

Dear Sir/ Madam

Subject: Draft Local Plan - Site SA45 – Land between Camlet Way and Crescent West, Hadley Wood

I and my family, tax-paying, voting citizens, have lived in Hadley Wood for over 25 years and we are variously members of the Hadley Wood Association and Hadley Wood Tennis Club. We were particularly attracted to the neighbourhood as it is surrounded by Green Belt, which protects the special character of the conservation area.

We wish to record our unreserved objection to the proposed site allocation, which would permit the development of 160 homes on Green Belt land.

Putting our emotional objections aside, we set out below our objections on Planning grounds:

1) Plan fails to develop/prioritise all brownfield sites. There is no prioritisation in the Local Plan of brownfield sites and, for example, only part of Meridian Water's capacity is included in the 20 year plan. Instead, the easy option of building on a Green Belt site with poor local connections and amenities has been chosen ahead of existing brownfield alternatives.

2) Destroys part of the Green Belt. Enfield's most recent Characterisation Study refers to the area as "a special area of landscape character which is a major asset for the borough. It is of both landscape and historic significance"; and "The existing Green Belt boundary should be retained and protected, and future development and land use changes resisted".

3) The Site makes a significant contribution to the purposes and openness of the Green Belt. The Hadley Wood Heritage and Character Assessment notes that the site provides "important views" and the landscape "acts as a buffer separating Hadley Wood from other urban areas". No account has been taken of the fact the site forms part of the Hornbeam Hills Area of Special Character.

4) Wildlife and biodiversity would be harmed. Building over 11ha of fields for 160 homes is an inefficient use of valuable land that serves an important purpose, and contradicts Enfield's green policies and the declaration by the Council of a Climate Emergency. The ecology of this unique area of rough grazing and wildlife habitat, a relic of the landscape of Enfield Chase, should be protected, not bulldozed.

5) Increases flood risk in other parts of Hadley Wood. Parts of the land are flood zone 3, and local sewers/flood defences are already insufficient in capacity, resulting in frequent flooding across Hadley Wood. The existing foul and surface water sewer infrastructure has not kept up with the pace of development, and could scarcely accommodate the increased burden arising from 160 new homes.

6) Wrong location for a sustainable development. This is not a sustainable site. It has poor public transport links with a PTAL 1a/b. Indeed, there has been systematic de-prioritisation of the rail services to Hadley Wood station over the last 25 years. The scheme

would be wholly reliant on cars, as there are very limited local amenities, no local GP, no post office, no secondary school, an oversubscribed primary school and virtually no local employment. The Duchy of Lancaster, through its historic land covenants, even prohibits the operation of a Pub or Bar in Hadley Wood.

7) Site is surrounded by Conservation Areas and Grade II listed buildings. The site is bordered and overlooked by the Hadley Wood Conservation Area, the Monken Hadley Conservation Area and Grade II listed buildings on Camlet Way. It would be impossible to build on that site without it adversely impacting the setting, character and appearance of those heritage assets.

8) The proposal is an opportunistic development rather than a strategic decision. The site was not on the list for development in the 2018 consultation document and was only added when the Duchy of Lancaster, as landowner, made it a condition of their support for the Local Plan. This is the same Duchy that prevents the local inhabitants from accessing a Pub (see (6) above)!

9) Fundamentally, the Site should not be classed as 'Available' and should not be included as an allocated site. The agricultural tenant's lease runs beyond the 5 year threshold and this Green Belt site should not be included for development in 10+ years' time, as other brownfield locations will become available to replace these 160 homes within that timeframe.

10) The council have not specified the necessary 'exceptional circumstances' why this specific Green Belt site should be released for development for 160 homes out of the 25,000 homes they are seeking up to 2039.

Can you please therefore remove this proposed site allocation from the next edition of the Local Plan and retain the Green Belt status for the land.

We would welcome the opportunity to attend any consultation in person/ via video meeting rooms.