

---

Dear Sirs,

I have lived in Hadley Wood for almost 10 years and value all the green spaces within the area which my family and I utilise on daily basis. We were drawn to Hadley Wood as it is surrounded by Green Belt, which protects the special character of the area.

We regularly walk our dog in the public land at Bartrams Lane and surrounding areas, have watched our children play football in the playing fields and enjoy the nature and wildlife the area has to offer - the proposed plan would massively impact our everyday life in a negative way.

I therefore object to the proposed site allocation, which would allow the development of 160 homes on Green Belt land on the following grounds.

- 1) Increased flood risk in many other parts of Hadley Wood. Parts of the land are flood zone 3, local sewers and flood defences are already insufficient, resulting in frequent flooding across the area. The existing foul and surface water sewer infrastructure has not kept up with the pace of development
- 2) 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 not be possible to build on the proposed site without negatively impacting the character, setting and appearance of the heritage assets
- 3) The Site shouldn't be classed as 'Available' and shouldn't 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
- 4) The council have yet to outline 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
- 5) Random intensification of density within 800 metres (as the crow flies) of any station is flawed, as it fails to take account of the lack of amenities and poor local public transport. The additional housing to be added between, behind and above existing homes does not represent sustainable development

Yours sincerely,