

---

I am writing to you to object to the proposal to build on the green belt land between Camlet Way and Crescent West in Hadley Wood.

I have lived in Hadley Wood since 2014, and one of the main reasons for us to move to the area was the green space and the natural beauty of the Hadley Wood village which sets it apart from other areas. We value the green space hugely, and this is so important to us as a family and for my young son to enjoy. We are members of Hadley Wood Association / the tennis club and use the green spaces all the time. In this day and age, and with the importance of protecting our natural environment, it is unforgivable to build on this land and I therefore absolutely object to the proposal to build 160 homes on the Green Belt.

- This plan has failed to prioritise the brownfield sites, and for eg only part of Meridian's water capacity is included in the 20 year plan. I am afraid the proposal is focused on the easy option of building on Green Belt, destroying the very environment we have moved here for, love and cherish and must protect.

- This site is a valued and valuable part of the Green Belt; referring to Enfield's most recent Characterisation Study, this space has been referred to 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". We cannot and must not destroy this hugely valuable part of our natural habitat.

- This site contributes significantly to the purposes and openness of the Green belt. Hadley Wood Heritage and Character Assessment notes that this site provides important views (which we genuinely enjoy as a family) and acts as a buffer, separating Hadley Wood from the urban areas. This is important in keeping the character of our beautiful Hadley Wood village. Your proposal has taken no account of the fact that this site forms part of the Hombeam Hills Areas of Special Character.

- The proposal will severely harm wildlife and biodiversity. Building 160 homes over 11ha of green is in direct contradiction of Enfield's green policies, and a bad use of precious green land with an important purpose for the local residents. The ecology of the area must be protected for the rough grazing and wildlife habitat.

- This proposal will increase risk of flooding in other parts of Hadley Wood. I am sure you will agree, having seen the devastating recent floods across London in overly built areas, that putting local residents and their livelihoods and homes at this risk is unacceptable. 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 water sewer infrastructure has not kept us with all the development, and no more pressure should be added to this.

- This site is not suitable for sustainable development. It has poor transport links with a PTAL 1a/b; the scheme will be fully reliant soon cars, and there are very limited local amenities. There is no local GP, no post office, no secondary school, and an oversubscribed primary school and no local employment.

- The addition of 160 homes does not warrant investment in infrastructure - the addition of a new primary school, secondary school, and health services. We already struggle with local amenities, and have to use health services / schools further afield across Potters Bar etc. Adding more families and children without consideration of the needs for services is totally wrong.

- This site is bordered and overlooked by the Hadley Wood Conservation Area and Grade II listed buildings in Camlet Way. Building on this site will 100% negatively impact the setting and character and appearance of these assets.

- This proposal is an opportunistic development rather than a strategic, sustainable one. This site was not on the 2018 consultation document and was only added with Duchy of Lancaster (landowner) made it a condition of

support for the local plan. It is morally wrong to destroy the very planet and natural habitat we so depend on, and in this day and age, must do everything in our power to protect.

- This site should not be classed as "Available" and should not be included as an allocated site. The agricultural tenants lease runs beyond the 5 years threshold and this Green Belt site should not be included for development in 10+ years time, given other brownfield sites will become available to replace these 160 homes within that timeframe.

- The council have not outlined the necessary exceptional circumstances, as to why this specific Green Belt land should be released for development of 160 homes out of the 25,000 homes they are seeking up to 2039.

- The indiscriminate intensification of density within 800 meters of any station is flawed; the proposal fails to consider lack of local amenities, schools, healthcare, poor public transport links. This is not sustainable development, adding housing between, behind and above existing homes.

Given the above reasons, I object to this proposal.