

I am writing to object to the inclusion of redevelopment of Sainsbury's on green lanes in the enfield local plan, my reasons for objecting are as follows,

Impact on traffic and vulnerable residents : This is a vital shopping location for residents and a change to that would force residents to drive to locations in southgate or on major roads such as the A10 or the north circular road. This allied to the closure of roads as part of the london low traffic network seems contradictory, there is a goal to have people travel less by car while at the same time forcing them to do so for essential shopping.

In a very immediate and real way this would impact the most vulnerable residents such as

- poorer residents who may not have money to do large weekly shopping,
- those who are unable to drive either because of access to a car or ability
- less digitally literate residents unable to order shopping deliveries via online services.

It should be a goal of the council to ensure that essentially shopping can be done by all within a reasonable walking distance and not supporting a move in the wrong direction.

Impact on local essential services & Infrastructure: The addition of a large number of residences in such a small area would add significant load to local services which are already stretched to an unacceptable level. There is already growing local dissatisfaction with provision of GP's, dentists, schools and sporting facilities. On top of this transport links via rail and bus would need to be invested in to support such housing density.

Additionally Green lanes is now (due to the LTN) the only through road from the north circular to winchmore hill and beyond, as such adding a major building works project that would disrupt this road would cause complete disruption to any car travel, the road is already gridlocked around school drop off and collection times.

It has been argued that this location is privately owned and that development may happen regardless of the enfield plan, however I strongly feel that the council should be holding the bar very high for this type of proposal - ensuring that the primary purpose of the site cannot be so fundamentally changed and that a large density of housing cannot be added without the necessary infrastructure and services being in place.

The council should be fighting the side of local residents to ensure quality of life in the area rather than adding this to the enfield plan to help usher through a for profit development that has led to significant concerns from residents.