As a resident of Enfield borough, I would like to respond to the Enfield Local Plan. Please find my comments below:

- I fully support the Council's ambition to build more affordable homes. I would encourage developments to not price out local need (for example, when I lived in Colindale NW9, some housing developments that were built were excessively luxe, some with swimming pools etc, with high price tags that priced out the local community even if some were considered 'affordable' and available via shared ownership etc. This kind of development just seems excessive to me). I fully support the commitment to securing 50% of all new homes as genuinely affordable.
- I support Medium Growth 1
- I support Enfield's commitment to responding to the climate emergency
- I appreciate your commitment to provide more accessible green spaces
- I support the principle of limited release of Green Belt land; I would hope that this is based on evidence in terms of its use by the community and any conservation needs etc.
- I support the consideration of housing for older people. I couldn't see if there was a certain proportion of the proposed housing development that was for sheltered accommodation / care homes etc, and would appreciate clarity on this in further consultation / communication on plans. Providing alternative housing accommodation for older people not only supports them in terms of their community needs, but also frees up family homes.
- I support the redevelopment of brownfield land, vacant and underused buildings for new housing and employment uses. However, proposal SA32 (to develop the site of Sainsburys on Green Lanes) doesn't seem to align with this principle and I therefore object to this proposal. This is a large and well used supermarket that I would not like to lose and would mean that some residents may need to drive to get to a supermarket facility of this size.
- I support the principles of SC2, BG1 and BG2 but feel that proposal SA59 (to use some of the Firs Farm Recreation Ground for burial and/or cremation uses) does not align with these principles. This site is a well loved and well used community area and green space and I do not believe any part of it should be lost or compromised. I therefore object to this proposal.

Finally, I just wanted to flag that in the <u>online version</u> of the Enfield Local Plan that I was reading, diagrams for 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 were missing. I appreciate that these documents are long with numerous inputs and diagrams, but it was disappointing not to have these diagrams to fully understand the proposals.