

-
- 3,000 new houses at a ‘deeply green’ ‘sustainable urban extension’ referred to as ‘Chase Park’ (also known as Vicarage Farm) on the open Green Belt countryside next to Trent Park either side of the A110 (Enfield Road) between Oakwood and Enfield town ([Policy SP PL 10, pages 80-87, and Figure 3.11](#));
 - 3,000 new houses in a ‘sustainable settlement’ at Crews Hill with the potential for longer term expansion ([Policy SP PL9, pages 77-80 and Concept Plan Figure 3.10](#));
 - 160 homes in Green Belt countryside at Hadley Wood ([SA45: Land Between Camlet Way and Crescent Way, Hadley Wood, page 364](#));
 - Industrial and office development in the Green Belt near Rammey Marsh ([SA52 page 372](#));
 - 11 hectares of new industrial and storage and distribution use at what is currently agricultural land east of Junction 24 of the M25 at part of new Cottages and Holly Hill Farm within Enfield Chase ([SA54, page 374](#));
 - a big expansion of the Spurs football training ground to the north of Whitewebbs Lane up to the M25, comprising of 42.5 hectares of land, for “professional sport, recreation and community sports/leisure uses” ([SA62 page 383 & SP CL4 pages 277–279](#));
 - Encouragement for tall buildings, including in sensitive locations such as the town centre conservation area ([see pages 156-60, Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4 and Policy DE6, and SA2 Palace Gardens Shopping centre page 321](#)). A [higher quality version of figure 7.4](#) is also available, showing proposed maximum building heights across the Borough.

Dear Enfield Council Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

While I support 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. 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. I am concerned that Crews Hill has been singled out for release from the Green Belt. The garden centres and other businesses there provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond. Instead of losing Crews Hill for housing, its horticultural activities should be encouraged and enhanced so that it can once again be a hub for food and plant production. Enfield’s ambitious housing targets can be accommodated on previously-built land [brownfield]. I refer you to the report, Space to Build, Enfield which was recently published by CPRE-London, Enfield RoadWatch and The Enfield Society. It provides evidence of sites for at least 37,000 homes, mostly in areas that need regeneration and would benefit from public transport and other infrastructure upgrades. The Green Belt is too valuable to lose for all the many environmental, ecological, economic, public health and other reasons that have been identified. The Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the NPPF, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

I moved to Enfield in 1976 and was attracted to the borough as it had a balance of open spaces and housing. During the pandemic the open spaces have been used by all the residents of Enfield helping to maintain their mental as well as their physical health.

The only people to benefit from one of these proposals to build on the green belt are the developers ie the Comer brother who live in Monaco and do not pay taxes in this country.

The number of tower blocks proposed is not in keeping with the history of building in Enfield. Until recently, apart from historic unsightly Enfield Council building and more recently the tower block near Enfield Town station – both not in keeping with the type of housing in the area, there are a number of plans for high rise blocks which may provide an immediate need to meet housing needs but the long-term effect of housing families in this type of housing will cause more problems in years to come. Social housing should be about providing high quality, lower rise properties without the need for creating more pollution both in terms of noise, light and traffic.