because of its green spaces, easy access to countryside and escape from Inner London.

I look forward to receiving the Decision of the Secretary of State for the Environment 9 September 1987.