
I have lived in Hadley Wood for 21 years and am a member of the Hadley Wood Association and my kids went to Hadley Wood Primary School. I value all the green spaces within Hadley Wood and was drawn to the locality as it is surrounded by Green Belt, which protects the special character of the area. I therefore object to the proposed site allocation, which would allow the development of 160 homes on Green Belt land.

1) Plan fails to develop/prioritise all brownfield sites. There is no prioritisation 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.

2) Destroys a valued and valuable 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) 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.

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, resulting in frequent flooding across Hadley Wood. The existing foul and surface water sewer infrastructure has not kept up with the pace of development.

6) Wrong location for a sustainable development. This is not a sustainable site. It has poor public transport links with a PTAL 1a/b. 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.

7) Too small for infrastructure investment. 160 new homes do not warrant the investment needed to increase schools, healthcare services, shops, leisure facilities, etc. [describe your current experiences / concerns].

8) 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.

9) 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.

10) 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.

11) The council have not outlined 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.

12) Indiscriminate intensification of density within 800 metres of any station is flawed, as it fails to take account of the lack of amenities, poor local public transport, distance is measured as the crow flies, etc. The additional housing to be added between, behind and above existing homes does not represent sustainable development.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my views on this matter.