

---

I write to express my opposition to Enfield's draft local plan, particularly in relation to the proposal to build 160 homes on Site SA45 which is designated as part of London's green belt.

I have lived in Enfield for over 30 years, now in Hadley Wood but the majority of that time in Palmers Green. I consider that your intended encroachment into our green belt to be ill-thought out. If Site SA45 is built on, it will have minimal benefit on Enfield's housing stock but it will have serious consequences for our local environment.

I am in complete agreement with the Mayor of London who last week stated that any proposal to encroach on London's green belt should only be considered in "very exceptional circumstances". There are absolutely no "exceptional circumstances" which would justify building on Site SA45.

Site SA45 was not included in the original draft plan. It was only added after pressure from the Duchy of Lancaster.

The Duchy had no interest whatsoever in appraising the housing needs of Hadley Wood or Enfield. Instead, it sought to turn the value of its plot from agricultural to residential to increase the value of its asset. Enfield Council has acquiesced even though the site was not in the original plan.

Site SA45 is not wasteland. It is an integral part of an area of outstanding beauty; there to protect all Londoners. It is green, attractive and accessible and, if built on, the damage to the environment will be irreparable. It will destroy a unique heritage stretching from Hadley Wood through to Hadley Common in Barnet. It would encroach on an area of historical significance still taught in our schools - the site of the Battle of Barnet, one of the most significant events in the Wars of the Roses.

Today, Site SA45 is part of an area of outstanding natural beauty enjoyed by walkers, cyclists and families alike. It fulfills the original intention of the green belt. It stops urban sprawl from London encroaching onto attractive, green, accessible land. It is there for the benefit of all - a green public asset which was put in place despite the severe housing crisis facing the country at that time. Now is the time for our present Councillors to show the same vision and strength as their predecessors and ensure that in dealing with urban renewal we also protect the environment for future generations. The two are not incompatible. The green belt is there not just for us but for future generations. Protecting it would be a legacy to be proud of.

The proposal to concrete over Site SA45, situated in the heart of our green belt, flies in the

face of the image Enfield Council seeks to portray. It is Enfield Council which prides itself as being London's first council to issue a Climate Emergency Declaration. It is Enfield Council which boldly declares that it will work with Extinction Rebellion. But it is Enfield Council which intends concreting over Site SA45;

a site which will have minimal impact on Enfield's future needs but which, if built upon, would cause irretrievable environmental damage. Protecting the environment has to be more than attractive words, more than slogans and declarations and more than image. It's about having the resolve to take courageous decisions which protect and improve not only our environment but that of future generations

In addition, Site SA45 has been added at a later date to the original local plan without any evidence that housing on that site would be sustainable. There are many concerns about the suitability of the site for homes. First, concreting over this part of the green belt could greatly increase the risk of flooding with surface water run off. Secondly, there is no infrastructure in place, There is only one primary school and no access to either Chase Farm Hospital or North Middlesex other than by car. Thirdly, the site is isolated from the rest of Enfield. There is absolutely no access to the centre of Enfield other than by car. Fourthly, public transport does not support the development. Trains through Hadley Wood station do not connect with any other part of Enfield. Cockfosters tube station can only be reached from the site by car but it is the Council's intention to close the car park there for high rise apartments. There is an extremely limited bus service to the Spires in Barnet. All other travel is by car. In these circumstances, it is difficult to understand how any building on Site SA45 would be sustainable.

For the reasons set out above, I am against Site SA45 being included in the draft local plan.