

### **Response to Draft Local Plan Consultation and Site SA45 in Particular**

I have been a resident of Hadley Wood for ten years and greatly value the distinctive character of Hadley Wood. I am writing to register my opposition in the strongest possible terms to the proposed allocation of the Greenbelt land – Site SA45 (Land between Camlet Way and Crescent West, Hadley Wood) – for development. I am directly affected by the development as it is immediately opposite my house.

#### **This is the wrong site for development**

The proposed site is not suitable for housing development for the following reasons.

- Any suggestion that ‘intensification’ around the station will lead to reduced car usage will not apply in this case as the Hadley Wood has no basic amenities and the residents of any development of the site would undoubtedly own cars and use them extensively. It is completely implausible that any reduction in car use could compensate environmentally for the loss of the green fields.
- The roads and infrastructure of Hadley Wood are not sufficient to support a development of this scale.
- The site is immediately adjacent to the Hadley Wood conversation area as well as adjacent to the Monken Hadley conservation area. Our house is part of the Hadley Wood conservation area and this proposal for development would dramatically change its character and run counter to many of its founding objectives of the conservation area.
- There are other historic sites in the area such as the site of the Battle of Barnet, Monken Hadley Church, as well as listed buildings and the proposed development would greatly detract from the amenity and historic character of the area.
- The proposed land is low lying and part of the rainfall storage which holds water before it passes down Monken Mead Brook. If these fields are built over, rainfall will runoff directly into the brook increasing the risk of flooding further down the brook.

#### **There is no need for Enfield Borough to use this greenbelt land**

The point of greenbelt land is that it is kept green in perpetuity. There is always a temptation to use greenbelt land for development as it is first, very easy for developers to use compared to brownfield sites, and second, gives a huge increase in value to the landowner compared to greenbelt compatible use. It is both the legal and moral duty of Enfield Council to uphold greenbelt for future generations as it is inconceivable that the land would ever be returned to greenbelt.

Enfield Borough has quite sufficient brownfield sites to meet its obligations for housing for the period of the plan. It therefore is wrong and a major betrayal of future generations to sacrifice greenbelt land when the Council should be concentrating on making sure brownfield sites are successfully developed.

I am also surprised and disappointed by the behaviour of the Duchy of Lancaster in making an offer of the land and wonder if the Royal family are fully aware what was being done in their name. Given the unique status of the Duchy of Lancaster, they might also consider the impact of adverse publicity in the eyes of the general public resulting from sustained opposition to their action. The Council must consider the possibility that their offer could be withdrawn undermining the proposed plan. If, in response to this possibility, the Council were to decide 160 homes is marginal to the overall plan and their loss from the plan would not significantly affect it, then, most emphatically, there is no justification for sacrificing greenbelt land to include them in the first place.

### **The process is inappropriate and disingenuous**

Given the historic and irreversible nature of sacrificing greenbelt land, it is paramount that the Council undertakes a complete and thorough consultation in order to be satisfied that all other possibilities have been fully exhausted (which as stated above, they clearly have not been exhausted). In this case, the council has undertaken the minimum of consultation and that over a summer vacation period. This site was not in any previous consultation nor was there any suggestion it might be – it has been introduced 'out of the blue'. It is wholly inappropriate at this late stage in the process for the council to have contemplated introducing this site to the plan. It is further both inappropriate and disingenuous to have the consultation over the summer vacation when many people are away and unable engage fully with the consultation process. This included both people who are directly affected and also people who can hold the Council to account for any assertion that all other possibilities have been exhausted.

I invite you to remove this site from the plan.