

From:
To: [LocalPlan](#)
Cc:
Subject: Draft Local Plan : Site SA45 : HADLEY WOOD ASSOCIATION - Part 4 : Responses Summary
Date: 28 September 2021 20:02:39

This is the Response of Hadley Wood Association (HWA or the Association) Part 4, a Summary of Responses relevant to Hadley Wood and in particular Site SA45 and Green Belt.

HWA has already sent Part 1 (Consultation - seeking an early meeting), Part 2 (Community Objections) and Part 3 (HWA as Site SA45 Neighbour objection).

This Part 4 Summary overlaps with other Parts to some extent, but we believe it is convenient for planners as well as our residents if we collate the range of Responses.

We invite planners to acknowledge that each of the elements summarised below are decisive contributions in this Consultation in favour of retaining the Green Belt status of SA45, restoring the position in the first draft DLP and correcting the mistake in the second draft.

Cumulatively, they represent an overwhelming case that should quickly be accepted.

The elements of the Response on SA45 (Green Belt and heritage, and related issues of intensification, sustainability, small sites and tall buildings) can be categorised under:

- A. Hadley Wood community submissions and support
- B. Enfield
- C. Barnet and Hertfordshire
- D. London and wider
- E. Individuals (1,000 plus)

They all (and strongly) represent objections to the loss of SA45 from Green Belt.

Taking these in turn, with every one an objection:

A. HADLEY WOOD COMMUNITY

1. HW Neighbourhood Planning Forum with seven professional consultant reports (through STEVE DE VOS) and Past Forum Chair also on Small Sites (DAVID HARBOTT). This addresses all the key issues relevant to the question whether the essential “exceptional need” test had been satisfied with the clearest conclusion “no”. The authors are residents also experienced planning professionals. The Neighbourhood (Draft) Plan must be given special weight. Each aspect is supported by independent consultant reports.

2. Hadley Wood Association (Parts 1-4 through ROBERT WILSON). As explained in Parts 1 and 2, HWA represents the views of very many residents, who look to HWA to lead. HWA fully endorse the NPF submission and incorporate the consultant reports.

3. Hadley Wood Conservation Area Study Group (through LEWIS TEMPLE) and Residents of HW Conservation Area (through JOHN LEATHERDALE). There would be substantial harm and this precludes the proposed development.

4. HW Rail User Group (through FRANCESCA CAINE), a strong local group working closely with GTR and very familiar with travel limitations. With PTAL 1, Hadley Wood is not a sustainable location for intensification.

5. Community Groups through their leaders : St. Paul’s Church (Rev RUPERT MACKAY), HW Jewish

Community (Rabbi), Women's Institute (PHILIPPA PHELPS) and those supporting objections by their communication channels : Golf Club, Tennis Club, Bridge Club, PreSchool, Primary School, Neighbourhood Watch, HW Security and local WhatsApp groups, and by adverts (local businesses).

B. ENFIELD

1. Local MP (Bambos Charalambous) and Councillors (Cockfosters Ward and the Enfield Conservative Group)
2. All main resident groups including: The Enfield Society, FERAA, Enfield Road Watch, CLARA (Cockfosters)

Note: these are mainly objections to the release of any green belt (Chase Park, Crews Hill, Ridgeway); if these objections are successful, then it must follow that SA45 should not be released. The Hadley Wood responses and evidence demonstrate that SA45 must remain in green belt whatever decisions are made on the larger sites: SA45 is a small site (160 units) which cannot make an "exceptional" housing need justification, is part of the plan to be built over ten years ahead, has special character and must be protected by Conservation Area and heritage factors.

C. BARNET + HERTS

1. Chipping Barnet MP (Theresa Villiers) and local councillors for the adjacent Barnet ward.
2. Heritage and other groups: The Barnet Society, the Barnet Museum and the Battlefield Trust; we anticipate objections also from Monken Hadley Conservation Area (MHCA), Barnet Residents Association, Hadley Residents Association, and Monken Hadley Commoners and from Herts. The secondary school within the MHCA ie Mount House School has objected (through HM SARAH RICHARDSON).

Note: SA45 is within green belt, an area of special character (Hornbeam Hills South), and heritage space (Enfield Chase, Battle of Barnet and Conservation Area) all of which are shared with Barnet.

D. LONDON + WIDER

1. MAYOR OF LONDON who has responded in clear and strong terms that no green belt loss has been justified, for reasons consistent with the HW NP Forum submission and consultation reports (A1 above). SA45 is clearly covered by this MoL objection; although not expressly mentioned along with Crews Hill and Chase Park, the general submissions plainly apply to SA45 : the PTAL is 1 (not 3-6), the number of housing units is small and only to be built after ten years, and additionally it is in the setting of Conservation Areas.
2. There is wide opposition to the Enfield Plan and we note, for example, the London Green Belt Forum, CPRE and National City Forum.

E. 1,000 INDIVIDUALS

1. There have been 1,000 objections to SA45. We believe this includes objections from half of all HW households. Given how many houses are unoccupied (under development, owned by non-residents or rented), how many people absent (Covid etc), and the usual inertia about responding to a council consultation, this is a remarkable demonstration of community views.
2. HWA has assisted residents by raising awareness of the consultation and the issues. Residents have been encouraged to respond with individual views but with HWA also providing notes on planning points to help focus on relevant concerns. Particularly in the last days of the consultation period, there were many requests to make the process simpler by providing a range of template responses, with over 100 letters delivered to Enfield. Each of these represents genuine individual objections. There are many very individually expressed responses, which show the strength of feeling.
3. The responses come from all ages including teenagers who have strong environmental concerns and are very upset that the green belt may be lost for ever, and at a time of climate change emergency.

4. The responses come from residents across the full area of Hadley Wood, not just immediate neighbours overlooking SA45. They represent green and heritage points, and amenity, as well sustainability issues of lack of services, schools and drains and dangerous traffic.

5. There are a number of multiple family responses, from children as well as parents, and those connected with HW in a variety of ways, including from neighbouring areas. These include ramblers and cyclists familiar with SA45 as part of the green experience of our local and National paths. These all deserve weight on top of the overwhelming response from HW households.

6. We anticipate a continuing flow of objections, albeit much lower than in the last days in the consultation. Although the “consultation is closed” as per the system acknowledgments, we believe they can and should be taken into account. There are a range of reasons why the responses may be sent after 13/9/21, including covid delayed returns to U.K.. Being directed to a specific draft policy item (SA45), they should be practical to include in the evidence. We are also identifying where addresses have not been included, so these can be resent with that extra detail.

7. Within the range of individual responses, there are quite a large number with important evidence additional to the main grounds generally adopted by objectors. No doubt planners will be reviewing every single response, but we intend to provide a further HWA Response as Part 4A to identify as least some of these.

We trust this is all of assistance to planners, as well as residents.

Note: we identify those submitting responses by NAME; we can supply addresses if that assists.

General

Planners will be going through the new Evidence Base of the responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation. We look forward hearing the timetable and to seeing the responses as uploaded to the website. We shall check (as practical) whether all the above responses have been recorded (not all have been acknowledged). We shall be very interested to see the response of SA45 landowner (Duchy of Lancaster) and the current tenant (we understand he has objected).

We firmly believe that these responses and the new Evidence Base will demonstrate beyond any doubt the Draft Local Plan must be changed in respect of SA45.

Sent from my iPhone