

Dear Sirs,

We have just moved to Hadley Wood, arriving in June this year. We are currently in the process of joining the Hadley Wood Association and are members of a number of local clubs. We moved to the area largely because of the green space at the end of our garden and all the other green areas within Hadley Wood. The Green Belt was a particular attraction, our children would be surrounded by countryside and all the benefits that brings.

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

In particular our objection is due to the following:

**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. There are so many unused buildings in our high streets and surrounding areas, surely there are more sustainable alternatives that should be considered before destroying a beautiful area of green belt.

**2) 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. As soon as we moved to the house we noticed a colony of bees in our garden, they arrived of their own accord and were an indication that the surrounding area was a rich habitat for wildlife.

**3) 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. Something we have already experienced in terms of the the existing sewer infrastructure, having lived in the road for just two months.

**4) Too small for infrastructure investment.** 160 new homes do not warrant the investment needed to increase schools, healthcare services, shops, leisure facilities. There is very little in terms of infrastructure in the immediate vicinity and much investment would be needed to sustain additional residents. The traffic flow would need to be considered as many of the roads are narrow and the congestion that would result would create chaos. Pavements are also too narrow for the extra pedestrians living and those supporting the new residents - this would need to be considered.

