

Dear Sir, Madam,

I am writing specifically to comment that the proposed redevelopment of the Sainsbury's site (Draft Local Plan p351, site allocation SA32, Sainsbury's Green Lanes) would be unacceptable in terms of the following impacts:

1. Removing a major supermarket would increase driving, traffic and local pollution from travelling further to another supermarket, or receiving delivery vans, and would in particular impact elderly and disabled people. Development would only be acceptable if a major supermarket remained in situ, so there was no loss of this essential community use and asset.
2. Trying to provide 299 homes in this location would be significant overdevelopment, and greatly increase cars, traffic and air pollution. This would worsen quality of the environment and negatively impact local residents in terms of air pollution, road safety and health outcomes. The intensity of homes would be clearly out of keeping with the character of the area, and would result in the provision of poor quality housing with poor space standards that would be unlikely to be compliant with your own planning policy for housing quality, density or associated service provisions (for example parking spaces, waste management and cycling storage).
3. The public green space next to and behind Sainsbury's, and in the area you have shown as up for development, is good quality, valued and well-used by the community. I believe your own planning policy as well as the London Plan and the NPPF seek to protect and enhance existing green spaces, not build flats on them. I also believe this green space was provided in perpetuity as part of the Section 106 Agreement for the Sainsbury's development. I believe it would be contrary to the previous planning approval and legal agreement signed by Enfield Council, as well as national, regional and local planning policy, to try to develop over it.
4. The library is a well-used and popular community asset. Any redevelopment would need to at least re-provide the same quality and quantum of space that is currently provided.
5. The description of site allocation SA32 states any development would need to provide improved walking and cycling routes. The site already has great walking routes (the public park, off-road and through mature greenery with multiple entrances/exits), and GReen Lanes has an excellent cycling route. Any development of the scale proposed could not match the quality of route already on the site - and so would have a negative impact in terms of pedestrian environment/'public realm'.

As an RTPI qualified planner it is clear to me that site SA32 is not big enough to support 299 homes + 13,325 sqm/143,000 sq ft of commercial development and also fulfil the existing community provision of public green space that this space provides, comply with local and regional planning policy and be in keeping with the character of the local area.

I believe the site allocation SA32 needs significant change to be realistic and achievable. Please can you respond to me on what will happen with my comment, and how it will be considered. Please can you also let me know if there are any public consultations coming

up on the Local Plan more broadly.