

**From:**  
**To:** [LocalPlan](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Draft Enfield Local Plan - Proposed Site Allocation Ref. No. SA45 - Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent West, Hadley Wood  
**Date:** 17 September 2021 09:52:24

---

Dear Sir,

I write in support of my husband's letter below which sets out our views regarding the proposal to build 160 houses on Green Belt land in Hadley Wood.

Hadley Wood is an isolated corner of Enfield with no direct links to Enfield Town. It has no transport links to Enfield, its only transport links being rail connections to the north and south and a limited bus service to Barnet. It has no infrastructure that could support the residents of 160 houses. The infant and junior school is full to capacity there is no doctor's surgery, no pharmacy and only a small general store.

The proximity of the proposed development to the Conservation Area contravenes many of the aims of the Conservation Area set out in council documents.

I wish to record my personal objections to the proposals and endorse all that is written in the letter below.

Yours faithfully.

---

**Sent:** 26 July 2021 18:24

**To:** 'localplan@enfield.gov.uk' <[localplan@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@enfield.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** 'hadley.woodassoc@btinternet.com'

**Subject:** Draft Enfield Local Plan - Proposed Site Allocation Ref. No. SA45 - Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent West, Hadley Wood

Dear Sir,

I write in response to the Draft Enfield Local Plan (ELP) and in particular to the Proposed Site Allocation Ref. No. SA45 (page 364) to build 160 houses on Green Belt land.

This proposal appears to be contrary to much that is written in the ELP and being adjacent to a Conservation Area contrary to the Council's views expressed in relation to the purpose of the Conservation Area and its raison d'être. The proposal is inappropriate in the ELP and appears to have been added as an afterthought and the plan does not give any justification for its inclusion.

In her Forward to the Draft Plan (page 3) the Leader of the Council states that, "Housing growth will.....focus on town centres and well connected urban locations..." and later in the Forward, that housing growth should lead to improvements in biodiversity. Building houses on an isolated piece of Green Belt is totally contrary to these initially stated aims and supports the view that this proposal to build on Green Belt in Hadley Wood was an afterthought.

In Policy 11.1, Policy DM RE 1 Character of the Green Belt and open countryside (page 262) it states that, "Development will only be permitted where it does not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the landscape and Green Belt" and that development within or adjoining Green Belt and open countryside will be expected to, "incorporate measures to improve the character of the Green Belt through environmental improvements and conserve and not detract from the open character of the Green Belt and surrounding landscape." The proposed building of 160 houses on Green Belt can only have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity and detract from the open character of the Green Belt and nowhere are there proposals to improve the character of the Green Belt through environmental improvements. There are no exceptional circumstances to allow release of the land from Green Belt. The plan SA45 contradicts the principles set out in Policy 11.1 and it is difficult to see how the two can appear in the same document. The concreting over of 11.05 ha of Green Belt can only destroy biodiversity and will also add to the already high risk of flooding in Hadley Wood.

Hadley Wood is the wrong location for sustainable development. It is neither a town centre nor a well connected urban location. It has a station but the connections from it are to Potters Bar and beyond to the north and New Barnet and beyond to the south. Hadley Wood is totally isolated from the rest of Enfield, there is no direct bus connection and this development must inevitably result in a significant increase in car traffic on all the local roads which will worsen traffic congestion and magnify that which will be created by the proposal to build on the Chase Park site. Hadley Wood has one small store, an infant and junior school already at capacity but no secondary school, no doctors surgery, no pharmacy and no capacity for new local employment. Hadley Wood is too small for infrastructure development and therefore the residents of the proposed new houses will be isolated from all

Enfield's amenities and forced to become "citizens" of Barnet but paying rates to Enfield. There can be no justification for the destruction of Green Belt to build 160 houses without supporting infrastructure in this isolated corner of Enfield. This would be an example of urban sprawl which the Green Belt was developed to prevent.

The proposed development is adjacent to the Hadley Wood Conservation Area which was designated in 1989. The council has agreed "to manage change in a sensitive way , to ensure that those qualities that warranted designation are sustained and reinforced rather than eroded."

(Hadley Wood Conservation Area Character Appraisal, Sept 2016). One of those qualities cited is the spaciousness of the area and the views between the houses. Page 14 specifically states, "More attractive breaks occur in the street frontage on the north side of Crescent West, where houses give way to open country with views out to the north west of hills and woods,,,,," This view would be replaced by one of 160 dwellings which contradicts the Council's stated aim in relation to the Conservation Area.

For the reasons stated above I object to the proposal SA45 in the Council's Draft Local Plan. The area proposed for development on the north west boundary of the borough is isolated, without appropriate travel links and with inadequate infrastructure. The proposal contravenes the Council's stated aims in relation to sustainable development and the maintenance of the adjacent Conservation Area and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the destruction of Green Belt.

Yours faithfully,