

Objection to item SA 32, Sainsbury's Green Lanes, N21 3RS on page 351 of Enfield Local Plan

I wish to lodge the strongest possible objection to the plan detailed above. The proposal is ill considered, inappropriate and, frankly, absurd. There are many clear reasons why this proposal should not go ahead and the current site and the facilities it offers left unchanged.

First among these is that the current Sainsbury's supermarket is a much needed and well used facility which provides the main large supermarket in the immediate area. Indeed this was the main reason why the original covenant on the land prohibiting commercial use of the land was overturned by the then Secretary of State, Nicholas Ridley. A major benefit is that it offers excellent and easily accessible parking space for all users and especially those doing a large family shop. Loss of this supermarket would be a major setback for the area and its residents and would inevitably necessitate additional travel to an alternative site with the knock on effects this would have on traffic and pollution in other areas.

Part of the original permission for change of use of the land granted to Sainsbury's stipulated that the land surrounding the car park should be developed as, in effect, a park for community use. This was carried out very effectively and this "park" area has been well used by local people since its inception. A major part of this was the retention of many mature trees around the boundary which aside from making the area peaceful and welcoming to be in is also good for the environment, especially given that the land borders a main road with high traffic density. I understand that these trees have existing protection orders which cannot be ignored.

The suggestion that this land could provide 299 "homes" is absurd. Such high density

housing would be totally out of character with the area and the increase in the local population would put unacceptable additional pressure on all aspects of the local infrastructure – traffic, public transport, air pollution, schools, GP practices and so on. This would add to the pressure already created by the huge recent development at the nearby Capitol House site.

Any change to the existing land use would involve changing either the supermarket, the car park the community park or all three. There is no justifiable logic or argument to support this. All must remain.

Local Governments are, by definition, elected to represent the needs on *local* people. There is nothing in this proposal that addresses this imperative. On the contrary it would seriously detract from the quality of the lives of local people in the ways outlined above.

This plan must not be implemented and must be withdrawn