
Dear Sirs

Local Plan - Site SA45 – Land between Camlet Way and Crescent West, Hadley Wood

I would like to strongly object to the proposed Local Plan for many reasons but particularly to the proposed release of this green belt site and the site allocation.

I have lived in Hadley Wood for 22 years and regularly walk along the fields overlooking this land. My children have grown up in Hadley Wood and have spent many hours enjoying this aspect of where they live. This site forms part of a beautiful and tranquil landscape which goes well beyond the borough boundary. I am devastated by the prospect of losing this valuable green belt asset for development. I also enjoy the character of the conservation area and cannot believe the Council is seeking to remove the green belt designation to allow the site to be developed into housing. This decision cannot be reversed and the loss so immense it will change Hadley Wood forever. I realise none of the emotive issues of local residents losing this valuable Green Belt will matter to the Enfield Planners. There is reference to 'Posh Hadley Wood' within the planning circles. There are junior planners forced to back a local plan they know is not fit for purpose, directed by senior planners with personal agenda's being pursued rather than the preservation of laws and policy that are in place to protect our Green Belt. I also realise the council have been given a mandatory housebuilding target by the government which they are trying to fulfil, albeit poorly. Already there are articles coming out in the press that these directives will be watered down and reversed. In this environment, where governments come and go and planning policies will change in the future the laws for the protection and preservation of green belt are for this exact reason.

I didn't choose to live in Hadley Wood because I am 'posh' or want to pursue that misconception. I live here because I have worked 50plus hours per week my entire life and am amongst the top 1% of tax payers. I believe I have the right to live in an area like Hadley Wood because it is rural and surrounded by greenery, heritage and conservation. I want quality air for my children, open spaces to enjoy when working life is so stressful and maintenance of mental health a priority. I need to be able to go for a walk and enjoy my surroundings to destress. I work for that right. Without people like me who work hard there would be no tax payers money to support the governments policies, spending and social care. I know we need more homes but developing on valuable green belt is not the answer. I was brought up to work hard, so as much as we should promote the rights of those less fortunate we should also recognise the rights of the hard working tax payer. If site SA45 stays in the local plan, I

9th September 2021 Mrs Cindy-Lee Watts 77 Camlet Way Hadley Wood

EN4 0NL

have choices because I work hard and can afford to simply move out of Enfield. I work for that choice. Continuing down this path where you have submitted such a badly thought out plan will only serve to have high paying tax payers like me move and your council loses valuable income. Enfield has quoted 7% of Green belt in the local pan, in fact when you work it out per square foot it is more like 10%. That is unreasonably high and cannot be justified. The local plan doesn't have a settlement hierarchy. It doesn't prioritise brownfield sites, which should be developed no matter the cost before ever touching precious green belt. The council hasn't

included any of their landholdings or estates which is shocking given the council is the single largest landowner in the borough.

Your criteria does not constitute exceptional circumstances. More like greed. The Duchy of Lancaster has proposed this site for development because it stands to make millions for the crown and so is an easy choice for the council to support in contradiction of its own policies. The council will also benefit from the sill tax, in the big scheme of the future of green belt and climate change, is that really justifiable!! Projecting 10 years from now, 20 years from now even 50 years from now we will never have the chance to reverse bad decisions or bad policy. We should preserve the green belt or it will simply vanish forever and the only winners are the developers who will want to maximise this site for profit.

I therefore wish to strongly object to the proposed release of this green belt site and the site allocation, which would allow the development of 160 homes on green belt land for the following reasons:

1. IT IS NOT A SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT LOCATION. Hadley Wood is a car dependent location and adding 160 houses will add more use of cars and this will in turn add to congestion which causes air pollution and this only increases the effects on climate change which is another huge issue in the world today. Good growth and development is needed but there is a lack of amenities and infrastructure, this would require significant investment to accommodate a meaningful increase in the number of residents through the development of this site or intensification around the station. Hadley Wood lacks schools, many local residents cannot get their children into our local primary school. We lack easy access to healthcare, shopping and leisure facilities, local public transport is poor and drainage/sewers inadequate. It takes a minimum of 45 minutes to walk to the closest bank, let alone a doctors surgery or dentist.

2. GREEN BELT SHOULD BE PROTECTED. The Green Belt must be protected and conserved as it serves vital purposes including separation from Barnet and Ponders Bar, helping air quality in the borough and biodiversity. The centuries' old grasslands are an important resource for carbon sequestration. According to the London Green Belt Council, the fundamental aim of the GREEN BELT policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, the essential aspects of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. Green Belts assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling or derelict and other urban land. The proposed local plan to reassign the above mentioned land for development is in STARK CONTRADICTION to the NATIONAL GREEN BELT policy.

The Local Plan proposes a quarter of the 25,000 new homes to be built on Green Belt land, in breach of national policies, the London Plan and Enfield's own Climate Change Action Plan. To build 25% of the new homes on Green Belt land cannot be justified. There is no justification why 160 out of the 25,000 homes should be built on the Hadley Wood site when such a small number of homes could easily be found outside the green belt.

3. THE LOCAL PLAN WILL DESTROY OUR UNIQUE HERITAGE LANDSCAPE. The Hadley Wood meadows under threat are part of the established Green Belt in an Area of Special Character across three boroughs. They provide visual harmony for many walkers and cyclists, are the setting for two Conservation Areas and their loss would greatly harm the heritage value of both Hadley Wood and Monken Hadley. The intensification plans would also cause harm to the Conservation Area.

4. IT IS UNNECESSARY AND WRONG. Neither the housing supply nor demand requirement has been adequately assessed. The range of housing need numbers is too wide to justify the

necessary exceptional circumstances, and various potential sources of supply, such as SIL sites, have not been assessed. There is also no evidence of compliance with the Duty to Cooperate with other boroughs.

5. CLIMATE CHANGE. As a car-dependent location Hadley Wood is not a suitable location for a large-scale increase in housing at site SA45 or through intensification. The already existing congestion would be worsened, leading to air pollution. How can developing on this beautiful field assist the Council in meeting its own Climate Change Action Plan? Why is the council seeking to concrete over this field. Surely this field contributes more to fighting Climate Change, than developing it for housing.

Please carefully consider all of the objections you have received and kindly remove all of site SA45 from the proposed allocation and fully investigate all brownfield sites in private and public ownership before looking to build on the green belt.