

---

I have lived in Hadley Wood for 25 years, having been born and raised here.

The quaint village was a perfect place to grow up with beautiful woods to explore and green sceneries to glance at during my walks to and from school. The greenery is the essence of Hadley Wood and what makes it a unique and attractive place to live. I therefore object to the proposed site allocation which would allow the development of 160 homes on Green Belt land.

The Green Belt is vital for maintaining a what is already deteriorating wildlife and ecosystem in Hadley Wood and surrounding areas. Plants and other biodiversity are necessary to balance out the carbon cycle to promote cleaner air and the Green Belt acts as the green lung.

Despite the Enfield borough setting the target of a reduced carbon emission by 60% by 2025 and promoting eco-consciousness, it seems hypocritical and unnecessary for them to go ahead and destroy the Green Belt.

Hadley Wood is also a small village with few main roads, which is already at maximum capacity. Whenever roads in Hadley Wood undergo repairment, the roads experience high levels of traffic. Congestion of the roads would further increase with the construction of new homes sited next to a main road, for a prolonged period disrupting the daily lives of the residents. Even after construction ends, due to the fact that Hadley Wood is not a very accessible village with poor public transport links, new residents will have to don a car-dependent lifestyle. This will not only increase the overall traffic in Hadley Wood in the long run, it will also add to the levels of carbon dioxide emissions.

Lastly, the reasons the borough is giving for constructing on the Green Belt is to accommodate for much needed housing. It is stated however, in the following PDF created on 01/10/2020 that there are over 3000 empty privately owned homes in Enfield.

<https://new.enfield.gov.uk/services/housing/housing-information-grants-and-nominations-scheme.pdf>

Subsidising more on the above scheme seems a much more effective approach than destroying the Green Belt for a mere 160 homes, of which only 50% minimum is required to be sold and or leased at affordable prices. Constructing on the Green Belt, the green lung of the country, to accommodate for needed housing should only ever be considered as a last resort, and from the above scheme I do not believe the proposed site allocation qualifies to this.

For the above reasons, I wholly object to the proposed site allocation of the development of 160 homes on Green Belt land.