

---

**OBJECTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF GREEN BELT LAND BETWEEN CAMLET WAY AND**

---

**CRESCENT WEST HADLEY WOOD**

My family and I have been living in Hadley Wood for over a decade and I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to develop the Green Belt land opposite my home. We live in Hadley Wood, despite there being a lack of public transport, amenities and infrastructure in order to enjoy the green spaces and quiet that Hadley Wood provides. I am an asthmatic and have purposefully moved to this area with its large green spaces so that I am not adversely affected by the pollution and poor air quality associated with living closer to London.

For many reasons Hadley Wood is not an appropriate location to develop an additional 160 houses:

1. Hadley Wood is not an area that can support sustainable development. We need to use our cars to get to the nearest urban areas of High Barnet and Cockfosters as there are no local amenities that can be used instead. The inevitable increase in car use and the resulting pollution and lower air quality that would arise from the additional housing means that this development is far from sustainable. At a time when Transport for London and the Mayor are expanding the Ultra Low Emission Zone to only 4 miles from Hadley Wood (A406) to improve air quality in London, I am aghast that Enfield council is considering a development that wholly relies on the use of cars to link the development to other areas which do have amenities, schools etc.
2. I could not purchase standard home insurance for my property in Hadley Wood due to the risk of flooding. My home insurance is therefore higher than it otherwise would be. There is frequent flooding and there have been many power outages on my road. Adding even more properties through this development would exacerbate the existing flooding problem especially as the infrastructure remains woefully inadequate.
3. Enfield Council's Cabinet declared a state of Climate Emergency and committed to making Enfield carbon neutral by 2030 or sooner. The proposed development is a direct contradiction of this declaration. It is wholly wrong in light of the council's declaration for there to be any development on the Green Belt as this valuable green space is also an effective carbon sink which will enable Enfield to meet its carbon neutral promise. On a broader level, during a time when the UK government desperately needs to lower its CO2 emissions if it is to meet its national climate change commitments, developments on Green Belt land is reprehensible. Concreting over the Green Belt and removing yet another natural resource to combat climate change may seem like a cheap and easy fix for increasing housing by the council in the short term, but the true cost of this development will be paid by our children and grandchildren as developments of this nature will cause us to fail in our ability to slow down global warming. Concreting over our green spaces cannot be the sustainable answer to providing houses.
4. All brownfield sites and developer land banked sites should be developed before any development on the Green Belt is even considered. The Campaign to Protect Rural

England published their estimate that approximately 37,000 homes could be built on existing brownfield sites in Enfield. When there is a glut of Brownfield sites that could be better used for housing, I cannot understand why the council would be an accomplice to (i) the destruction of the Green Belt in light of devastating climate change and in contradiction to their own statements on the Climate Emergency, (ii) the lowering of air quality for our children by placing a development reliant on cars, (iii) the potential damage to not only our homes but those on the proposed development due to flooding (which will only increase as extreme weather caused by climate change becomes more frequent), and (iv) the ruin of the character of Hadley Wood for which it has enforces strict Conservation Area rules.

This proposal appears to be wholly opportunistic for both the council and the greedy developers, short terminist and without proper consideration of the numerous adverse immediate and long term consequences. I would ask the council to reject this development.