

Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

The consultation on the draft Local Plan has been poor. There were only consultation events in three locations. The events were drop in sessions. and notification of the events was poor. I attended the Palmers Green Library event on Tuesday 17th August from 1700-1900. The consultation materials were non-existent. There should have been consultation boards and visual presentations of the key themes.

I strongly agree with Transport Policies T1 (Promoting Sustainable Transport) and T2 (Making active travel the natural choice) and compliance with the Mayors Transport Strategy (MTS) sustainable and active travel mode share targets.

However, the policies do not go far enough in their expectations of developers. They need to be strengthened and the wording changed from 'should' to 'must'

I strongly support that new developments will be car free or offer very low parking provision in line with the London Plan 2021. All proposed development must produce nil detriment highway trips.

Development sites **must** prioritise the provision of high quality pedestrian and cycle connectivity, promote the use of e-bikes and in doing so provide secure residential and retail/commercial cycle parking. E-bikes will have a much more substantial part to play in transport up to 2039 and provision should be put in place for this.

New development **must** (rather than be expected to) deliver improvements to the transport network where they contribute towards Enfield's sustainable regeneration and development, **prioritise** (rather than promote) sustainable modes of travel, reduce severance, improve safety and environmental quality and support business.

I agree with Policy 1c that new development will be car-free (or offer a low level of parking provision) and support complementary measures, such as car clubs and contribute towards well-designed walking and cycling routes.

Developments must contribute to improved public transport infrastructure but there should not be over-reliance on Crossrail 2 or other London-wide transport infrastructure projects that may not be delivered.

Policy 1d Cycle parking provision (long and short stay) should comply with 2021 London Plan for all development types.

I support the prioritisation of walking and cycling and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs)

Figure 3.10 Crews Hill concept plan, p76 (Policy PL9) has no key and cannot be interpreted.

Figure 3.11: Chase Park concept plan p83 (Policy PL10)

Appendix C: Page 317 and Page 351: Strategic Site Allocation SA32 at Sainsbury on Green lanes

I object to the development proposals for the Strategic Site Allocation SA32 at Sainsbury on Green lanes for the following reasons:

The site is unsuitable for the scale of the proposed development and does not have the capacity for substantial mixed use development and for 299 residential units.

This would lead to over intensification of development of the site that is not in keeping with the Winchmore Hill area. This contravenes Policy SP TC1: Promoting Town Centres Section 1 c) maintaining and enhancing their distinctive features and characteristics where these make a positive contribution to the locality, including their

built form, historic and cultural character.

The existing Sainsbury supermarket site has considerable green space with mature oak trees fronting Green Lanes and shrubs and grass around the perimeter which necessarily provides noise and visual mitigation for the residential neighbourhood in close proximity. The green space provides important environmental and amenity value for local residents to visit with small children/ walk dogs etc.

I am concerned that further development of the Sainsbury supermarket site would remove existing mature green space and have a significant adverse effect environmental impacts, including impacts on ecology, biodiversity, townscape and heritage environmental topics.

If the green space was retained then the intensity of the development of 299 units would mean that the overall building height would not be in keeping with the townscape of Winchmore Hill.

The site would generate additional residential and commercial highway trips which would cause congestion in the local area, which is wholly residential to the west. This would generate associated transport-related noise and air quality impacts for existing local residents.

There would be significant pedestrian and highway congestion around Winchmore Hill station which cannot be accommodated within the existing station urban realm and compromise the conservation area.

There is insufficient capacity on the Great Northern rail line to accommodate additional rail patronage that would be generated by this development site.

The construction impacts of 299 residential units and associated retail and commercial space would also have excessive traffic and transport environmental effects on the local road network.

If Sainsbury in Green Lanes was retained as a development site it should be greatly scaled down according to a much smaller housing allocation. In addition the commercial element should be scaled back. Whilst I support the continuing provision of a supermarket in this location, additional retail is not required as it would compete with existing development in the Local area along Green Lanes.