

Response to the Draft Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation 2021

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation and I would appreciate your acknowledgement of my personal concerns as follows:

I have lived in Enfield Chase for nearly 6 years and in that time have observed the detrimental impact of the development at Trent Park. Large areas of trees felled, wildlife habitats destroyed and restricted access to parts of the park (Snakes Lane for example). As a family we thrive in natural open spaces and are concerned by your proposal to destroy more of our boroughs green spaces which will negatively impact on the special character and identity of Enfield.

I would like to express my objections to (Page 72) **Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11 and** SP PL8: Rural Enfield (Point 2) where it states that 1,000 ha of re-wilding is proposed, along with the creation of wetlands to mitigate flood risks. Wetlands don't solve these flood risks but existing ancient woodlands CAN. Our Ancient woodlands cannot be replicated in the medium to long term, as trees need decades to establish themselves and play their part in reducing pollution levels and providing resilience against climate change. (Page 73)3.8.11 goes on to boast that the proposed tree planting and rewilding programme "would become one of the only rewilding projects in close proximity to a large city" that is because Historic Enfield Chase is the ONLY surviving example of a chase within Greater London. I would like to also draw attention to (Page 74) 3.8.12, which eludes to the fact that the rewilding schemes proposed are NOT guaranteed as they will require funding/grants to be sourced 'to facilitate the delivery of the interventions set out'. Our Green Belt needs to be protected at all costs and alternative options sought. The Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF], and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan. 'The Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development in line with government policy'. Sadly, this is totally inadequate, as currently Government policy does not offer protection against developing woodlands.

With this in mind, I would also like to express my objections to; Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10; Policy SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364; Policy SA54, page 374; Policy SA52 page 372; and Policy SA62 page 383 and SP CL4 pages 277-279 as most of these sites are part of historic Enfield Chase. The remaining parts of Enfield Chase need to be protected as they are a very rare and valuable landscape asset and cannot be replicated. **Once these areas are gone there is no getting them back (regardless of how ambitious the rewilding**

programs are thought to be) it would be completely reckless and short sighted to destroy green spaces when we are in the midst of a climate crisis. I totally support the Enfield RoadWatch campaign, which strongly advocates the protection of our precious Green Belt in favour of more ecological alternatives.

While I am in support of housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. Housing built on Green Belt is not affordable. I believe that there are alternatives available to meet housing targets and that the Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations.

The comments provided in this response to the consultation are my own views.