

---

Dear Sir/Madam

I live in Brookmans Park and our house is directly adjacent to Green Belt land, where the local community has challenged successfully various attempts to build on part of the land. I have strong connections to Hadley Wood. My Father lived in Hadley Wood for 63 years. I lived in Hadley Wood for 10 years and have been a member of Hadley Wood Golf Club for over 60 years. I therefore visit the area regularly and know it well.

Hadley Wood has a special character, particularly around Crescent East and Crescent West. It is bounded by Green Belt which is so important to its character and which hasn't been breached to date. I object to the proposed site allocation which would allow the development of 160 homes on Green Belt Land.

As a general point on the importance of retaining Green Belt, the following is a quote in 2020 from a Principal Management Development Officer in another borough:

"The Government attaches great importance to the Green Belt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. In the Green Belt, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances"

The principles stated in this quote were endorsed by a Government Planning Inspector, also in 2020.

These principles are essential to this site because no very special circumstances have been demonstrated by the Council to support this site being taken out of the Green Belt and included in the Local Plan for development in 10 years' time. The site is also outside the settled curtilage of the Hadley Wood neighbourhood. Maintaining this curtilage has been very important in the development of Hadley Wood over many decades.

Development of this site would destroy a valuable part of the Green Belt. Enfield's most recent Characterisation Study refers to the area as being of landscape and historic significance and, importantly, states that "The existing Green Belt boundary should be retained and protected, and future development and land use changes resisted". Thus, if this site is included in the Local Plan, this statement of the Council would be completely overturned.

In my view, the site is not sustainable for development even if the fact of it being in the Green Belt was ignored. The public transport links are not strong enough to prevent car use. 160 houses would likely mean at least another 200 cars for residents. Crescent East and Crescent West had commuter cars of those travelling by train, parked on both sides prior to the pandemic. It is very difficult to

navigate already when cars going in opposite directions try to pass. Thus adding further cars coming from the site will exacerbate this problem. There are also very limited local amenities.

Following on from this, the site is too small for infrastructure development and therefore there is no chance of increasing the already limited shopping and other facilities that are available. Furthermore, indiscriminate intensification of development just because a site is within 800 metres of any station is flawed as it is measured as the crow flies and does not take account of local inadequate infrastructure.

I would also make a final point that all brownfield sites in the borough should be included in their entirety within a Local plan covering many years hence before allocating land in the Green Belt. There are regeneration companies who redevelop brownfield sites with difficult land issues caused by industrial use. Thus there are hardly any brownfield sites that are not capable of redevelopment.

I restate my objection to Site SA45 being included in the local plan