

From:
To: [LocalPlan](#)
Cc:
Subject: Draft Local Plan: Site SA45 etc HADLEY WOOD ASSOCIATION - PART 2: Community Objections
Date: 13 September 2021 23:04:53

Further to HWA Response Part 1 (Consultation), this is Part 2 - the HWA objection to the release from green belt of Site SA45 for housing development, and some other DLP policies as applied to Hadley Wood (intensification, taller buildings, small sites), to other green belt sites and to Cockfosters Station.

1. Hadley Wood is a community of special character : a green and spacious suburb surrounded by rural and wooded green belt developing out from a Conservation Area round the north-south commuter station.
2. We have about 1,000 households. About half are members of HWA, which has over 1,000 individual members.
3. HWA was established in the 1960's in part to protect HW from destructive development. It retains that role, but has taken a positive view to support sustainable development together with the Neighbourhood Planning Forum and has a continuing dialogue with LBE planners for mutual understanding of planners and residents about policy and applications.
4. We are aware that residents have strong views about retaining the green character of HW, and its heritage assets. This is fundamental to why they come to live here and their enjoyment of it. They recognise and value strong and long established Planning policies protecting green belt and heritage assets, good growth, good design and now Climate Change. It is fundamental to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.
5. Residents' views been shown by their support for the HWA Campaign "Treegate" to stop Network Rail cutting down swathes of trackside vegetation and turning this round into "natural capital" national rail policy, alongside Tree Council. Their strong valuation of the Conservation Area was demonstrated by the exceptional high volume of objections to an application for overdevelopment with business (care home) change of use in our residential area; that application was withdrawn earlier this year in the face of this determined opposition. This was not "nimby" but fighting by residents of all ages all across Hadley Wood to preserve heritage assets which are valued in policy by Enfield as a whole. We consider ourselves as guardians of the heritage and environment for the next generations, as should LBE.
6. As part of our support for sustainable development, we have endorsed the Blue & Green Strategy which emphasises the value of green belt and river management, with tree planting and re-wilding. We have engaged with Thames 21 to bring flood protection to Monken Mead in the area of Bartrams Lane (our leased land and Site SA45). Our qualification has been that these policies, and Climate Change, must be positively applied to challenge the incessant pressure by the Planning department for windfall backland development, casually encouraging the loss of mature trees whose environmental and amenity value cannot be replaced by a few whips beside a field somewhere else. 30% of trees in London are in gardens. We have had some success at Planning Committee resisting Officer recommended developments, but we really need the DLP to be clear about priorities.
7. Upon receipt of the DLP, we undertook a review of the draft policies and identified high concern over the green Belt issues and intensification, small sites and tall buildings. We identified that these are contrary to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, to existing policy and assessments, and a failure to consult. We invited our Planning Sub Committee, with the Neighbourhood Planning Forum, to prepare Responses with the employment of consultants as appropriate. For simplicity with residents, we have followed their highest concerns with the focus on Site SA45 and green belt.
8. We have held two public meetings (by zoom) which have endorsed the community objections. The views of residents have been further demonstrated by the increasing flow of responses all objecting in strong terms to the loss of green belt. We are well aware of views from many conversations The Planning Sub Committee work with consultants has shown that there are very strong Planning reasons to object.
9. In these circumstances the Association has no hesitation in making its own objection to the DLP in respect of SA45, also the loss of any green belt (particularly Chase Park as close to us), intensification and any change of

policy designed to justify the Cockfosters Station development with four tall buildings (the wrong sort of development in the wrong place, highly damaging to the local character and community, similarly on the edge of green belt and Conservation Area).

10. Summary and detailed reasons are set out in the NPF Response which, together with the consultant reports, we adopt and incorporate. We also adopt the Response of the HW Conservation Area Study Group and the valuable presentation on Green Belt and Intensification presented on behalf of CA Residents by local historian John Leatherdale.

10. We note the similar objections from many other organisations including The Enfield Society, the Barnet Society, our neighbours CLARA and many others. All opposed to the loss of green belt, also the objections from the Mayor of London, MPs and Councillors in Enfield and Barnet. There is clearly something wrong with these proposals.

11. One side of the Planning objection is that LBE have simply failed to make necessary assessments (heritage, green belt, areas of Special Character; housing need, alternative sites, sustainability) or in general to make out any “exceptional need” to justify taking green belt with its consequence of irretrievable damage for a few houses to be built in over ten years time towards a necessarily imprecise and changing target of 25,000 over twenty years. In Planning terms, that is an impossible task.

12. The other side is the positive one that the site is a very special one, and must be conserved and protected. It is not a flat field in the middle of nowhere. It has a topographically special character recognised as Hornbeam Hills South spreading across three Planning districts, to which the green belt is also common. Damage to our green belt substantially damages adjoining green belt. The meadows are in themselves of special character as part of an old field system with long term grazing, with all the biodiversity and carbon benefits. They are part of the Battle of Barnet site. The rural nature of the meadows and this green belt are an integral part of the heritage value of two adjacent Conservation Areas (HW and Monken Hadley). They are formally part of the Setting of HWCA, and in reality an integral part. A housing estate in this location will substantially harm (“drain away”) the Conservation value of Crescent West transforming (negatively) its character.

13. We complain at the lack of consultation. Any such consultation would have quickly shown up how the site is obviously neither appropriate nor sustainable.

14. Similar and additional reasons to object apply to Chase Park and Cockfosters, on a larger scale and also unsustainable.

15. Sustainability and intensification (including small sites and taller buildings) arguments founder on the reality of Hadley Wood transport, services and infrastructure. The DLP proposals depend completely on the simplistic factor that there is a station. This has no regard to the reality of PTAL 1, of just a parade and few services, no available primary and no secondary school places, of walkability issues. This is a car dependant place contrary to the simplistic assumption.

16. The 800m zone is any event wholly inappropriate and of no use for intensification. There is no scope for faster development. Leaving aside the SA45 site, much of the space is the railway and established open space (including HWA leased land). Critical to the rest is the Conservation Area, which takes up much of the remaining place with all the balance effectively in its Setting. The area cannot provide any significant planned growth. It is already at the tipping point towards urban. On the contrary, with its heritage and green Belt character, it must be an area for ENHANCED protection.

17. Not least, we refer you to the hundreds of individual objections from residents and family and friends and others connected to Hadley Wood. We believe that there are over 1,000 individual responses, including up to half of local households. Reading even a few of them shows why the green belt here must be preserved.

Young people have become highly engaged at the idea of this generation taking away their green environment especially at this time of Climate Change Emergency: “We understand the need for affordable housing, but there must be another way.”

We all know that there are other ways than irretrievable loss of the Greenbelt in Hadley Wood.

We must ask that you remove Site SA45 from your development plans, and focus on enhancing the environment.

