
Subject: FW: Concerns / feedback - for the Sainsbury Site on Green Lanes, London N21 3RS

We are writing this email with reference to the proposed Housing Strategy document (<https://new.enfield.gov.uk/services/planning/enfield-strategic-housing-land-availability-assessment-shlaa-2020-planning.pdf>).

My wife and I are so concerned that we will be adversely impacted if these or similar housing proposals for this Sainsbury's site as in the Plan proceed at all.

To which we record our complete objections, and for any further development at the above site that reduces existing open space around the Store and its usefully spacious car park.

Simply put - the approach ought to be " green -up " / develop other available Brown field sites and sites in other better places in the Borough - and for such housing. Not degrade already pressed Borough Green belt / the Green Spaces in the Sainsburys Site local to us and our local Community. Browning - down the " green belt " / this valuable amenity wildlife open spaces as at this site and as proposed, makes no sense.

If the site is developed for housing, or at all further, also where is and when do we see Impact Assessments on - environment / pollution levels /already stretched public and essential medical / schooling services / traffic and parking pressures that are already chaotic on Green Lanes along the present site and surrounding roads like our own. Not just outline, but detailed before any " go ahead " is given - whether the subject of conditions or contract obligations on any developers or the Council.

During the past 2 years of Covid restrictions we and many other local residents - across all age groups / cultures / parents / children / across the full socio and economic / health states - took solace in the walkable to / fro amenity areas at this Site. As well the excellent New River site opposite. Latter was an excellent use of Council money and returned a derelict " brown" site back to its Community. Why also degrade that improvement, by increased footprint that more housing opposite will cause.

We would also note more concerns and that we know echo views of others:

- Further population increases with such housing can only lead to an over population of the area; beyond its current natural growth rate.
- The rise in apartments on road side situations will negatively impact the look and feel of the surrounding area – given the recent and future developments along Green Lanes - Travis Perkins, Capitol House etc.
- Where will improved supporting infrastructure come from / be sited - for nurseries , doctors, dentists, schools etc.
- Congested roads and pressure on parking exists now. When " schools come out", crossing

Green Lanes there is hazardous - to school kids, pedestrians and drivers.

- Loss of green space / flora and fauna / trees etc on this site – used as an area for families and leisure which contributes to the health and wellbeing of all residents as well as mitigation against pollution - can't be sustainable / justified. We need the trees as the "Lungs of the area" - to reduce polluting fumes / dust / noise levels caused by Green Lanes road users.
- The character of the area at the site / surrounds will be degraded by apartments / high rise styled buildings.
- We feel it is an inappropriate choice of site for housing given the close proximity of existing traditional historical properties. Redevelopment of sites on the A10 make more sense as there are few such properties affected / blighted.
- If we lose Sainsbury's there is no other major supermarket in the area. This would severely affect elderly and disabled residents. This will force people to drive or use already hard pressed public transport to supermarkets further away in Enfield Town / Palmers Green / along the A10. How will that map to the council's policy of encouraging people to shop locally and walk and cycle.
- Why not develop Morrisons area for housing in Palmers Green. Such that would not affect any adjacent properties. There must be other examples of better sites for such housing plans.
- It is our understanding that there is already a precedent that the Sainsburys site should not be considered for such a development and this was factored into the original Sainsbury development where a greenbelt space was developed and there was a ceiling height placed on the Sainsbury structure. We are insisting on the protection and preservation of existing green space at the site.
- The new development proposed at Sainsburys site is not in keeping with the area where the majority of properties are dated back to Edwardian times and would ruin the overall feel of the area.
- It is repeatedly observed, by others more expert than we, that excessive flat developments reduce area value. It is therefore unwelcome we think to all impacted - not just us.
- Extensive analysis on all of the above points and metric impact needs to be considered before any further consideration is given by the Council - it would be unfair and potentially damaging to permit further and proper consideration of this site for flats otherwise. We would prefer that the Council agree that the area is just unsuitable for housing due to the qualitative factors already mentioned above - it is unsuitable we think.
- Further, given the significance of this planning exercise and the potential impact on residents we would like to understand why more formal and transparent communication was not provided by the Council on the matter sooner.
- Will there be any Wildlife assessment of the Sainsburys site - for any rare / protected species there may be; brown squirrels apart that could benefit from a "cull". What of "TPO's" placed on the mature trees at boundaries of the current site?
- We believe there are also protected Bat and Stag Beetle populations, on site / in the local surrounds too. Already under threat, any such housing could result in lost rare habitat and with real risk of their extinction in the area.

We look forward to your response to our concerns, as well more formally with your further public consultations - towards all your Council taxpayers please.

